

Highland Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

Comments received for the consultation that ended on 13th December 2013 ordered by Customer

Customer Number	04359	Name		Organisation	Nairn Kayak Club
Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)	HHL Scotland		HHL Scotland		
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.32 Nairn	
Reference			Type	Change	

Comment Changes

Nairn Kayak Club wishes the Nairn Harbour Area and environs to be zoned for 'Commercial, Recreation and tourist related Developments' along the lines of the attached map and for it to be noted that the Council will pro-actively support environmental enhancement of the area.

Representation

Nairn Harbour plays an important social and economic role within Nairn and is seen by Local Elected Councillors, NICE, Nairn Kayak Club & Nairn Sailing Club as a strategic asset in the future development of Nairn as a regionally important tourist location. Furthermore, Nairn Harbour still has a commercial function which needs to be safeguarded from inappropriate development/uses of the harbour area. Finally, both the Sailing Club and Kayak Club have ambitions to develop the Harbour Environs as a regional and national important training venue for dinghy sailing and kayak sprint racing, which will require the provision of new facilities within the harbour area and we would wish the plan to supports these ambitions.

Allocated to	Nairn	General	General	
--------------	-------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Tier 2 Centre - "West Seafield Retail Park" to be changed to "Inverness Retail Park" Revised wording for the Policy 1: "The Council will not support any proposal for development that is likely to have a significant adverse effect on the vitality and viability of any of the centres listed below and highlighted on the maps in Section 4. Developers of proposals that generate significant footfall should consider potential sites for their development in a sequential manner working down the hierarchy of centres listed below. If the Council considers that a proposal may result in a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of any of these centres then the developer will be required to produce a retail impact assessment."

Representation

HUT supports the allocation of "West Seafield Retail Park" as a centre under Policy 1. However as a point of clarification this reference in the Policy should be changed to "Inverness Retail Park" in order to reflect the trading name of the Retail Park. HUT considers that the reference to "adverse effect" and "adverse impact" should be amended to refer to "significant" adverse impact/effect in order to be consistent with the SPP. If reference is to be made to "proposals that generate footfall" this should be amended to refer to "proposals that generate significant footfall" in order to be consistent with the draft SPP review. The reference to the developer being required to produce "a sequential assessment" to assess the impact on vitality and viability should be amended to refer to "retail impact analysis" as the required assessment that should be submitted.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Our client is not averse to the principle of residential development in this location; however there are issues which the planning authority must consider in relation to Morrisons presence in this location for over 13 years. As the Council will be aware, the Morrisons Alness store currently benefits from 24 hour deliveries under permission 06/00651/FULRC. Given this permission, our client is understandably concerned that the new residential site may impact on their existing operating and trading abilities. Accordingly, we would stress that every effort should be made to ensure that adequate protections are assured to Morrisons that their 24 hour delivery operation, which has been in place for 6 years will continue, unhindered. Finally with regards to this allocation, we would respectfully request that Morrisons are kept updated on the progress of this residential development and are given the opportunity to comment on any future AMSICs on the site with regards to any impact on Morrisons' existing operations.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Proposed Allocation AL21: Invergordon Road East The Inner Moray Firth Proposed Plan continues to promote the above site for retail development. This site has been allocated for retail development since at least the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (February 2007), which was adopted six years ago. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP, 2010) paragraph 52 states that all Development Plans should enable gaps and deficiencies in the provision of shopping, leisure and other services to be remedied by identifying appropriate locations for new development. In doing so, commercial realities are to be taken into account when Development Plans are prepared. Paragraph 56 of the SPP adds that planning authorities should identify suitable and viable sites in terms of size, location and availability within a reasonable time period. Although a 'reasonable time period' is not defined in the SPP, this has previously been defined as five years in earlier versions of SPP on town centres / retailing. We are not aware that any proposals have been progressed / submitted for planning permission. Given that over at least the last six years since the Ross and Cromarty Local Plan was adopted, the site has not been developed for retail use, we would question the viability of this site for retail development. Therefore the Council should consider whether promoting this site for another period of approximately 5 years through the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan is practical, necessary or indeed likely to be implemented. In the meantime, should the proposed retail land use allocation be maintained, we would strongly urge that careful consideration is given to the type and scale of retail development for this land. Given that Morrisons and Lidl stores are located to the immediate west of the proposed allocation, we would argue that only non-food retailing should be promoted. It is important that an indication is provided in the emerging plan to identify the type and scale of retail that is considered to be most appropriate (as noted in SPP). In doing so, this is more likely to ensure that the most appropriate retailer shall be attracted to the site, should this retail allocation remain in place. This will also help from an operational point of view to ensure that the infrastructure in the area, as well as Morrisons' operating and trading characteristics are not adversely affected. At this stage, there is no evidence available to suggest that there is a gap/deficiency in retail provision in Alness or how the proposed allocation would address any such gap/deficiency. However, given that Morrisons is already well established in the area, it is not likely that a further convenience (food) retail development is required. With reference to Circular 1/2009, paragraphs 34 – 37 refer to the need for a monitoring and evidence base. As noted above, we are not aware of any evidence that has informed the emerging retail allocation AL21. Paragraph 37 of Circular 1/2009 clearly states that evidence is required to inform plan making, justify the plan's content, and provide a baseline for later monitoring. This lack of evidence or apparent justification for additional retail floorspace is a concern. The allocation of retail land should be based on deficiencies in provision in the area and supported by evidence of this. Similarly Policy 1 of the Proposed Plan notes the importance of promoting and protecting town centres and the need for sequential assessment of retail proposals. As a result we would question why an out of centre location has been allocated for retail development within the Proposed Plan. This lack of evidence, combined with the lack of any proposals/applications over the preceding six years, casts doubts over the merits of continuing to promote this site for retail. As is stands, we therefore object to the proposed land use allocation AL21 which would allow unrestricted retailing. Should further evidence become available to inform the proposed allocation or should the Council seek to clarify the type, scale and nature of retail that is acceptable for the site, we would be pleased to review this and comment further as appropriate.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Allocate land at Balvaird Road for housing, previously as referred to as Site Option H7 in the Main Issues Report. Land area 5.5 ha and capacity of 90 and include other requirements from the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan in respect of the need for a master plan, improved access and contributions to improving village facilities.

Representation

We write to object to the omission of land at Balvaird Road on the north eastern flank of Muir of Ord from the Proposed Plan. Our client, the 3A Partnership, owns land forming part of Site Option H7 in the Main Issues Report (MIR). This land is also currently allocated for development in the adopted Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan (R&CELP), as part of the site referenced 8. The rest of site 8 is owned by a Mr Cameron and adjoining this land to the north is a longer term area ref 17, owned by another client, Mr James Sutherland. Earlier this year the 3A Partnership sought to obtain planning permission for a development of 13 houses on part of the current allocation. This application (ref. no. 13/02423/FUL) was refused on the grounds that it did not provide a master plan developed in partnership with adjacent landowners together with the lack of a suitable safe access and a disproportionately high density relative to the remaining land. A separate direct access to the 3A Partnership land from Balvaird Road formed part of the planning application, dictated mainly by ground site level differences between this and Mr Cameron's land. We were still in negotiations with the Council's Roads service when the Area Planning office decided to refuse permission under delegated powers. The preferred single access to this and Mr Sutherland's land is also indicated on Mr Cameron's land holding. At the time it was not possible for the 3A Partnership to prepare an overall master plan in partnership with the adjacent land owners, particularly as Mr Cameron does not wish to see his land developed. However, that is not to say that this situation will not change in future and therefore overcome the "difficulty" referred to by the Council. The density reason is now contradicted by the Council's intention to increase the capacity of sites MO2 and MO3. In response to the MIR submissions the Council advised of concerns about the capacity of the Balvaird/Seaforth/Great North Roads junction in the centre of the village at present if this development were to proceed. The Reporter to the 2005 R&CELP Inquiry stated that much of the road network is no better, or worse, than many local roads in the surrounding area. The Local Plan also made provision for the improvement of Balvaird Road as a requirement for sites 8 and 17, possibly including road widening, street lighting and traffic calming. Some improvements were also carried out in recent years in relation to the development of other land served by Balvaird Road. The MIR response also advised that there is some scope to bring forward improvements to the junction to increase its capacity, some of which are planned to proceed with the refurbishment of the railway bridge. These latter improvements suggest a slightly longer timescale for development at Balvaird Road. A development timescale to follow sites MO1 to 4 will allow further time to seek the co-operation of all the landowners involved to prepare the overall master plan and explore all access options. However, we are concerned that the present situation was given as the main reason for not allocating the land in the Proposed Plan. There are a number of other land allocations continued into the Plan where their effectiveness depends on more than one party to bring forward master plans in advance of development and where not all the parties are in agreement. This includes, for example, land at Tain (TN5) and Maryburgh (MB1). In any case we challenge whether not having the co-operation of all land owners is a valid reason for removing the allocation from the development plan. It is more important to prepare an overall master plan and assemble enough land to allow a satisfactory permission to be granted and implemented. Nevertheless, the 3A Partnership is willing to work together with the other land owners to bring forward a master plan. We also note that although rejecting land such as at Balvaird Road from being included in the Proposed Plan there may be the prospect of development to the north of the settlement in the longer term, as paragraph 4.74. However, it is disappointing that this is not followed through with at least a "longer term" allocation similar to land at Nairn (NA9) and Tore (TR2), which suggests a lack of consistency across the Plan area. In rejecting the allocation of other land around the fringes of the village the Council stated that "there is sufficient housing land identified in Muir of Ord on sites which will have less of an environmental affect." However, we note that the introduction of site capacity figures has doubled the potential development for some of the sites carried forward from the adopted Local Plan, which could result in more environmental effects. Furthermore, the Plan seeks to add to the already high density cluster of housing at the Cairns, which is more distant from the main village facilities and services. The capacity of MO2 (Tore Road) has increased from 40-65 in the adopted Local Plan to 104 in the Proposed Plan. The former indicates the requirement for perimeter planting and amenity space, which are now missing from the Proposed Plan. These seem to have been sacrificed for more housing, which will have more of an environmental effect in terms of visual impact, increased traffic and surface water discharge. Similarly, the capacity of Mo3 (Ardnagrask, Corrie Road) has been increased by almost 132% from 22 in the adopted Local Plan to 51. This is a site with access limitations examined during the 2005 Public Local Inquiry for the adopted R&CE Local Plan. At the time the Council did not support an increase in

the level of housing in the area due to the potential traffic impact on the single track road. We also question the contribution of allocations MO4 and MO5 to the supply of effective housing land. By the time the LDP is adopted MO4 may be substantially completed and therefore not count towards this supply. We would also expect the sites Mo1, 2 and 3 to be substantially developed in advance of other land being opened up for development, particularly in view of their closer proximity to the village centre. MO5 is more distant than Balvaird Road from the centrally located village community and commercial facilities, including the primary school. It is more difficult to achieve safe active travel along the A862 road. Its development would also result coalescence with the large housing group of Windhill to the south. In view of the above we now seek the re-inclusion of land at Balvaird Road, previously indicated as H7 in the MIR. Even if it is the medium to longer term before the development can commence the land should at least be allocated in line with allocations at Nairn South (NA9) and Tore (TR2). We also suggest that the site capacities for MO2 and 3 be reviewed.

Allocated to Muir of Ord General General

Customer Number 01034 Name 3A Partnership Ltd Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Administrator Yvonne Macdonald G H Johnston Building Consultants

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference KH4 Type Change

Comment Changes

“housing and subject to site appraisal and viability, retail, community and/or business use”

Representation

The IMFLDP should acknowledge the prevailing site conditions that are characterised by severe dereliction, dilapidated buildings and a significant prospect of contamination; and remedial work required to make the site suitable for redevelopment is clearly a major undertaking. The representation to the MIR sought to relieve any undue burdens – including any policy commitment that might affect the viability of a redevelopment proposal. In that regard – whilst the principle of a non-residential element is not opposed per se the PLDP states “Retail, Community and Business” in addition to housing as the primary use; the IMFLDP should not insist on all three of these uses (retail, community and business) being accommodated, but rather allow the option of one or more within one building, subject to site appraisal, restoration costs and a viable proposal for the site as a whole. In the same vein, the IMFLDP should not prescribe a housing capacity for the site that could limit the potential for reuse of the land. The priority should - in the interests of the community as a whole - to rid the land of a past use and a significant eyesore. There is developer interest in achieving that objective; but that could be thwarted by a lack of flexibility in the IMFLDP. A Geo-Environmental Preliminary Assessment is in progress. This may be produced as a relevant document, with agreement as necessary. Documents Geo-Environmental Preliminary Assessment (subject to availability)

Allocated to Kirkhill KH4 MacMillan’s Yard

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Note letter is submission to the Main Issues Report from John Mackenzie (land owner) - address for A.McAllister. This letter follows discussion with Mr Tim Stott at the Conon Hotel in the afternoon of 24th May - and subsequently on the telephone - about ground in my ownership in the middle of Conon Bridge. The land, to the South of the playing field and the Church and associated car park, is that shown as MUI in the draft plan (and on the copy thereof enclosed.) (nothing enclosed)I confirm that I would be happy to release this land for development, which might involve relocation of the existing playing field southwards to permit development at the northern end of the site. My agreement to this is, however, conditional on the retention of the (a) playing field somewhere within the overall site. I understand that it was suggested at the public meeting on 24th May that there exists some title condition affecting this piece of ground which would constrain or preclude development of it. This land has been in the ownership of my family for over 300 years and to the very best of my knowledge and belief no such condition or restriction exists, nor has it ever existed. It may be that the source of this suggestion is confusion with the green open spaces which exist within the housing development to the east of the site which I have marked in green highlighter on the enclosed copy of the plan. I trust that the above confirmation is adequately clear but will be happy to provide any further information which might be required.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Opposes further development in this area because: it would worsen existing traffic congestion, no feasible access route exists and it would worsen existing sewerage and surface water flooding problems.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to build houses in the above area of Conon Bridge. This land includes the present playing field which we understand is owned by the Amenities Association. The playing field and the area of the present car park was gifted to the village in the 1950s. It is important that the playing field remains in the hands of the village, and also that sufficient off-street parking is retained in this central position beside the church. I further ask that you amend the above plan to show this entire area (CB3) as a green space dedicated to the provision of outdoor recreation for all ages in the village. There is a great need to develop further amenities in Conon Bridge to keep pace with the rapid development currently taking place round the village, and surely this is an opportunity for the Highland Council to work with the community in Conon Bridge for the benefit of all. Ps The area of playing field floods from the EilBurn. As such I do not think this area is appropriate for development and should be left so that flooding can be accommodated on grassed playing fields. I, my wife, children and dog regularly use the playing fields for recreation to the benefit of all our health. The loss of this area would be a great shame.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

1. The local Primary Achool is too small to accomodate an extra influx of students. 2. The topography would result in excess rainwater flooding off a new development onto the existing houses which already have a history of flooding. 3. It would spoil the view of Fyrish Hill and woodland for the existing residents surrounding the area. 4. There are alternative locations which are more central to the village and more suitable for development. 5. When Novar Estates got the area accepted into the local development plans there were irregularities in the methods used to achieve their goals. The main one was a failure to communicate with local residents as to their proposed plans. When questioned on this matter Novar Estates said they had mailed a letter to each house in the surrounding area which is NOT the case. I have spoken to a substantial number of local residents and have yet to find anyone who DID receive any communication. When a committee of local residents took the matter up with the local community council we discovered that they too had stated their objections and were overruled. 6. There are limited public transport facilities to the village with no rail link and a reduced bus service. This would probably result in an increasing number of cars in the village which has moderate parking facilities. In particular the primary school has very poor drop/pick up areas for parking, 7. The telephone exchange is outdated which results in slow broadband speeds - with extra housing this would place an increased burden on the exchange resulting in even slower speeds. 8. I feel there will be an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours by reason of noise, disturbance, loss of privacy, being overlooked etc. 9. The proposed development is overbearing and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. 10. The development would possibly compromise highway safety.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Delete the part of the Drakies/SDR buffer south of the former Northern Constabulary HQ from the general Raigmore/Beechwood business allocation. Re-allocate for open space. Possibly also re-appraise the identification of Raigmore Hospital as a business use.

Representation

This part of the long established Drakies/SDR buffer was only included in previous local plans to allow relocation of the Police HQ playing field if expansion of the operations building over the old playing field was proposed. With the establishment of Police Scotland and the redundancies that the merger process gave rise to it is highly unlikely that further expansion of Police office and other operations accommodation will be required. Inclusion of this open land and the high amenity trees on its north side are therefore at odds with most of the rest of the area covered by the proposed business allocation. There is also no capacity in the Old Perth Road residential slip road and Inshes roundabout leg serving Drakies to take more traffic from expansion of the former Police HQ. I also question why Raigmore Hospital is allocated as part of a Business area when it is clearly more aligned with "community" uses. If a masterplan/development brief is to be prepared for the IN65 area it must address the constant rat-running along the Old Perth Road residential slip road serving Drakies by traffic seeking to avoid the traffic lights at the hospital junction. This has been a problem for many years and impacts upon the amenity of adjacent residents as well as being a danger to school children walking and cycling to and from Millburn Academy. This problem exists despite an access restriction order being in place for a long time as it is never enforced by the Police. Indeed many of the "offending" drivers are those making journeys that either start or end at the former Police HQ.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Change the allocation of IN57 from Community to Housing with a capacity for 5 to 8 houses and include the adjacent wooded margins of the Holm Burn and Drumdevan House within the Inverness City Settlement Development Area. 2. Consider deferring the timescale for IN32 to the longer term or delete it from the Proposed Plan altogether and maintain as countryside.

Representation

Our client, Freda Newton, owns a significant area of land surrounding Drumdevan House, south of Torbreck Road. We made previous submissions at the Call for Sites (CfS) and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages seeking low density housing on open land in a woodland setting within the Settlement Development Area (SDA). These submissions seem to have been given little weight and appear to have been treated inconsistently compared with those from the owners of open land at nearby Knocknagael. In the course of addressing objections to the Highland wide Local Development Plan, the Council stated that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". However, identification of the completely new and "preferred" MIR Housing Site Options H15 and H49 after the HwLDP Examination took place was completely at odds with this view. In one part of the response to our previous MIR submission on this land and the nearby land at Knocknagael (H15 in MIR), the Council continues to express the view that the need to allocate more land is not merited. In this regard it is stated that "there is no quantitative need to allocate additional housing land within or close to the City". Yet the Proposed Plan allocation of the Knocknagael land under IN32 is also clearly at odds with this view. In light of this we remain concerned about why this allocation is supported and not our client's land at Drumdevan. Reference was made as part of the consideration of previous submissions to "countryside character" and "outwith urban edge" for our client's land. The same should have been said for IN32 particularly as it is of more obvious countryside character and is currently identified as a green wedge in the adopted Inverness Local Plan. Indeed, many residents at nearby Mains of Culduthel purchased their houses on the basis that they would be overlooking a green wedge that they thought would be safeguarded through successive development plans. This was evident from many of the objections to the planning application lodged and subsequently withdrawn by the Knocknagael Farm owners. The area is also part of an active working farm outwith the urban edge. Whereas the land at Drumdevan is relatively well contained in the landscape by its wooded margins, does not intrude into open land and is not part of a working farm. There is also a precedent of allowing some development within this landscape on adjoining land without detriment to the setting of the urban edge. At the Inshes Church LDP workshop for the MIR on 29 May 2012 it was explained by Planning officials that consideration was given to the future potential of the part of Knocknagael Farm which has effectively been severed from the main part of that farm by the Flood Relief Channel. This resulted in a very large area of open prominent land north of the Flood Relief Channel appearing as a "preferred" housing site in the MIR and now in the Proposed Plan, with the remainder of the severed land shown for community allotments under IN56. The green wedge of open farm land at Knocknagael clearly separates the existing Holm Dell and Mains of Culduthel housing areas. Housing development in this area would be large in scale and potentially very obtrusive, whereas our client's land at Drumdevan is very secluded and unobtrusive. We also act for other owners of significant development allocations at Ness Castle (IN31) and Milton of Ness-side (IN24), which have been identified in successive development plans for the last 30 years. Now that the development of these areas is close to coming to fruition we would be concerned that the significant allocation of land at Knocknagael would prejudice their logical development in line with the phasing of successive housing strategies for the City. The early phases of the Ness Castle development will also see the expansion of capacity in Holm Primary School for that development and the limited capacity at Lochardil Primary is under pressure from the remaining undeveloped land at Mains of Culduthel and Slackbuie. In terms of the openness of the Knocknagael land we can understand the prospect of a future allocation for allotments or possibly open space but not for housing. It is also has a "countryside character" location and is "outwith urban edge". However, in the context of IN32 being allocated in the Proposed Plan there is no consistency in the consideration of the significantly smaller and unobtrusive "small scale low impact" Drumdevan land. In doing so we also feel that the Council has bowed to pressure from a government agency. Just because it is severed by the Flood Relief Channel does not mean that it cannot continue in agricultural use. This is also not a reason for claiming that its inclusion for a suburban extension to the City does not "represent a sensible opportunity to infill up to a new, defensible City boundary." The Crofting Commission could take a more responsible approach to safeguarding the agricultural use of the land through leasing it out to others for grazing or sub-dividing it into new croft units. In light of the above factors we feel the Council is not consistent in its assessment of our client's land compared to its continued support for IN32 through the stages of the LDP. In terms of the small scale and minimal impact on the setting of the urban edge of the city, identification of the land at Drumdevan for housing stands its

own merits.

Allocated to	South Inverness	IN32	Knocknagael	
--------------	-----------------	------	-------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

(1) Change the allocation of IN57 from Community to Housing with a capacity for 5 to 8 houses. (2) Include the adjacent wooded margins of the Holm Burn and Drumdevan House within the Inverness City Settlement Development Area.

Representation

Our client, Freda Newton, owns a significant area of land surrounding Drumdevan House, south of Torbreck Road. We made previous submissions at the Call for Sites (Cfs) and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages seeking low density housing on open land in a woodland setting within the Settlement Development Area (SDA). These submissions seem to have been given little weight and appear to have been treated inconsistently compared with those from other organisations and a government department for open land nearby. The reasons for not allocating it for low density housing are also not properly founded. Our client is therefore extremely disappointed that this land is not allocated for housing in the Proposed Plan. In addition, the identification of the largest part of this land for "Community" under IN57 has been undertaken without any explanation of this development potential or consultation and is unacceptable. We now seek the allocation of IN57 for housing to help meet the demand for such. Inclusion of the wooded setting of this land within the SDA will also help provide a more logical, definitive and defensible edge to the city boundary. We re-iterate some of the main principles of the previous submissions as follows: - (a) A suitable road access can be provided from the Torbreck road together with connections to public the sewer and water supply networks. (b) There are existing remote foot/cycle path connections from Holm Dell and Ness Castle offering opportunities for active travel and safe routes to school. (c) As the land is not shown as lying within the 1 in 200 years flood risk area there should be no need to undertake a flood risk assessment. (d) The wooded margins provide containment of the land in landscape terms and so will help integrate development and minimise intrusion on the Listed Drumdevan House. (e) It is less intrusive in the landscape than other comparably larger allocations. (f) Any buildings would be set back requisite distances from the Ness Castle/Holm House TPO and Semi-Natural/Ancient Woodland designation. (g) No part of the land is Prime quality agricultural land or part of a farm business unit. (h) With potential for more than 4 houses it will help deliver contributions to affordable housing in line with the Council's policies and towards improved education facilities. (i) It will also help meet the demand for low density housing development in a high quality wooded landscape setting on the edge of the city (precedent already set in this area) reducing pressure on the open countryside or Hinterland around Inverness. In the course of addressing objections to the Highland wide Local Development Plan, the Council stated that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". However, identification of the completely new and "preferred" MIR Housing Site Options H15 and H49 after the HwLDP Examination took place was completely at odds with this view. In one part of the response to our previous MIR submission on this land and the nearby land at Knocknagael (H15 in MIR), the Council continues to express the view that the need to allocate more land is not merited. In this regard it is stated that "there is no quantitative need to allocate additional housing land within or close to the City". Yet the Proposed Plan allocation of the Knocknagael land under IN32 is also clearly at odds with this view. In light of this we remain concerned about why this allocation is supported and expand on concerns in a separate objection to IN32. The Council's response continues: "These sites are located on the fringe of the City of Inverness but are not appropriate as a formal expansion of it given their small size and relatively long active travel distance from local facilities." Smaller scale development opportunities for lower density development within the SDA will help meet the demand for self-building. Few if any of the existing Local Plan allocations on the south side of the city have allowed for such demand to be met in recent years. Despite the recession which has affected the house building industry in recent years there is still a market for low density housing that would take some of the pressure off the countryside in the Hinterland around Inverness. There is also a shortage of large plots for high end of the market detached houses, replicating many of the properties built along Island Bank, Stratherrick Roads and in recent years on adjoining land at Drumdevan. Such provision would add to the choice of sites across the city as they are not expected to be available in the more conventional large scale medium density suburban expansion areas such as Ness Castle, Charleston, Slackbuie and Inshes. Other allocations are unlikely to offer such potential either with perhaps the exception of land at Milton of Ness-side (part of IN24), although individual plots may not be available in the more immediate future as this depends upon prior expensive servicing of intervening land. Most of the other allocations around the fringes of the city are also a relatively long active travel distance from local facilities at the present time. In considering the Drumdevan land for community uses reference is made to it as "less vital to the open green wedge aspect at this location and not subject to significant woodland and flooding constraints but would set an inappropriate precedent if developed for urban housing." However, we argue that for these very reasons it is suitable for housing, but not of a normal urban scale or density. A precedent has already been set in this area for low density urban fringe housing to the immediate south. The site lies

between this and the Holm Dell development and would effectively be an infill site. If the larger paddock is not subject to significant flooding constraints we also question that why there is a need to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment. In dismissing the housing development potential of our client's land it is very disappointing that the Council have deemed it for community use without a full explanation of the viability of this potential or discussion of this with the owner. The reference in the report on the MIR responses to "a previous proposal for a small private school at this location may be acceptable" seems to be a wishful allocation by officials without full research of the need for this and other community facilities in this area. No approach was ever made to the owner about such a proposal and we also understand that the existing private school has now closed as it was unviable. The only aspect we agree with is the need to account for shading from nearby trees to the west. However, this will not necessarily limit the footprint and mass of future buildings. The requirement to set back buildings from the Essich road frontage is not explained although it is probably not necessary to mention specifically as setbacks will be defined by retained boundary trees. In light of the above factors we feel the Council is not consistent in its assessment of our client's land compared to its continued support for IN32 through the stages of the LDP. In terms of the small scale and minimal impact on the setting of the urban edge of the city, identification of the land at Drumdevan for housing stands its own merits.

Allocated to	South Inverness	IN57	Essich Road (West)	
--------------	-----------------	------	--------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

To not include IN49-Bogbain Wood as a development area and retain it in its present state

Representation

I wish to object to the proposal of building 75 homes at site IN49-Bogbain Wood for the following reasons. 1. Inverness is one of the fastest growing cities in Western Europe (Martin 2007). This has led to the unabated expansion of the city limits and inevitable erosion of natural habitats surrounding the city. The population in 2001 was 51,000 and by 2007 had risen to 60,000. It is expected to double in the next 30 years (Martin 2007). With this population growth there is a potential for increased environmental pollution and a reduction in the air quality and quality of life of which Inverness prides itself. This situation is compounded by the topography of the surrounding countryside i.e. mountains limit physical expansion so any growth will be in confined space (Lawton et.al. 2010:Para.23). As the city is surrounded by mountains continued expansion of house building limits the tree growing area and the city will be surrounded by moor and heath. Reducing tree growing areas around the city is a short-sighted and dangerous precedent. It risks soil erosion and creating alluvial deposits which increases the danger of flooding and the undermining of the foundations of buildings on perimeters of the city. There will be an inevitable reduction of natural habitats for the fauna and flora. There is recent evidence of an increase in road kills, such as deer, observed only a couple of days ago on the link road through Milton of Leys to Inshes. It is on this stretch of road that two new housing developments are under construction, only a year or so after a neighbouring development was completed. 2. The area is a popular recreational area. On an evening's walk this summer in the area I met 26 people and 18 dogs over the period of one hour. These recreational areas should not be reduced and the building of 75 houses in an unspoilt area only serves to increase pressure on other areas with the constant degradation of the environment. 3. I understand that there is a constant pressure from central government to build houses in their insatiable quest for financial growth. Estates like this may well prosper during a thriving economy but another recession and they risk becoming areas of economic and social deprivation, especially as there is increasing concern about personal debt (Pond et.al 2013) 4. Facilities and amenities in the area are limited. This creates a situation where every family who will live on this estate will need at least one car, leading to the inevitable congestion and attendant environment issues. Driving past Milton of Leys and Inshes primary school at starting and finishing times highlights this. REFERENCES LAWTON, J.E.A., 2010. Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, 29th Study: The Environmental Impacts of Demographic Change in the UK Visit to Inverness and Perth : 26-28 APRIL 2010. 29th. London: Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution. MARTIN, L., 26th March, 2007-last update, Inverness: the new Shangri-La? [Homepage of New Statesman, London, UK], [Online]. Available: <http://www.newstatesman.com/life-and-society/2007/03/city-inverness-poland-local> [10th December 2013]. POND, C. et.al., 2013. Maxed Out:Serious Pesronal Debt in Britain. The Centre for Social Justice [Online] Available: http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/UserStorage/pdf/Pdf%20reports/CSJ_Serious_Debt_report_WEB_final.pdf 12th December 2013

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reduced housing density proposed in these areas, or such as would result in increased traffic on the road from Mossfield to the A9

Representation

In accordance with these sections of the proposed Plan, approx 160 new dwelling houses may be built to the east of the existing town of Alness, and to the south of the A9. This will effectively move the centre of Alness eastwards, and join the town up with the existing ribbon development at Mossfield/ Achnagarron South. The conurbation in this area will then exceed 200 houses added to the east of the town of Alness. Such intense development will place severe pressure on existing capacity of the road from Mossfield to the A9 to deal with vehicular traffic. The junction with the A9 is already dangerous, and already affected by traffic coming from Invergordon, also to the East of Alness. This junction cannot sustain increased traffic safely unless radical steps are taken to accommodate the new build which would be permitted by the proposed Plan. It is difficult to envisage what practical traffic solutions could be put in place to the east of Alness to deal with such an increase. In effect, the only safe solution would appear to be: a) create a roundabout on the A9 (clearly unacceptable as restricting the traffic flow on a major trunk road at a spot where visibility is restricted by the contours of the surrounding land); or b) create a flyover and access roads on both sides of the A9 to service both the anticipated increase in traffic flow, and also the existing increasing traffic volume to and from Invergordon (also to the east of the town of Alness) to replace the existing bridge and access road on one side of the A9 at the 'LIDL/Morrison junction'. Neither solution appears particularly easy in view of the sight lines in this part of the A9. Accordingly, I urge instead reconsideration of the proposal to impose such extra pressure on an area already under strain from volume of traffic seeking to join the A9. I suggest the possibility be examined of decreasing the proposed permitted housing density to the east of Alness, and instead expanding housing volume to the west of Alness, where better traffic solutions already exist at Alness Point and Skiach junction.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change to developer requirements

Representation

With reference to the "Notification of Publication of Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan", location Site NA4 – Sandown, we would like to make the following comments. 1 That the number of homes does not exceed the 350 stated. 2 That buildings on the field immediately to the North of Wyvis Road and south of the A96 are restricted to single story. 3 Houses immediately to the North of the A96 should be no more than 2 story. We do not want our house to be devalued as a result of this development and we do not want to see the approach to Nairn blighted by high and unsightly development.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04397 Name Alec Barden Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) HHL Scotland HHL Scotland

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.41

Reference NA1 Former Showfield East Type Change

Comment Changes

Concern is expressed over the level of housing units proposed for the site (30). The Objector would support a reduction in the number of units and the number relocated to another site within the town limits, namely land at Torwood, Moss-side Road, Nairn.

Representation

The Nairn Showfield plays an important part in the green space provision within the town and whilst it is acknowledged that the site is now not appropriate for the agricultural show for a number of reasons, the land is still well used by local sport teams and for general recreation provision. The Showfield would no doubt benefit from some environmental improvements works, including landscape planting and play park provision and the objector understand this might best be achieved by the land owner developing part of the site for residential development, for which there has been a long standing zoning for such. Unfortunately the IMFLDP has significantly increased the level of the residential development to a degree which the objector (and various other local residents) believes is excessive given the important of the green space and road network access. Consequently, this objector believes the housing unit number should be reduced and other land identified within the town boundary to accommodate these properties. In light of this, he would advocate that his land holding at Torwood (see attached plan) could be appropriate, subject to suitable environmental assessments, as a suitable alternative for these additional housing units.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Proposal IN55 should be solely community and or woodland use. IN55 should not include Retail (Bulky goods only) or Non-residential institution. In the requirements section the Council should incorporate the need to provide the community use provision for the area and maintain the green corridor along the A9. Additionally to the stated brief in the requirements section the Council should recognise the need to maintain and safeguard the vista at the gateway to the highland capital where north bound traffic enters Inverness. The stated proposal to prepare a masterplan / development brief to adopt as supplementary guidance must be prioritised as a request for planning permission in principle has been submitted, Ref 13/04334/PIP which seeks alternative use of IN55 and adjoining property. Furthermore identified need for but absence of supplementary guidance to address land safeguards for the various development factors and influences including the trunk and local road network including drainage improvements, flood risk assessments and transport assessments is sufficient cause to suspend all development planning applications in this area.

Representation

Proposal IN55 should be solely for community use and or woodland use. The current Greenspace entrance corridor into Inverness along the A9 will be eroded with retail development creating a break in entrance vista to the capital to the highlands. The first sight to any North bound traveller on the A9 will be a retail development cut into the natural landscape which is currently bounded with secluded hedges and woodland trees. This is contrary to the green wedge/network and community open space proposed with IN63 located adjacent to the upper Inshes/Milton of Leys developments. The map on page 33 highlights the negative effect IN55 will introduce as all other areas of existing woodland and agricultural land along the A9 South remain unaffected. Area IN55 provides a natural landscape boundary with tree lined perimeter to the existing retail development at Inshes. All properties in this area have secluded tree or woodline boundaries which softens the hard landscaping beyond. Visual screening cannot fully replace the intrusion into this open space. IN55 is contrary to planning policy to provide and maintain a green network for the trunk road network. IN55 also extends the Inshes retail zone between areas of existing residential use. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 1: There will be a loss of regional amenity to the portal vista on entrance to the capital of the highlands. 2: There will be a reduction of greenspace boundary and land safeguard around the trunk road network. 3: There will be a loss of protection to local plan greenspace and reduction of seclusion around existing residential properties. IN55 encroaches on previously decrefted land which has been protected by Green Wedge designation in previous local plan developments. The Highland-wide Local Development Plan (LDP), April 2012, introduced the change of land use to mixed use allocation for the area referred to as IN55 which is shown on the Inshes - Raigmore area map 4 in the HwLDP. IN55 will marginalise and enclose the existing residential properties located towards the North of the site. My home, Fernbank 7A Inshes Holdings is in the centre of this enclosed environment and will be surrounded by retail or commercial developments should the proposed local plan proposal change to IN55 be implemented. The amenity detriment to all the residential properties in this affected area will be significant where the area is largely rural in outlook with open outlooks South and adjacent woodland surrounding where wildlife prosper. Indeed there is a community of Roe deer which reside in the adjacent area along with water fowl and wading birds. The area is a wildlife sanctuary on the perimeter of the city and should be protected. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 4: The change in land use is contrary to previous local plan proposals. 5: There will be a significant loss of residential amenity with existing residential properties to the North of IN55 will be marginalised and enclosed with surrounding retail developments and road systems. 6: The existing wood and wetland wildlife sanctuary will be destroyed. Area IN55 is an open area with areas of wet marshy ground and low areas subject to frequent flooding. A raised berm has been previously constructed along the West boundary of the IN55 area to enclose an open drainage ditch. The ditch crosses under the culloden road embankment which is the North boundary to area IN55, in a twin circular culvert which on a number of recent occasions was unable to accommodate the water runoff which caused flooding and resulted in significant property damage to the adjacent retail development. The berm also prevents natural drainage from the entire area of area IN55 and all surface water runoff collects in the low lying area and extensive flooding results which also builds up into my property boundary. Indeed the impact from recent upstream residential developments appear to have contributed to the increased frequency of flooding in the drain and surrounding area. Any additional hard landscaping associated with the IN55 proposal will increase both the surface water runoff and the area flood risk noting the limited capacity downstream drainage system and ground soakaway capability. Any improvement to the culvert drain would require additional capacity to be provided noting the current design appears to be undersized. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 7: There will be an increase in flood risk to the existing residential properties and retail properties. 8: The engineering drainage capacity of the existing culvert drain to the North of IN55 would require to be

increased to accommodate any further increase in surface water runoff. Note this culvert is potentially under-designed for the current demand due to recent changes to the upstream catchment areas and any improvement may require replacement through the Culloden road embankment. Area IN55 does not require to provide retail (bulky goods) as there is extensive vacant provision at the Muirtown/Carse retail park the Inverness stoneyfield retail-park and at the Longman area. These existing brownfield sites should be redeveloped prior to consideration of greenfield areas. The IMFLDP should emphasise this approach and state the priority areas for development which should be based on demand and accessibility. Increased retail at Inshes will only increase the local traffic flow which is currently congested at peak times. The local road network and associated infrastructure including links and the need for segregation with the trunk road network must be assessed and a clear and forward looking plan implemented instead of the apparent current approach with developer led specific projects with no overall programme management. This apparent lack of an integrated development approach has led to piecemeal, disjointed and conflicting project development needs between developers and public funded organisation's. Indeed the IMFLDP stated proposal to prepare a masterplan / development brief to adopt as supplementary guidance must be prioritised as a request for planning permission in principle has been submitted, Ref 13/04334/PIP which seeks alternative use of IN55 and adjoining property. It is concerning that this PIP has been submitted when the IMFLDP remains to be endorsed and adopted and therefore the application should be rejected in the absence of the stated "Masterplan/ development brief" to act as supplementary guidance. Non-residential institution (Class 10) should be provided within the existing boundary of the Inshes development area where the demand can be justified and not within area IN55. There is no demand for provision of Non-residential institution development adjacent to the existing residential properties in the IN55 area. Any development of this nature would only increase the demand on drainage and road network as described previously. Summary of reasons not to support IN55 change. 9: Retail development should be prioritised to vacant brownfield locations before consideration of greenfield sites. 10: The increase in retail traffic will only compound the current traffic congestion in the local and trunk road networks. The current road network cannot sustain further development without major infrastructure improvements due to localised traffic flow pinchpoints to and from the existing inshes retail and residential area. 11: There is no coherent integrated development plan to address current and future major infrastructure projects particularly the A9/A96 East link and how this affects area IN55. To complete the IMFLDP the trunk road improvements must be incorporated and future proofed. 12: Without a masterplan/development brief for area IN55 no development should be undertaken to prevent further application for planning permission such as has recently been submitted it this cannot be assessed for compliance with the IMFLDP proposal which is still not endorsed or adopted. 13: Non-residential institution (Class 10) should be provided within the existing boundary of the Inshes development area where the demand can be justified and not in the IN55 area. Any development of this nature would only increase the demand on drainage and road network as described previously.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

While not opposed to the allocation of this site for allotments, it is important that any potential allotment provider (presumably CAGS) provides for public access to the shore side of the field (north) as this could then become a significant community asset, with e.g. seating provided by the Community Council on a grassed area.

Representation

Cromarty Community Council some 10 or 12 years ago made contact with the owner of the site with a view to persuading him to make the land over to a local trust so that the field could be tidied up and turned into a community asset with bench seating at the shore. This attempt was unsuccessful, but the community interest in the site continues, and it should not become out of bounds to non-allotment holders.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Showfield should be retained as an Amenity Openspace and Outdoor Sports Facility which is its current designation in the Highland Greenspace Audit 2010. There should be no development allowed on the Showfield which should be retained as an Openspace for the benefit of the inhabitants of Nairn.

Representation

Introduction As part of the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan (IMFLDP) I received a letter from you regarding the proposals for the Former Showfield in Nairn. Currently the Showfield is an open, grassed area of approximately 3.6 ha. It serves as an amenity greenspace for the residents of Nairn where they can walk, exercise, the children can play games and people can enjoy being outdoors. Additionally it contains the football pitch used by a local amateur side to train and hold matches. As such the Showfield serves as a very important and valuable open space to the residents of Nairn. The Highland Greenspace Audit 2010 recognizes it as such on one page identifying it's primary role an Amenity Greenspace with being an Outdoor Sports Facility as a secondary function and then on the following page showing its primary function as being an Outdoor Sports Facility. Whilst this is a contradiction, clearly both roles were seen as being so important that it was difficult to determine which was the primary role and which the secondary as numerous local residents walk, play and exercise daily and the football team trains and plays regularly. Clearly the Showfield is a very important asset for the fitness, wellbeing and enjoyment of the people of Nairn. Current Position Under the current Nairnshire Local Plan (Adopted 2000, continued in force 2012) the Showfield is identified as primarily being kept as open green space for the community with the potential for a small development at the south eastern end. Specifically this proposal is Development of 8-10 houses 0.6ha for development (approx 16.5% of Showfield area) Pedestrian access to the Showfield from Lodgehill Road through the development specifically mandated As a condition of planning consent the developer would have to enter into a formal Section 75 agreement securing the use of the remainder (approx 3 ha. 83%) of the Showfield as a public open space. Importantly this proposal retains most of the Showfield as Open Space and keep a large enough area to fulfill the roles of both Amenity Greenspace and Outdoor Sports Facility (fenced off football pitch). Proposed Change in IMFLDP In the letter I was sent about the IMFLDP there is a significant change in the designation and proposed use of the Showfield. Firstly the Showfield is shown only as a Sports Ground despite the fact that the Highland Greenspace Audit 2010 identifies its primary use as being an Amenity Greenspace and any observation of the large number of residents who use it daily to walk and exercise would confirm this designation. Secondly the new proposal under the IMFLDP is for Development of 30 houses 1.8 ha. for development (approx 50% of Showfield area) No specific mention of pedestrian access from Lodgehill Road through the development to the remaining area of Showfield No requirement for a formal Section 75 agreement on the future of the undeveloped part of the Showfield only a general comment that it should be retained as greenspace used as a reconfigured football pitch. Comments In the letter I was sent about the IMFLDP proposals for the Showfield it is marked as a Sports Ground. This is incorrect and contradicts the designation in the Highland Greenspace Audit 2010 where the primary role is correctly shown as an Amenity Openspace with a secondary role as an Open Space Sports Facility. In order to understand the role the Showfield fulfills for the local community it is important that it is not simply seen as a sports field but that full weight is given to it's role as an amenity openspace and it should be designated as such on the IMFLDP. The increase in the number of houses proposed is excessive. If any of the valuable amenity greenspace has to be built on at least the old plan with 8-10 houses was reasonable and preserved most of the Showfield as greenspace for the benefit of the community. This plan retained sufficient space to allow for both a football pitch and a good amenity area for walking, exercising and playing. The new IMFLDP proposal to build 30 houses and develop half the area of the Showfield does not. What remains of the Showfield will be almost completely dedicated to a fenced off football pitch and pavilion with only a very narrow strip of greenspace left round the outside of the pitch. This area will be insufficient to satisfy the important amenity role which was identified as the Showfield's primary use in the Highland Greenspace Audit 2010. This proposal will significantly reduce the open green space in central Nairn. The IMFLDP is not mandating that any retained part of the Showfield will be under a Section 75 agreement restricting it to being kept as a Greenspace for public use. This omission allows any developer far too much leeway. In the case where the developer collapses or decides to wind the company up there would be no formal restriction on the use of the remaining part of the Showfield. While unilateral undertakings with covenants may be a suitable approach for the provision of off site play areas and the like this is not the case where the obligation is to keep a specific piece of land as a public Greenspace. A formal planning restriction on future use attached to the land itself is the only robust approach and should be spelled out as such. The Scottish Government provides statements of Government policy on nationally important land use issues. One of these is SPP; PAN 65, Planning and Open Space which clearly states in paragraph 37 that "Development plans have a key role to play in protecting and promoting high quality open space. Development plans

should safeguard important open spaces from development in the long term and identify spaces that require specific improvement.....". To clarify their position on this issue Highland Council have adopted 2 specific policies for Open Space and Physical Activity. In the current Highland-wide Development Plan Highland Council has adopted 2 specific policies for Open Space and Physical Activity, namely Policy 75 and Policy 76. Policy 75 states that the Council will safeguard existing areas of high quality and fit for purpose open space such as the Showfield and that any development of 4 or more houses will be required to provide additional publicly accessible open space. In the face of this stated policy it is a contradiction that Highland Council proposes in the IMFLDP to build housing on 50% of a high quality open space in the heart of Nairn and then devote what remains to a football pitch. This would be to the significant detriment of the many local residents who walk, exercise and play on the Showfield on a daily basis. The only way that the Council can meet its stated policy and preserve the primary role of the Showfield as an Amenity Openspace would be to retain the area left after development as a green, open space with no football pitch not to halve the openspace and use that area almost exclusively as a fenced in football pitch and pavilion. This would mean there was no football pitch however Policy 76 states that the Council will safeguard playing fields from development so clearly both policies cannot be met under the current proposals for the Showfield. The solution is clear. In the IMFLDP as too much area is being developed and too little retained to enable the Showfield to continue fulfilling its current valuable roles as Amenity Openspace and Outdoor Sports Facility never mind that the proposed development would require an increase in both. To meet Highland Council's stated policy objectives the IMFLDP should not be proposing that any of the Showfield open space should be given over to development. It should be retained as a mixture of amenity openspace and a football pitch. However if there has to be any development on the Showfield then it should be restricted to the 8-10 houses with all the other caveats specified in the Nairnshire Local Plan (Adopted 2000, continued in force 2012) as any other proposal would retain insufficient openspace to provide both an area for the public to walk, exercise and play and football pitch much to the detriment of the inhabitants of Nairn. Allowing development of 50% of the Showfield also flies in the face of the Council's stated policies on Open Space and Physical Activity and severely damages their credibility on this important issue.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I believe the development of housing at this site, ie adjacent to the 11th hole at Muir of Ord Golf Club - would have an adverse effect on not only the Golf Club but also existing properties in that area as the drainage/sewage system is already a problem.

Representation

As a playing member of the Muir of Ord Golf Club I respond to the proposals as follows. Muir of Ord has already expanded and the site adjacent to the 11th hole does not seem a practical proposal for several reasons. The main reason, as I see it, would be the inherent additional drainage/sewage problems for the Golf Course, which already falls victim to flooding problems in rain/snow conditions. The additional houses would, therefore, add to that problem as well as the inevitable sewage connection issue. The Golf Club may well consider future expansion and the area identified at the 11th hole would be the ideal, in fact only, area that would facilitate this. Should such expansion be considered by the Golf Club this would not detract from the rural landscape of that locality. Also, the road there is mostly single track and the housing development proposed would add significantly to the traffic problem. I feel that the proposal to develop this site with private housing would not serve this area to best advantage. I would therefore oppose and lodge my objection to such a proposition. Alick Polson Muir of Ord Golf Club Member

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Inherent additional drainage/sewage problems for the area adjacent to Croyard Drive would be massive and insurmountable to overcome without first resolving the existing long term flooding problem. 2. Building on an environmentally friendly area. 3. No infrastructure in place for existing developments and therefore future developments would cause significant problems. 4. Village way of life being eroded by over development of housing. 5. Traffic congestion on Croyard Road – road safety issue because of nearby primary school.

Representation

PUBLICATION OF INNER MORAY FIRTH PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN : SITE BE1 – BEAULY EAST – YOUR LETTER : REF. IMFLDP/PP/NN We refer to the Highland Council Local Development Plan in respect of the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan, in particular the site identified as Site BE1, ie adjacent to Croyard Drive, Beauly, details of which were recently circulated. We wish to lodge our objection to the proposed housing development shown thereon and identified as Site BE1. In recent years Beauly has expanded significantly and at the present time the infrastructure is barely adequate to cope with the current population level. Further development would only serve to add greatly to this already existing problem. We moved to Croyard Drive just over two years ago and already within that time we have seen tremendous flooding at the rear of our back garden when there is heavy rain and/or snow - the most recent occasion being 5th/6th December. In fact it is a great worry to us. Last October one of our neighbours narrowly avoided having his house flooded because of the quick thinking of his immediate neighbour to call the fire brigade to pump the water. All this flooding is a result of a very poor and incapable drainage system. The heavy clay soil exacerbates this problem. The water in the field ditch flows furiously and when it arrives at the culvert the pipe is not large enough to cope with the fierce impact of the water and, having nowhere else to go, backs up and flows over the banks of the ditch, spilling into the field area identified as Site BE1. In fact, since our tenure, the water also spills onto the main road to the front of the Police Station/Catholic Church area and causes flooding there – a great road hazard to travelling motorists. It doesn't leave much to the imagination to guess what an additional 238 homes would do to an already mammoth problem. The inherent additional drainage/sewage problems for this area would be massive and insurmountable to overcome without first resolving the existing problem. Flooding in this area is a very real fear for us and it is hoped that commonsense will prevail in this instance and our objection will be upheld. The area to the rear of Croyard Drive is environmentally friendly and is a pleasant rural green belt area. Large gaggles of geese frequently winter in these fields. The countryside is slowly being eroded (in a most unattractive manner) by all kinds of development, ie housing. Beauly/Denny overhead lines. Beauly is termed a "village" but the way things are going it will soon be a town it's almost that already. The "village" way of life is an extremely important community asset which would be eroded if it is developed in the way proposed. The additional housing would also undoubtedly add to the already severely congested Croyard Road area which in the interests of road safety would be a main concern because of the existence of the nearby primary school. I would summarise our objections as follows : 1. Inherent additional drainage/sewage problems for the area adjacent to Croyard Drive would be massive and insurmountable to overcome without first resolving the existing long term flooding problem. 2. Building on an environmentally friendly area. 3. No infrastructure in place for existing developments and therefore future developments would cause significant problems. 4. Village way of life being eroded by over development of housing. 5. Traffic congestion on Croyard Road – road safety issue because of nearby primary school. Alick and Doreen Polson 4 Croyard Drive IV4 7EE

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the area currently referred to under Policy IN49 to be safeguarded from development. In other words, I would like Policy IN 49 deleted and a new Policy written which would safeguard the land for its current natural recreational uses, habitat for flora and fauna and essential 'green corridor' of open space which benefits both Highland people and local wildlife.

Representation

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. (These Policies and some relevant Statements are copied in full at the end of this letter).
2. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people.
3. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected.
4. We are concerned about the threat any proposed development would have on the local wildlife. During our visits to the area we have spotted deer, hare and badger, and some of these animals are protected species. There is also a wide variety of birds and interesting pond life including newts, frogs and toads. We therefore object to the resultant loss of habitat and adverse disturbance to wildlife which would occur should this land be developed.
5. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. There is no need for artificial bunds, this land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary.
6. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies, as outlined below:-

Policies and Statements referred to in Objection 1 above and final paragraph are herewith copied below as follows:-

'The Council's Vision for the Highlands': Paragraph 5.1: "By 2030... the Highlands will have created sustainable communities, balancing population growth, economic development and the safeguarding of the environment...and have a fairer and healthier Highlands." Paragraph 5.2.2: "We will have

safeguarded our Environment by ensuring the special quality of the natural, built and cultural environment is protected and enhanced.” Paragraph 5.2.4: “We will have achieved a healthier Highlands by providing places that contribute to increasing healthy lifestyles, opportunities for quality open space provision and access to enjoy the outdoors; and protecting and enhancing the green network within and around settlements leading to cohesive and fit for purpose network of greenspaces...” Policy 60: Other Important Habitats: “The Council will seek to safeguard the integrity of features of the landscape which are of major importance because of their linear and continuous structure or combination as habitat “stepping stones” for the movement of wild fauna and flora.” Policy 74: Green Networks “Green networks should be protected and enhanced. Development in areas identified for the creation of green networks should seek to avoid the fragmentation of the network and take steps to improve its connectivity where this is appropriate.The main principles of the Council’s Future Guidance on Green Networks are to help promote green space linkages and to safeguard and enhance wildlife corridors in and around new and existing developments...and to set out mechanisms for delivery of projects to maintain and enhance the existing green network.” Policy 75: Open Space “The Council’s long term aim for open space provision is for: -the creation of sustainable networks of open space of high quality -areas of local open space that are accessible by foot and linked to the wider network -fit for purpose green spaces and sports facilities that support and enhance biodiversity; and -open spaces that improve the quality of life of residents and visitors Existing areas of high quality, accessible and fit for purpose open space will be safeguarded from inappropriate development and enhancement will be sought where appropriate.” Public Access: Para 23.7.1: “Access to the outdoors is important to the Highlands for recreation tourism and to help everyone maintain a healthy lifestyle”.

Allocated to

South Inverness	IN49	Bogbain (west)	
-----------------	------	----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the development allocation for IN71 changed to not allow retail development of the site retail.

Representation

The site marked IN71 should not be allocated for retail use for a number of reasons: 1. Policy 1 (page 13) states that Council “will not support any proposal for development that is likely to have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of any of the centres listed below” ... these include Inverness City Centre and Inshes Retail Park. These areas would be at risk of losing business if retail development is allowed at IN71. Furthermore within 500m of IN71 there several established retail outlets. In addition there are more retail outlets currently under development at Wester Inshes (IN70) and Milton of Leys (IN72). Less than 1 mile from IN71 there are several major retail chains and a more under development at the Inshes Retail Park and IN69 (Asda). 2. Parking, vehicular access and pedestrian safety are further reasons that the proposed development allocation for IN71 is not appropriate. IN71 is a small site which offers a limited area for development, car parking and access. There are currently no footpaths on Old Edinburgh Road South which a single track road, very popular with cyclists and pedestrians of all ages. Increased car activity to and from any development on this site creates a safety risk. Recent residential developments at Parks Farm and Milton of Leys have been linked by footpaths to Old Edinburgh Road South to encourage pedestrian usage. This has been successful and has led to a significant increase in numbers of pedestrians and cyclists for which there are no safe paths to avoid the traffic. Further development at IN71 at this critical junction will increase safety risks for these road users. It is my view that if a retail development were built on this small site, cars would park on the existing roads increasing risks to pedestrians, cyclists and other roads users. A further consideration is that Old Edinburgh Road South is still designated with a 60mph speed limit adjacent to IN71. 3. “One of the main elements of the strategy for the Inner Moray Firth is to focus attention on the area’s town and local centres to bolster their role as well connected meeting places and as hubs for local facilities.” The development allocation IN71 appears to be piecemeal development of residual land. It does not sit well within an overall co-ordinated plan. 4. Old Edinburgh Road South is currently a poorly maintained single track road with inadequate surface drainage. Frequently after a heavy downpour, significant volumes of surface water affect the road at the location of IN71. 5. Old Edinburgh Road South is the only access for a number of working farms and large farm vehicles frequently use this road. Further development at the entry to this road would create issues for these vehicles, local residents, other road users and visitors to any development on IN71. I object to the piecemeal development allocation of IN71 as I believe there are sufficient retail opportunities offered with the appropriate level of services and infrastructure within close proximity to it. Furthermore development at this site creates significant road safety issues.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04014 Name Alison Miller Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Clarity

Representation

I would like to know where the access to this site would be regarding the placement of 6 houses/ all surrounding roads are very narrow and already a rat race at times., any further traffic would obviously cause more problems and I would appreciate more information. I am objecting to the proposal as it stands as there is just not enough information in order to understand despite talking to Highland Council.

Allocated to Nairn NA3 Achareidh

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We support the Highland Council's proposal, as outlined in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, to designate the Bunloit area as hinterland. We welcome the Council aims (detailed in Paragraph 2.7 of the Plan) to direct housing to the most appropriate locations and to offer greater protection to those areas of the countryside (including Bunloit) where the demand for commuter based housing is the greatest. Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 states that a Planning Authority's decision on a planning application must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless, material considerations indicate otherwise. Therefore, for the Development Plan to be accepted, material considerations are critical, forming the baseline and framework of that decision. In this respect, we consider the following material considerations (Planning Aid for Scotland, Spring 2010), presented in no particular order, pertinent for the inclusion of Bunloit into the hinterland: • Visual appearance of current developments and their relationship to the surroundings – including scale, density and level of development • Environmental impact – pollution / contamination of water supplies • Impact on nature conservation – including loss of protected habitats and species • Adverse economic impact – reduction in tourism • Provision of suitable access and transportation • Adequacy of infrastructure (i.e. sewerage, drainage and water supply) Additional development where the above considerations are not taken into account, on the grounds that Bunloit is situated in the "wider countryside" and thus likely to have a minimal effect in a "dispersed, low-impact community" will further exacerbate the current problems, detailed below. As such it is vital that Bunloit is brought under the "hinterland" designation with respect to the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan. The arguments with respect to these material considerations are detailed below, however it is recognized that many of the points identified are interrelated and so have not been discussed individually to avoid repetition. 1. Visual appearance impact of current developments and their relationship to the surroundings. Bunloit lies within the Special Landscape Area (SLA) of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig. Such local landscape designations compliment National Scenic Areas and are specifically defined to safeguard areas of local landscape importance from inappropriate development. The Great Glen Way, used by thousands annually, passes through Bunloit and the popular climb of Meall Fuar-mhonaigh, which sits above Bunloit, provides panoramic views of Loch Ness and the surrounding area. Further, due to its elevated position Bunloit is readily visible from both the surface of the loch and Boleskin and Foyers on the south side. Should all planned housing developments be completed (under the "wider countryside definition" - HWPD Policy 36) within a few years there will be well in excess of thirty dwellings along, and visible from, the Bunloit road. Over half of these will be new-builds constructed in the last ten years, with the density and design of the most recent (four or five bedroom town houses) differing greatly from those of the original settlement. It is therefore hoped that the inclusion of Bunloit into the hinterland will result in stricter planning procedures being applied to further developments, so limiting their negative impact on the visual amenity of an area favoured by tourists, and which should have been protected by the very nature of its SLA designated status. 2. Impact on the environment Due to the intensity of development, peri-urban ("hinterland") areas are under considerable environmental pressure resulting in direct negative effects on biodiversity and nature conservation. As such, more rigorous planning procedures are applied in hinterland than in the "wider countryside", where it is considered that the fewer, more dispersed developments which are permitted, generate a significantly lower level of environmental impact. However, given the current intensity of housing developments in the Bunloit area, due to its relative close proximity to Inverness, it can be considered more as a peri-urban buffer zone under severe pressure from development, than "wider countryside". It should therefore be brought under "hinterland" and its associated planning procedures at the earliest opportunity. 3. Nature conservation effects With respect to nature conservation within Bunloit there are six UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority (BAP) habitats, one of which, dwarf shrub heaths, is of international importance as it is a habitat largely confined to the British Isles. Seven UK BAP priority mammal species have been documented and sixteen UK BAP priority bird species recorded during the period 2010-2013 (see Table). Frequent stands of juniper (UK BAP Priority species) are also found. BAP Priority Listings for Bunloit Habitat: Upland oak Woodland, Wet woodlands, Upland hay meadows, Upland heathland (dwarf shrub heaths), Purple moor grass and rush pastures, Blanket bog. Mammal: Water vole, Hedgehog, Brown hare, Otter, Pine marten, Red squirrel, Brown long-eared bat. Bird: Skylark, Linnets, Twite, Lesser Redpoll, Cuckoo, Yellowhammer, Red Grouse, Scottish Crossbill, Spotted Flycatcher, Curlew, House Sparrow, Hedge Accentor, Bullfinch, Black Grouse, Song Thrush, Lapwing. Plant: Juniper All of the above species, including reptiles that have also been identified across Bunloit, are protected under UK law (Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981). All species records have been sent to the Highland Biological Recording Group to be included in the National Biodiversity Network. Finally, it should be noted that, Bunloit lies entirely within an Important Bird Area (Central Highlands Hills and Glens) which is recognized as being of global importance for the conservation of bird populations. Further development, similar to that currently permitted, will continue to

adversely impact upon habitats due to loss and fragmentation and on bird, mammal and other species due to disturbance during the construction and post-construction periods as well as loss of breeding and foraging areas.

4. Provision of suitable access and transportation Bunloit is accessed by a narrow, single track road with passing places which terminates at Grottaig. In the first two miles it climbs rapidly to nearly 1000 feet, negotiating five hairpin bends and gradients in excess of 20%. The road surface is continually eroding due to problems with drainage and is often heavily iced during winter causing accidents. Lorries, tankers and the school bus all struggle on “the hill” often damaging the surface or becoming stuck when they run off the road. While passing places are wide enough for cars, many have insufficient depth to allow a larger vehicle to pass and a number of poorly sited. The road is often blocked by snow or fallen trees. The Great Glen Way passes along the road and there are only two sections of footpath, forcing walkers, cyclists and horse riders onto a road, insufficiently wide for a car and cycle to pass safely let alone heavier forms of transport. Any additional development would further increase the volume of traffic and, whilst some of this would be “commuting”, the majority will be increased volume of service vehicles, e.g. fuel and septic waste tankers, refuse and delivery trucks plus the associated additional vehicle movements during construction. All these journeys add further strain to a relatively fragile environment, and have the potential to damage the roadway and increase the probability of traffic accidents, especially pedestrian/ vehicle.

5. Adequacy of infrastructure (e.g. sewerage, drainage and water) Bunloit, which has a population of over one hundred inhabitants plus numerous holiday makers, has no mains water system and so is totally reliant upon springs and boreholes. As identified during the summers of 2010 and 2013, when a number very nearly ran dry, some are bordering on inadequate. No attempt has been made to evaluate how further developments within the area will impact upon water supplies, either in terms of adequacy of supply or quality and especially with respect to the sinking of new bore holes relative to those reliant on spring supplies. Neither is there a mains sewerage system with each property using a septic tank and associated soak-away. The efficiency of these systems relies heavily on the occupier to ensure that both their correct use and regular desludging is undertaken. That many small burns show enhanced nutrient levels (eutrophication) during the summer when water levels are low, suggests that some systems are overloaded leading to run-off. The fact that aquatic invertebrates, particularly freshwater shrimp, are no longer found in one burn, further indicates that a level of pollution from neighbouring soak-aways has at times become quite high. A local borehole test carried out in 2009 showed E.coli levels greater than acceptable. It is considered that further developments may cause such levels to increase due to the reduced ability of the substrate to attenuate from increased numbers of soak-aways and surface run-off, a problem especially acute for spring-fed water supplies which tend to harvest water closer to the surface. Were springs to be lost through a decline in water quality, a number of dwellings have neither sufficient land on which to site a bore hole nor the necessary funds to undertake such an operation. The current drainage along the Bunloit road is inadequate. This arises for two reasons the first being a direct consequence that little or no maintenance is undertaken to ensure that the sections of ditch or culverts are cleared on a regular basis. Culverts frequently flood across and along the road, often impacting upon neighbouring properties causing flooding and erosion. A second cause is related to the increased hard landscaping associated with construction of new tracks to houses. While these should be engineered not to discharge onto the carriageway, many do so depositing considerable quantities of water, silt and mud flowing across the road surface.

Conclusion While the Bunloit area is currently designated by Highland Council as “wider countryside”, given the present level of development, in part due to its proximity to Inverness, it cannot realistically be considered as anything more than a peri-urban buffer zone under severe pressure. This is resulting in a decline of both visual amenity and environmental quality, loss/ destruction of protected habitats and species and places considerable strain on a barely adequate infrastructure with respect to components such as water supply, sewerage, access and road safety. As such it is vital that Bunloit is brought under the “hinterland” designation and its associated planning restrictions with respect to the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan.

Allocated to				Hinterland boundary
--------------	--	--	--	---------------------

Customer Number 04030 Name Alison Taylor Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN2 170 houses Type Change

Comment Changes

Landscaping should provide "Amenity Buffer Zones" between existing and new houses so that hedge/fence/ garden maintenance can be carried out

Representation

Existing properties in Provost Ferguson Drive, Moss Road, Manse gardens and Stagcroft should be given the benefit of such an amenity corridor. This was raised by HC Planning Officer James Farquhar in report RP34/07 and has been actioned in Tain already.

Allocated to Tain TN2 Land to rear of Craighill Primary School

Customer Number 04030 Name Alison Taylor Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN2 land to rear of Craighill Primary School Type Change

Comment Changes

That plots immediately to the rear of existing housing should be single story only in height.

Representation

In order to preserve the amenity and privacy of existing housing which back on to site TN2, no new build should be higher than single story. The majority of existing properties are bungalows and any new build exceeding a single story will look directly into their bedrooms. This has been previously raised in the HC Report 06/0069697/OUTRC

Allocated to Tain TN2 Land to rear of Craighill Primary School

Customer Number 04002 Name Alison Walker Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.87 Ardersier

Reference AR6 North of the Village

Type Change

Comment Changes

I notice that the present wording in the proposal is "limited" to caravans and changing block. I would like to see Camper vans, Manager's House, Shop and Office added.

Representation

As the wording as written at present may make future planning applications more difficult and it is fairly obvious that a Caravan Park/Site needs these extra facilities I would like to see these added at this stage.

Allocated to Ardersier AR6 North of village

Customer Number 04346 Name Alistair & Selina Rennie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph Page 131 & 132

Reference CT2 - Contin Mains

Type Change

Comment Changes

We neither support nor object to this proposal as there is insufficient information provided to meaningfully comment.

Representation

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We note with interest the proposed development 'CT2- Contin Mains', which is immediately adjacent to our home. Whilst we acknowledge that '53 homes, business/tourism and retail' properties seems like a large number, it is a reasonably large area. Nevertheless, it is hard to comment meaningfully when there is so little detail on the proposal (ie their nature, position, layout & density etc). We therefore welcome the development of a Masterplan, as requested by the Highland Council, which is in keeping with the surroundings and allows more informed local consultation. As this proposal would increase the number of houses in Contin by a third, it is imperative that it is developed sensitively to ensure a positive contribution to the area. We welcome further opportunity to comment as the proposal develops.

Allocated to Contin CT2 Contin Mains

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Inverness to Nairn Growth Area Paragraph 3.2: Add as the penultimate sentence in this paragraph: "Development will have achieved high and even exemplary standards of sustainability, including a significant modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport and, where new settlement / urban extensions have been built, building design and layout are to the highest standards of sustainability." Paragraph 3.7: Following the final sentence, add: "The Plan will promote and support the significant modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport that will include incorporating the Dalcross rail halt into evolving plans for Tornagrain, Inverness Airport and their surroundings, along with incorporation of cycle plans into the A96 corridor linking Inverness, Tornagrain, Nairn and beyond." Any cycle path incorporated into the A96 corridor should also extend to Whiteness, to link the varying opportunities available there by active transport route to the nearby urban centres. Provision should be made for developer contributions to fund increased cycle infrastructure provision, as well as walking paths, public transport and roads. Water treatment infrastructure Policy 4 While the importance and benefits of larger scale water treatment infrastructure is fully recognised, there may in some instances be potential for more viable local alternative waste water treatment systems, especially in the context of the most exemplary of sustainable settlements. These would typically be small scale and / or local treatment systems and could include artificial wetlands and use of waste water in growing biomass. Such systems would of course only be acceptable if it can be robustly and conclusively demonstrated that this would not result in the deterioration of water quality in the wider catchment, or compromise the improvements provided for in other policies. Add into the first sentence, after (...Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1988): "... unless it is robustly and conclusively demonstrated that a more viable local alternative exists, such as connection to small scale and / or local treatment facilities, artificial wetlands or biomass growing."

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

West Inverness Paragraph 4.9: Add the following additional bullet point: provide dedicated cycle and walking path provision in the planned urban extensions both into the City and to other destinations further afield, particularly where these are for 50 dwellings or 100 new jobs or more. South Inverness Paragraph 4.11: Amend the second bullet point to include, in place of "Bught and Torvean and better access routes to the countryside", to: ...Bught and Torvean, better access routes to the countryside and into the City and to other destinations further afield, particularly for urban extensions and other development where these are for 50 dwellings or 100 new jobs or more. Nairn Paragraph 4.32: Amend the fourth bullet point to insert, in place of "road and rail improvements", to: road, cycle, pedestrian In paragraphs 4.33 to 4.41, insert reference to improved / additional cycle and pedestrian provision at an appropriate place Tornagrain This is a key settlement for Highland, Scotland and perhaps beyond. In addition to providing for housing and economic growth within the IMFLDP area, it is the only stand-alone new town to be provided under the Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative and as such the opportunities for an exemplary and highly sustainable settlement of the 21st century should be taken to their full potential While the SSCI notes that communities within the Initiative will not necessarily fulfil every sustainability criteria, the fact that this is the only stand alone new town within the current SSCI projects suggests that this should seek to be the most exemplary of them. While the masterplan as approved under the recently approved outline planning permission provides many key features that will assist in meeting that potential, the very best practice for cycling, walking and sustainable transport infrastructure should be incorporated into each phase or part phase, and into any future reworking of the masterplan. In addition, provision should be made within the plan for re-working of the masterplan, and for applications for each phase or part of a phase, to provide the following: Allocation of areas with best soils within the site boundaries for food growing - allotments, houses with large gardens (and a mechanism to ensure that these gardens remain largely undeveloped) and, as an addition to allotments, community orchards and plant nurseries Community orchards / plant nurseries could also be added to the range of uses for public open space - although it is recognised that access to them may need to be restricted, in the same way as for allotments. A diverse mix of house types should be encouraged within relatively small spaces, such as within street blocks, (recognising however that this is perhaps somewhat at variance to the first bullet point in this section above), so that neighbourhoods include a mixture of larger and smaller houses and also flats. This would result in a mix of age and social groups within neighbourhoods, as well as a mix of tenures. Flats can be usefully incorporated into buildings on street corners, where rear gardens will be smaller or perhaps non-existent provided that balconies are provided and public open space is easily accessible by walking. These corner buildings should also offer the opportunity for local shops and other appropriate businesses. Provision should however be made in their design for these premisses to be flexibly designed, to allow conversion in at least some cases if the businesses accommodated there do not prove to be viable Provision should be made within Tornagrain for sustainable energy infrastructure of types that are appropriate to an urban area - for example biomass-fired Combined Heat and Power plants, and community heating. While I largely support this policy, there is however one point in it that is somewhat puzzling. This is the inclusion in the text for Site: TG1 of a specific inclusion of petrol stations within the uses that should be provided for. This is not an appropriate single use of any site within this exemplary settlement. Petrol stations are harmful to sustainability for the following reasons: They cater almost exclusively for the least sustainable forms of transport; Where there is a retail component, they undermine town and local centres and individual local shops by diverting sales away from them; The means of accessing any retail component at petrol stations is almost exclusively by private vehicle. The specific inclusion of petrol stations within the uses that should be provided for should therefore be deleted. Appropriate locations in the vicinity for any new petrol stations should be on the A96 corridor, or very close to it so that they would not be used primarily by motorists within Tornagrain, and should include the following features: Provision of alternative fuels, particularly charging points for electric vehicles; Provision in each case of a cycle service area; Restriction on the area for any retail use within the petrol station building to a maximum of around 35 to 50 square metres (the acceptable figure to be determined in the light of sound planning advice); For any retail use over this area, a choice of shops should be provided so that premisses are available for lease to an independent retailer - the custom would not then be monopolised by one petrol company. In such cases, the area of retail to be provided for an independent retailer should be at least equal to, or exceed, that provided for the petrol retailer for other retail goods. Conclusions Time does not allow me to offer comments on the remainder of the plan, but I would support greater incorporation of sustainability initiatives generally across the plan area and particularly within the other identified towns and settlements within the IMFLDP. I hope that the above comments are useful, and I would

welcome the opportunity to attend a public examination of the Plan.

Allocated to Comments on the vision and spatial strategy

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

The Vision and Spatial Strategy in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP, or the Plan in this representation) sets out a sustainable development strategy for this pivotal part of the Highland Council area and beyond that, for all of northern Scotland. This representation comments on just a few specifics of the Plan. I seek to add or modify text within the Plan as follows: Transport Paragraph 2.20: Add : "Improving both public transport and non-motorised transport networks (cycling and walking) can be of assistance in achieving the Plan's sustainable development objectives, alleviate congestion on those parts of the highways network close to or within cycling distance to the largest settlements provide, provide greater overall capacity within set funding constraints by diverting a proportion of private travel in those areas to more cheaply provided cycle and pedestrian paths, and in doing so possibly free up highways funding to improve road provision in more remote parts of Highland, where cycling and walking do not represent such a viable alternative in the more densely populated areas covered by this Plan." Paragraph 2.21: Add at the end of the paragraph, after the seven bullet points, "Future projects could provide additional non-motorised transport infrastructure, for example: - dedicated cycle path provision as part of the A96 corridor improvements; - further dedicated cycle and walking path provision in and between settlements and urban extensions, particularly where these are for 50 dwellings or 100 new jobs or more." Alternatively, these two bullet points could be included as additional points within the main list of seven points, if these projects have already been identified.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

would like this taken out of local development plan as this is the only football pitch in village and it gets used a lot by all the kids in village

Representation

should not be houses on the green area where al the kids play sports

Allocated to

Customer Number 04288 Name Allan MacDonald Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Site IN 32

Reference Site IN 32 Type Change

Comment Changes

An updated existing plan showing the actual housing layout would be more appropriate to allow a proper assessment to be made. These fields should remain for agricultural use. It may be more amenable if there was a proper green belt formed similar to the one created at Parks Farm or is this the only green belt proposed for the City. Is there any no build zone stipulated for the SWIFRC.

Representation

Another Green Belt amenity area would enhance the City there are little enough areas like this in the Capital of the Highlands. The green belt could remain in agricultural use, in some form, allotments have been highlighted in previous plans. Alternatively it may be left to grow wild with some strategic planting and structured footpath.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04100 Name allan maciver Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.128

Reference cb3 Type Change

Comment Changes

to leave the car park and football pitch where it is.

Representation

why waste money moving it when it is and has been a great location where it is.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 04366 Name Allan Robertson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 1.Introduction

Paragraph Page 3 'Next Steps'

Reference The adoption process

Type Change

Comment Changes

In 'Next Steps' any change by the Council to the Reporter's recommendations proposed by the Council must be advertised for further comment. If the Council decides not to adopt the Reporter's recommendations the further objection process should be explained to those frustrated by the non-adoption.

Representation

In 2006 the Reporter's recommendation for Upper Cullernie Farm were rejected on the whim of one Councillor who had not taken a public part in any discussion other than appearing to sympathise with the objections of Community Council and those living near the proposed site. In 2006 following the Council's formal adoption of the Local Plan I wrote to the Scottish Executive/Scottish Government objecting to the non-adoption of the Reporter's Recommendation. In spite of my specifically drawing my MSP's attention to my letter of objection I received a letter of apology from the Scottish Exec/Govt for their having mislaid my letter and advising me that in the interim the Local Plan had been adopted/approved. Both of my suggested changes would give more transparency to the planning process which is often viewed cynically by the public. In spite of the diligence of officials, politicians working behind the scenes lay themselves and their motives open to unnecessary suspicion.

Allocated to East Inverness IN79 Upper Cullernie Farm

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Clarify whether this policy refers only to the present development of which the planning permissions are referred to. It should be made clear that no more houses will be allowed here. Explain what is meant by the 'junction improvements at Cullernie Road' - Cullernie Road is beside the village shop. The development joins what remains of the old road, from Balloch to the Nairn Road, which was diverted when the Barn Church Road was built. Explain what the reference to a flood assessment means and includes. Add a map which shows Where IN79 is.

Representation

Reference to existing planning permissions does not indicate whether that is intended as a limitation. We have already seen the number increase. More hard surfaces mean more run-off in wet weather. The surface water drainage does not work - during wet weather the road from the site drains on to the existing road; and the incorrect partial amendment of the old road's cross-fall now leads water from that road into our and our neighbours' gardens (as a result of incomplete adherence to the original planning conditions). Also, the partial re-surfacing of the old road is too flat and smooth which means that any dampness in freezing weather is held and turns to ice without the benefit of a texture which allows a grip for feet or tyres. Traffic calming measures should be added to the old road because traffic to and from the new houses travels too quickly for the safety of other road users. The Council's assessment that the effect of the short length of road would prevent dangerously high speeds underestimated the power of modern cars.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

I object to the proposal that site NA1 former Showfield East is given development status on 1.8 ha for 30 houses with the retention of the balance as greenspace accommodating a reconfigured equivalent football pitch.. It should be retained as a greenspace.

Representation

I object to the proposal that site NA1 former Showfield East is given development status on 1.8 ha for 30 houses with the retention of the balance as greenspace accommodating a reconfigured equivalent football pitch. It should be retained as a greenspace. The Highland Greenspace Audit 2010 identified the Showfield as having a primary land use as amenity greenspace. The Highland Council Nairnshire Local Plan (NLP) published 2000 and continued in force in April 2012 in Policies S2 par 10 (f) allocated 0.6 ha at the Showfield for 8-10 houses with a S75 Agreement to be obtained to secure the remainder of the Showfield as public open space. NLP par 31 also stated "the Council will safeguard the following additional structural open spaces which are integral to the town and its amenity: the Showfield (see par 10 f)..... and that improvement or upgrading of facilities or enhancement of these areas as community parks is encouraged." The current proposal is to take away 50% of the Showfield as open space and build 30 houses on it. 3 times the space is to be allocated for building (1.8 ha instead of 0.6ha previously allocated in the NLP 2000, continued in force 2012.) The Showfield is a high quality, safe, open, well maintained greenspace and is therefore well used. It provides the setting for a wide range of social interactions and pursuits that contribute to the amenity and character of Nairn and is of high community value. The current football pitch has permanent sturdy wooden posts and rails to keep people off the pitch. If half the Showfield were built upon and the current pitch and pavilion were relocated to the remaining half there would only be about a 20 m strip left round the resited pitch for all the other activities that take place on this open space. The size of the retained part of the Showfield does not allow sufficient space for the vast amount of differing activities carried out on the Showfield i.e. walking, children playing, informal kickabouts, rounders, baseball, frisbee, youths meeting up, picnics etc. There are a huge number of walkers who use the Showfield everyday and the channelling of everyone round the perimeter strip of the fenced off football pitch would result in overcrowding with too many people at one spot at one time, wear and tear, erosion, trampling and loss of vegetation resulting in an unappealing area, an unattractive place to go and no adequate space for the mixed uses currently made of the Showfield. The current proposal focuses entirely on accommodating a resited football pitch to the exclusion of the needs and current use as an open green space by a multitude of other users for recreational use and exercise. The current proposal not only flies in the face of the Council's acknowledgement of it as a greenspace which is integral to the town and its amenity but it also breaches the Scottish Governments Planning Advice Note 65 Planning and Open Spaces which gives advice on the role of the planning system in protecting and enhancing existing open spaces. PAN65 supports the Scottish Planning Policy SPP11 Open Space and Physical Activity. SPP11 sets out how Scottish Ministers expect open spaces issues to be considered by Local Authorities. Development plans have a key role to play in protecting and promoting high quality open space and they should safeguard important open spaces from development in the long term (par 37 of PAN65). The key objectives of SPP are to protect and enhance open spaces to protect and support opportunities for sport and recreation. (Par 14 SPP11 and Par 15 SPP11) Under Par 40 SPP11 there is a presumption against development on open spaces which are valued and functional and that Local Development plans will identify and protect such open space in line with the audit and strategy. The current proposal for 30 houses in the development plan is in breach of Par 57 SPP11 which states that Planning Authorities should set out in Local Development Plans specific requirements for the provision of open spaces in new developments. There is no reference to a Planning Agreement being required to keep the remainder of the Showfield an open space as a condition of the development of 30 houses. There was a S75 Agreement required for the previous development of 8-10 houses in the previous development plan. Par 28 NPPG11 Sport Physical Recreation and Open Space states that robust planning policies are required to safeguard established open spaces and playing fields where they contribute to local community needs and enjoyment. Par 94 NPPG11 states local plans should have regard to the recreational needs of all members of the population including disabled people, the elderly and children, not just footballers. It also states local plans should identify existing sports facilities, open spaces, pitches and playing fields and show those important for protection on the Proposals Map and indicate the circumstances in which the Council will seek to use S 50 Agreements. It should also include policies to protect and enhance existing open space and other land of recreation, amenity or wildlife value and prevent the piecemeal erosion of playing fields and pitches through a succession of small developments over a long period. Under Par 101 NPPG11 Councils should consider the recreational needs of all members of society including disabled people, elderly and children and resist proposals for the development of open space. The current proposals focus on the needs of footballers, not the vast number of other users which use the Showfield for non footballing exercise

and recreational activities. The current proposal flies in the face of the Highland wide Local Development Plan Policy 75 which states that existing areas of high quality accessible fit for purpose open space will be safeguarded from inappropriate development. All sites identified in the Audit of Greenspace will be safeguarded unless.....substitute provision will be provided meeting the needs of the local area. As mentioned above, building on half the Showfield with the remainder focusing on football use to the exclusion of the extent and nature of other recreational activities carried on at the Showfield is in blatant breach of the Council's own Policy 75. The current proposal also flies in the face of the Highland Council Supplementary Guidance Open Space in New Residential Development adopted December 2012 for anyone seeking planning permission for 4 or more dwellings. It states the Council's objectives in relation to open space sport and recreation provisions and that the Council seeks to ensure that open space in new developments will be well located, well designed, fit for purpose, sustainable and to promote health and well being. That cannot be achieved if half the Showfield is built on and half taken up predominantly by a football pitch with a 20 m perimeter for other recreational use. There is not sufficient space left for the other recreational uses which has to be accessible by non footballing persons, disabled persons, the elderly and children. If half the Showfield were built on it would result in a deficit of open space provision of that type within the locality and with the Highland Council's requirement that new developments of over 4 dwellings should supply a certain amount of open space for that development, the Showfield is being reduced by half and simultaneously the demand increased. In summary the current proposal is in breach of the Statutory provisions and policies set out above, is too high a density of building with not sufficient left of the Showfield to accommodate the nature of the current recreational usage, not just the football pitch, and has no planning agreement to safeguard the long term future of the unbuilt upon part of the Showfield as a high quality valued open space as identified in the Greenspace Audit and existing Local Plan. The need for 30 houses at the cost of reducing well used prime greenspace by half cannot rebut the presumption against development in SPP11. Once built on open space is almost certainly lost to the community forever (Par 38 NPPG11). The Showfield should be retained as greenspace.

Allocated to	Nairn	NA1	Former Showfield East	
--------------	-------	-----	-----------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Ideally I would like the proposed plan to be abolished completely but, recognising that this is unlikely, I would ask that the proposed plan should end at least two fields' distance from the border line of the plan to the houses that currently exist in Reasurie.

Representation

Resuarie is a community of its own with its own identity, being neither an annex of Smithton nor of Cradlehall. For many years, this clearly identifiable settlement has enjoyed a demarcation from the other two larger communities, but we have seen more and more houses grow up around us. We have already had to endure a large development of flats at the Smithton end of Caulfield Road North which we believe will have a significant impact on the single track road. Now we are being asked to accept proposals for a further 1,300 homes or community, business, industrial or non residential institution use which will back on to our back garden. The visual amenity which we will enjoy, looking on to the Black Isle and beyond, will be destroyed. We will become absorbed in a greater Easter Inverness urban sprawl with no demarcation from Raigmore to Culloden. We will lose our identity. However, I have to accept that the current culture within the council seems to include a determination to develop on any suitable plot of land, irrespective of demand, and so I would respectfully ask that consideration be given to the establishment of a buffer zone of at least two fields between the existing houses in Resaurie and the boundary line for the proposed plan. I feel that, while being far from ideal, and while still impacting severely on the visual amenity that we currently enjoy, this this would represent some form of compromise between the current proposal and the wishes of the residents here. It would also constitute some sort of break between where Inverness ends and Resaurie starts which would allow us to continue to have some degree of separation from the spread of the city. I would also ask that consideration be given not to use Caulfield Road North to access teh proposed Development. I am concerned that the single track Caufield Road North is simply not wide enough to support access to the size of development currently envisaged. The road has already been recently altered to cater for the Barratt's development of flats at the end of this road, and we are currently having to adapt to the consequences of that. Many people walk along this road as an access into the city, many of those are young children travelling to Cradlehall Primary School or Smithton School. Cyclists also use this road regularly and so do horses. While it is a clear road with a 30mph speed limit, to all intents and purposes it is used in the same way as a country lane in its current state. The fact that houses front directly onto it in many sections means that widening it is impossible and it simply could not carry the traffic that a development of the size planned would generate. I recognise the need for change and I recognise the need for development, but in line with what we have already had to face from the Barratt's development, I honestly believe this latest proposal to bring the development area right up to the garden fences of the houses that have been in Resaurie for many years, and enjoyed the benefits of spacial and visual amenity, would be brutally excessive, rapacious act which would serve neither existing residents nor the intended land users to their satisfaction. Resaurie has traditionally been a semi rural idyl, enjoyed by the people who live here. The proposal in its current state is for a development that will be very much right in our faces. If it has to go ahead we would respectfully ask that a distance of two fields is kept between what we have and what you plan which may at least give us the illusion that we have not lost everything.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Draw attention to risks of suburbanisation, define meaning of housing group and state development limits

Representation

“Hinterland” and Suburbanisation: Earlier plans gave considerable emphasis to the benefits of retaining accessible countryside close to existing residential communities. This emphasis was not merely focused on technical landscaping criteria but linked to the whole wide issue of lifestyle choices and to the aim of creating an attractive environment which would attract new people to the Inner Moray Firth. It is therefore disappointing that this Plan seems to treat the interland as the “bits left over” rather than as an aspect of the Plan critical to the overall development of the area. In the area between Invergordon and Tain for example over half the area designated as “hinterland” in map 3 is also designated as “growth area” and parts of the growth area overflow into the hinterland of the designated “hinterland”. This suggests that the designation “hinterland” is largely meaningless and subject to ready abandonment. It appears that over the last 20 years the status of land in the “hinterland” category has been downgraded in Planning Department thinking. This is evidenced by the experience of West Lamington. In 1990, the initial draft of the Lamington Local Plan advised no further development west of the Marybank Road principally because of drainage problems from the septic tanks of houses built in the early 1970s. The 1991 final version of the Plan allowed the possibility of limited development where there was a need specific to this location for land management purposes, for example. However, the Plan emphasised the serious drainage problems. In 2003, the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan went out for public consultation but the Lamington section was unfortunately advertised as a Scotsburn section and not as a set of amendments to the existing Lamington Local Plan with which local residents seemed more than content. The effect of the changes was to add areas of the better in-bye croft land to the settlement development area and to minimise any reference to the substantial drainage problems. As no-one in West Lamington realised that the “new Scotsburn Plan” referred to their immediate area there were no objections to this section of the Plan until after the draft Plan had gone for Scottish Government approval. Within a few months of the new Plan coming into effect, there were applications for no fewer than 12 new houses on/or adjacent to one croft of which 9 were on land added to the settlement development area by the new Plan between the top of the Marybank Road and the Scots Burn at Fern Hollow; permissions for 7 houses now exist, although none have been constructed. It was anticipated that the recent clarification of the criteria for identifying settlements suitable for development would rule out Lamington as such a settlement and that the undeveloped land within the settlement development area would revert to hinterland status. However, the recent draft capacity study of Lamington has identified the area between the Marybank Road and Fern Hollow as “hinterland” containing a “housing group” suitable for infill or rounding off despite a recent planning application having included a report from reputable consultants reinforcing the original assessment of the drainage limitations arrived at by Planning Department staff in 1990. Previous plans have given a clear impression that “housing groups” referred to a handful of adjacent buildings (such as a substantial farmhouse and its ancillary buildings) and not to a half mile collection of small groups of homes totalling 15 existing houses and 7 speculative planning permissions all likely to generate drainage problems if built. Thus, over less than 25 years, an area in a recognised settlement has changed from being considered unsuitable for development to an area in the supposedly protected “hinterland” awaiting proposals for infill or rounding off. I do not believe that the particular circumstances and/or experience of Lamington is by any means unique. One of the distinctive features of Easter Ross remains the scattered small groups of houses and individual homes set in the countryside, often occupying settings only visible from immediate vantage points. Although some developments have been permitted in recent years which are by no means matched to the established character of the area, most of this scattered rural housing is in character, or at least shrouded by trees or landforms, and makes a positive contribution to the scenic character of the area as enjoyed by both residents and visitors. Recent Highland Council Planning Department consultations and publications emerging from the Highland Wide Local Plan and related documents have stressed both the undesirability of suburbanisation of the countryside and the current opportunity to guard against this. At this time the negative impact of suburbanisation is growing because of future transport priorities and of the implications for public expenditure arising from increased amenity expectations. A definition of “housing group” which embraces the likes of West Lamington is an open backdoor to uncontrolled suburbanisation. The outcome can only be increased settlement in locations which can neither be serviced by public transport, which are too remote for active travel and which require public services which can only be provided at disproportionate cost. As no part of the Highlands is more at risk from suburbanisation than the Inner Moray Firth a small section in the Proposed Plan should draw attention to this and a specific definition of housing group should state clear limits in both numbers of existing and additional units and in geographical scale of the group should be specifically stated. The importance of “hinterland” in managing the danger of suburbanisation

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Answer fundamental questions about the propose of attracting ten of thousands of people to the area.

Representation

The various plans and planning policy documents produced in the late 1960s and early 1970s, such as "The Moray Firth - A Plan for Growth" - were significantly more holistic in their approach than this document. Each of the main themes of this plan seem dealt with in isolation. The environmental content - both natural and man-made - is largely presented as a competing alternative to the creation of employment and the consequent need for expanded housing rather than as a factor integral to the process of economic development. In the early 1970s I managed the recruitment, from both local and wider sources, for the initial workforce of the Invergordon Aluminium Works to achieve 50% output when production was held until the market recovered from the addition of 50,000 tonnes to the UK supply. I then became the first Personnel Manager of Brown & Root Highlands Fabricators and set up their recruitment and selection system. Although initially there was a substantial supply of very capable and adaptable recruits available in the Inner Moray Firth area, a small number of recruits with very specific skills and experience had to be brought into the area. Largely because of the efforts of the Highlands & Islands Development Board a vision of the area, and of the lifestyles available in it, had been successfully communicated very widely in Scotland and we had absolutely no difficulty in generating a completely satisfactory response to our recruitment advertising and in quickly appointing very satisfactory people. A development plan which demonstrates an understanding of the strong links between the process of creating jobs, and attracting suitable people to perform them, and quality of life opportunities for incoming employees and their families would be an enormous assistance to those charged with finding suitable in-migrants and attracting them to the area. This will be a significantly greater task over the next decade than it was in the 1970s as the number of permanent jobs to be filled will be larger, the supply of underemployed people in the area will be lower and changes in Scotland's cities since then have made urban lifestyles in central Scotland much more attractive by comparison. I believe that it is therefor necessary for the document to answer, whether directly or indirectly, fundamental questions about the purpose of attracting tens of thousands of people to the area who will fill the 25,000 additional homes planned and perform the jobs envisaged and about the purpose of any consequential fundamental changes to the satisfactory lifestyles afforded to those who live here today. This is made more difficult by key issues being merely cross referenced to other documents - many still under preparation - where even a short explanation of the relevance of the content of the subsidiary document might strengthen the impact of what is expressed in the Local Plan. Earlier plans and policies stressed a desire to retain the specific character of each of the communities of the area and to offer a wide choice of type of residential community to those who settle here. Statements in this Plan about the desirability of developing brown field sites in established towns and villages, and in reflecting established architectural features in such developments, do not adequately convey the importance of this in creating and maintaining townscapes, etc. which increase the contentment of those living and/or working in the resulting built environment but protect the appreciated features of the previous environment which the established population does not wish to lose. It might be possible to indirectly convey the lifestyle potential of developments such as "active travel" routes and places of interest such as heritage features of the built environment if these were shown or named in some of the maps, even if currently still under consideration or negotiation, and if it were made clear whether such "active travel" routes, for example, were merely pavements protected to some extent from passing motorised traffic or if some were intended to offer attractive routes quite separate from established roads reducing distance to be covered or linking features which their users would appreciate.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04493 Name Andrew Currie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph 2.20 - 2.23

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Specify what is required in terms of railway improvements. Mention potential of a frequent light rail service through Inverness. Reflect need for adequate parking and existing and future rail halts.

Representation

Transport Issues: Earlier plans and policies were more explicit about the link between major needed improvements to transport facilities and both economic and lifestyle effects of significant infrastructure investments. Forty years ago, when the major upgrading of the A9 commenced the initial plan covered the A9 from Perth to Invergordon. The new plan to provide a continuous dual carriageway from Perth only to Inverness contradicts the emphasis given to Easter Ross in the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan as the location of much of the area's industrial expansion. The 1972 A9 upgrade to Invergordon not only reflected the then anticipated industrial development of the north shore of the Cromarty Firth but also recognised that the A9 between Inverness and Invergordon was already the busiest section of trunk road in the Highlands and that it was 4 times busier than the second busiest section. The Plan should therefore not merely indicate the need for junction improvements on this route and for overtaking lanes; a crawler lane on the incline from the south end of the Cromarty Crossing was already on the 5 year rolling programme in 1997. It would also be useful to specify what is required in terms of railway improvements which were analysed in some detail in earlier plans. At the present time long-distance services - provided largely by suburban rolling stock - are supplemented by a few commuter services into Inverness. Mainline services to Inverness, particularly from the south, deserve more suitable rolling stock. RailTrack was supportive of the idea of more frequent services between Tain and Nairn in light rail vehicles able to accelerate away quickly from frequent intermediate stops but was held back by the cost of a complete upgrade of the signalling system to meet the requirements of a mix of different types of rail traffic. Surely the potential of a frequent light rail service through Inverness deserves a mention particularly as much of the population both now and as envisaged live relatively close to the rail route. The Plan would also have to reflect the need for adequate parking at both existing and possible future halts.

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number 04158 Name Andrew Stanley Organisation Soudley Research Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference NA13

Type Change

Comment Changes

Changes as per comment 1.

Representation

Our representation is detailed in comment 1 but as our representation letter is two pages plus plan and there is a limit of two files per comment, here is page 2 of our letter.

Allocated to Nairn NA13 South of Balmakeith

Customer Number 04158 Name Andrew Stanley Organisation Soudley Research Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA13 Type Change

Comment Changes

Increase size of allocation NA13 to natural boundaries.

Representation

The area allocated as NA13 does not reflect the existing settlement boundary, does not provide flexibility for new and existing businesses and does not provide Nairn with a range of development sites for the expanding population. Our comments are contained in the attached file.

Allocated to Nairn NA13 South of Balmakeith

Customer Number 03985 Name Andrew Black Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IN24

Reference IN24 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like the rough ground that lies between Torvean Quarry and Craig Dunain hill to be kept as a green area. There should be minimal change made to this rough ground without consideration to the wild life that depend on it for basic survival.

Representation

My main objection to the development plans for IN24 in the Kinmylies area is the distuction of nesting sites for Yellow Hammer and Sky Lark as well as hunting ground for Kestrel and sparrowhawk . I would like to see more conservation of the rough land that surrounds the Kinmylies area. In particular the area of land that lies between Torvean quarry and Craig Dunain hill. This land supports many bird species that are currently in decline within the UK, in particular Yellow Hammer, Sky Lark, which have nested in these fields for as long as I can remember. These fields are also hunting grounds for Kestel, Sparrowhawk, Tony Owl and more recently the Red Kite. A large part of wildlife's demise is the destruction by development of their habitat, habitat require for basic survival of their species. These birds and many other creatures depend on this type of rough ground which unfortunately seems to be most desirable for the building of residential and commercial premises. I would object to any plans to change the use of these fields that does not provide adequate provisions for the conservation of a large part of this rough ground. Tourists come to Scotland for the beautiful unspoilt scenery and wild life, not to visit the shops and housing estates.

Allocated to West Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Northern part)

Customer Number 03964 Name Andrew Cartmell Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Croy CR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like no houses to be built on proposed site CR1

Representation

This building of 35 houses on site CR1 will cause excessive noise pollution,not just during the construction process but also on completion The addition of 35 houses and therefore a possible 70 cars with dramatically affect the nature of a rural village. The current road access into Croy includes 2 single track roads that would not be suitable for this kind of increase in traffic. Also drainage issues are a concern. Several properties built in recent years have caused drainage problems and the erection of this amount of houses directly next to and slightly higher than my property causes me great concern. There is included in the local plan a building of some 10000 houses in a major site at Tornagrain. Why the need to ruin the centre of Croy with this site? The value of my property is now going to decrease dramatically because of the proposition. I do not want to live with a housing estate in my back garden but now cannot afford to move precisely because if this plan

Allocated to Croy CR1 East of B9006

Customer Number 03968 Name Andrew Melville Organisation ref. Inchmore Hall IC3

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Inchmore Hall IC3

Reference Inchmore Hall IC3 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like proposed use for Inchmore Hall (IC3) changed to Mixed Use, ie suitable for business and / or residential.

Representation

Inchmore Hall IC3 I request change of allocation to Mixed Use, for the reason that it was and is difficult to find a tenant for a building of this type in this location. If in the future a suitable tenant cannot be found then residential development should, in my view, at least be an option. I do not see why this site has been singled out for retention as business use only. There was a shop site in Inchmore until recently and that site could equally have been allocated as business use instead of allowing full scale residential development. Also, it would have been on the side of the road where most residents live, negating the need for perilous journeys across a busy road. I do accept that the Inchmore hall site has a long established, safe and well used vehicular entrance / exit and this no doubt makes it attractive as a commercial venue, but not everyone travels to shops / business premises by car, and in my view there are similar sites in the area with good entrance / exit facilities. If the building is redeveloped in the future, say for business use, it may be that tenants will be more easily found, and encouraged to take up a long-term tenancy if he/she/they can live on the premises, ie in a house built on to the premises, or, in a flat or flats above. With this in mind I respectfully request that the site now be allocated to Mixed Use. Thank you Andrew Melville.

Allocated to Inchmore IC3 Former Inchmore Hall

Customer Number 04444 Name Andrew Stanley Organisation Soudley Research

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) A Wood Savills (UK) Limited

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN8 Type Change

Comment Changes

To add retail and tourism and leisure uses to the list of potential uses

Representation

This change should ensure that the Council's proposed Supplementary Guidance can take account of a wide a range of potential mixed uses for the site to ensure that a commercially viable proposal can come forward and the Longman Landfill site remediated during the lifetime of the plan. It will also help ensure an attractive environemnt can be created on the waterfront in addition to other business uses within the site.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN8 Former Longman Landfill

Customer Number 04444 Name Andrew Stanley Organisation Soudley Research

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) A Wood Savills (UK) Limited

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference INV13 Type Change

Comment Changes

To add business, retail and toursim/leisure to the list of potential uses for the site

Representation

This change should ensure that the Council's proposed Supplementary Guidance can take account of a wide a range of potential mixed uses for the site to ensure that a commercially viable proposal can come forward and the Longman Landfill site remediated during the lifetime of the plan. It will also help ensure an attractive environemnt can be created on the waterfront in addition to other industrial uses within the site and allow for a more holistic aproch to be taken to the development of this area in conjunction with proposed amendments to IN8

Allocated to Central Inverness IN13 Former Longman Landfill

Customer Number 04394 Name Andrew Whitty Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph

Reference IN 22 Type Change

Comment Changes

no housing development in proposed site

Representation

I feel the area should be developed for the general public and tourists for leisure and recreation as we don't have anything like that near the heart of the city . I feel to cram more houses close to centre of town will be regretted in future years.

Allocated to West Inverness IN22 Highland Council HQ

Customer Number 03940 Name Angela Boyle Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Objection to development on green space NA3-Achareidh Impacts negatively upon the green space and beauty of Nairn which is a major part of attracting tourism to the area. Also displays utter disregard for the wildlife in this section, e.g, red squirrel, deer.

Representation

Home owner

Allocated to Nairn NA3 Achareidh

Customer Number 04093 Name Angela Gardiner Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph 3.14

Reference Fendom Type Change

Comment Changes

Land towards Fearn side of Fendom road not reclassified.

Representation

The land is currently prime agricultural land and used as such so there is no need to change this as there is plenty of land (particularly on the other side of this road where there are no houses). In addition, I have major concerns regarding all types of potential pollution as a result of change of use of the land. There are a number of children living in this area. The exact use of for this land has not been made clear which is unacceptable when we are asked to give our views on this.

Allocated to Fendom General General

Customer Number 04224 Name Angus Bethune Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.142

Reference CU6 Type Change

Comment Changes

It is considered that this site would be best-suited for housing development; your comment about it being "suitable for all uses" would need clarification.

Representation

I wish to record my interest in this site, being the part-owner (with my sister) of the field to the south of this site, which is accessed from the main road. The upper part of this site, accessed from the Findon road, has already been developed to form housing plots

Allocated to Culbokie CU6 North of Schoolcroft

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Clarification of proposed number of dwellings , etc , noting 85 sites considered previously in local developement inquiry

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

To acknowledge that there should be linkage re developement of school and facilities with this site use and that this should also be a pre requisite for the use of EV1

Representation

Site EV3 – Drummond Farm 5.4 Ha Provided they are prepared to extrapolate some of the area to accommodate the expansion of the school, associated parking, recreational area and suitable safe access then they could earn the right to the additional planning gain on the remainder of the development.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04257 Name angus craik Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.147

Reference Consolidation of Settlement should be restricted

Type Change

Comment Changes

Consolidation of Settlement should be restricted to Consolidation – not a massive increase in population which is not feasible nor necessary in the time span of the plan.

Representation

Consolidation of Settlement should be restricted to Consolidation – not a massive increase in population which is not feasible nor necessary in the time span of the plan.

Allocated to Evanton General General

Customer Number 04257 Name angus craik Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.150

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

changes with reference to road network, rail stop

Representation

4.150 Upgrades of the road network is an immediate priority and can be easily achieved by being considered together with the bridge to gain access to the extremely valuable area of Teandallon, linking to Swordale road and alleviating the congestion and dangers presently being experienced in the Village. At peak times an accident is waiting to happen! A rail stop would be advantageous but the demand is not high as road transport is needed/desired here and at destination so this is not an immediate priority as parking at station becomes a problem.

Allocated to Evanton General General

Customer Number 04257 Name angus craik Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.151

Reference evanton school Type Change

Comment Changes

4.151 kiltearn primary Concern re capacity of school, current traffic flow/ parking, option for appropriate developement of site at teandallon not being considered without pursuing developers commitment to investmentin infrastructure

Representation

4.151 The Primary School expansion, associated parking and safety concerns all point to development of Teandallon paying for all or at least the major part of the cost without it becoming a burden on the Council. I was distressed to be told by our local councillor that the lease of the land to Drummond Farm was unbreakable and this is obviously incorrect. There may be conditions of notice etc but this is not insurmountable – if the will is there – the way is there. It is imperative that this is not allowed to continue as the realised value in monetary terms and potential is enormous and beneficial to the entire community and the Regional Council. Consideration of approval in any other area would prove detrimental to the future value of Teandallon land and it is essential that this asset be exploited to the maximum before allowing gain elsewhere.

Allocated to Evanton General General

Customer Number 04257 Name angus craik Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph ev1

Reference ev1 Type Change

Comment Changes

noting that developement of EV1 should also lead to improvement of road infrastructure , linking Swordale to the main through road, reducing traffic flow through the centre of the village , with associated reduction of risk to pedestrians and cyclists

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to Evanton EV1 Teandallon East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Acknowledgement that due to limited demand, any further consideration of this site would reduce the economic viability of the development of site EV1, which has already been purchased and in ownership of the Highland Council and previously considered for development.

Representation

Due to above, any consideration of development of EV2 would negate any interest in development of EV1 resulting in loss of value and return from this publically held asset.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Acknowledgement that rail linkage directly to the deephaven site , is currently unfeasible and alternative use as a drop off station is inappropriate for the community.

Representation

Site EV5 – Highland Deephaven – 147 Ha The jetty extension may or may never transpire but the rail link has become an impossibility due to insurmountable technical problems and other site changes which now preclude access and link up. The permissions have already expired and a totally fresh approach and application would be required.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Advantage re developement of EV1 and assocaited infrastructure Centralised developement of village promoting walking and cycling to amenitys as opposed to peripheral expansion, necessitatiing car use and congestion therein.

Representation

Site EV1 – Teandallon East - Capacity :125 The area indicated as 10.3 Ha could sustain a higher capacity and by allowing a more generous gain to a developer would provide a greater incentive. If the desired capacity is regarded as 210 in total this is achievable and attain a high level of convenience with safety allowing provision of the desireable improvements. A major benefit is also the proximity to the school and safe footpath access to the store. Traffic would be more widely dispersed saving tempers and possibly life.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

More accurate more representing current roads, lanes and pathways

Representation

Current map disproportionately represents width of small lane from Station Road to Culcairn Cottage, from which it may be falseley construed that this would represent a suitable ingress/ access to the proposed site.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04257 Name angus craik Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph 4.148

Reference 4.148 (general introduction) Type Change

Comment Changes

consideration of contents of section 4.148, re school, , associated parking, local amenity,previously purchased and designated developement land

Representation

4.148 - Reference is made to the Novar Designed Landscape to the North but it is not clear what this implies as no changes appear to have been made in the last 30+ years There is a Primary School – close to max capacity with no treatment room and very limited space. Parking is a major problem and the deposit and uplifting of young pupils is dangerous and MUST be addressed before any life is lost. There is one convenience store , one Licensed Hotel, Sports Centre with limited parking and a Public Hall with no parking . Any Housing development should be confined to the previously designated area at East and West Teandallon on land purchased some 35 years ago for that purpose. There is only a limited demand for housing and no apparent demand for additional mixed work units.There is in any event an Industrial and mixed use area nearby at EV5.. The previously held ‘Presumption in favour of Agriculture’ should be reinstated’.

Allocated to Evanton General General

Customer Number 04257 Name angus craik Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph EV2

Reference ev2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Restoration of presumption in favor of agricultural use to be reinstated in keeping with general strategic plan. Current land use having historical extensive period of highly productive utilisation. note no previous consideration of land being put to set aside.

Representation

Site EV2 – Culcairn – 12.3 Ha - Capacity Previously reduced to 85 This can be reduced totally as not required nor desireable – At its extremity it is some 1800m from the School and would aggravate the congestion and dangers presently experienced.

Allocated to Evanton EV2 Culcairn

Customer Number 04421 Name Angus Macleod Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable) Roy Stirrat FRTPi Stirrat Planning Consultancy

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.170 – 4.174

Reference Strathpeffer, Housing

Type Change

Comment Changes

The proposal is to change the proposed IMFLDP by adding a 0.8 ha windfall housing and woodland site – see Site Plan Existing and Proposed. Four detached houses, served by a private access and a new woodland creating a strong landscape framework are proposed. The houses would be in character with those neighbouring, and support the policy aim of modest housing expansion. The site is just outwith the proposed settlement boundary, and is redundant farm land without beneficial use over many years. As a gap site between Coulwood and Elsick Farm, development here together with a large woodland next to Elsick Farm will create a housing and landscape asset. Site development cannot be construed as ribbon development or out-of-character. Four houses in large gardens would be contained by the new woodland, the overall wooded character in this part of the town would be enhanced, a public footpath connection would be created through the new wood to Blackmuir Wood, and a strong southern landscape town boundary would be created. A standard-compliant private access to the A834 would serve the four houses.

Representation

1.Representation relates to the site refused planning permission in principle on 19th October 2010 for the development of one house. It is submitted that the opportunity should now be now taken to reconsider the beneficial use that this site could make to increasing Strathpeffer's housing supply and strengthening its southern boundary by establishing a large woodland.

2.Planning Application 10/03364/PIP, Plot 1 Land to South of Coulwood, Strathpeffer proposed the erection of a house to the east of the A834 road between Coulwood to the north and Coulwood Cottage to the south. Plot 1 of 1.1ha extent was proposed for one detached 5 bed house served by a new non-adoptable midway vehicular access from the A834. The proposed access road was shown continuing south beyond Elsick Farm into the larger Plot 2 extending south past Laurel Cottage to just beyond Hawthorn Cottage. 3.The application was refused for the following reasons : 1)The proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policy H3 of The Highland Structure Plan and Policy GSP10 of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, which presumes against the erection of new housing within the Hinterland Around Towns. No justification for departure from this policy (which complies with Development Plan Guidelines) has been put forward. 2)The proposal is contrary to Strathpeffer Policy 17 of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan which seeks to maintain the open character of the countryside around the fringes of Strathpeffer, notably towards Loch Kinellan, Coul and Jamestown. The erection of a house within the site, between Coulwood and Elsick Farm, and its associated access and garden grounds, would significantly erode this currently open character through the introduction of additional Buildings/hardstanding, the domestic appearance of garden grounds as opposed to the fields associated with open countryside, and would lead to 'ribbon' development through the visual joining of Coulwood and Elsick Farm. 3)The boundary of the settlement of Strathpeffer is well defined by the hedge around the garden ground of Coulwood, which denotes the transition from built form into the open countryside of the neighbouring fields. The proposal would lead to a visual encroachment into the field between Couwood and Elsick Farm, which would visually extend the built form of Strathpeffer, contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan Policy Guidelines. 4)The proposal is contrary to Policy BP3 of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, which only allows development if there is no significant adverse effects on heritage, amenity, public health and safety interests. This proposal would seriously damage the visual amenity of the area, through enabling the encroachment of an additional building into the open countryside, and a visual linking of Coulwood and Elsick farm, and contribute to 'ribbon development' in this area of currently open countryside. 4.Revised proposals as shown on the Proposed Development site plan are submitted for reconsideration: i.Development only of Site 1, slightly increased in size from the planning application site, to allow establishment of a large woodland extending south of and containing Elsick. The former Site 2 is excluded from consideration. Four houses are proposed, each with a large garden and therefore reflecting the development scale and style of neighbouring houses. ii.Planting of a major woodland block of native trees, of extent 0.57ha, subject to forestry grant and maintenance requirements, on the southern part of the site and extending behind Elsick Farm. It achieves the following benefits : -contains development of the site to the south -provides a substantial new landscaped edge to Strathpeffer -provides a strengthened transition between built form and countryside -provides a stronger landscape town boundary than the garden hedge at Coulwood -provides a landscape context for the presently isolated Elsick Farm -precludes further housing development south of Elsick Farm -stops any visual impression of ribbon development iii.The proposed site has the visual appearance of unused land; indeed the land has not been used agriculturally for many years or attracted interest for other uses. Eastern views across the field are limited by the dominant backdrop scale of Blackmuir Wood. The site thus has strong landscape containment to the east but is part of a long open corridor of land to the south beyond Elsick Farm and towards Jamestown. The proposed large woodland will provide a strong complementary terminal landscape feature to both the proposed site and the town. As tree stock establishes and

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments.

Page 56 of

The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

946

becomes the ever more apparent the woodland will increasingly be seen to contain Strathpeffer's urban form. iv. Access taken at the site corner by the 30mph signs, and therefore almost within the village boundary; with sightline distances available for both 30mph and 40mph speed requirements. The proposed access thus offers safe access and exit to the A834. v. It is submitted that development of four detached houses with large gardens will not seriously damage the visual amenity of the local area, or that of neighbouring Coulwood; nor are there any other environmental or nature impacts. 5. The eastern site edge is bounded by the mature mixed woodland of Blackmuir Wood (Forestry Commission), with a public footpath along its edge used by the community. A footpath on the southern boundary of the proposed woodland would connect and diversify the community's local path network. 6. Technically compliant site access to the A834 is available based on Council design guidance. Along this section of the A834, from the 30mph sign at the Strathpeffer boundary to Elsick Farm, there is a maintained 2m wide grassed verge, wider in part on the side opposite, and a number of access and road traffic management features. This stretch of road thus has a compromised visual quality, clearly making the road traveller aware of the transition from the countryside to the town: Side Opposite Site ■ new large bellmouth access and integral service bay to farmland ■ closeby, on a widened verge, a large stone-built special "Welcome to Strathpeffer" sign and extended cleared grass verge sightlines ■ 30mph speed restriction advance warning sign (100m) ■ 30mph Please Drive Carefully sign at town entrance Site Side ■ Access No 1 to Elsick Farm ■ Access No 2 to Elsick farm ■ 11KV electricity pole near 30mph sign ■ 30mph Please Drive Carefully sign 7. Road design guidance requires a new access to have a distance of 30m from an existing property (Coulwood). Positioning the proposed access at the nearest site corner by the 30mph sign achieves this distance. 8. Between Elsick Farm and the village boundary the road speed is 40mph, with the 30mph advance warning speed reduction sign opposite Elsick Farm Access No 1. Visibility 'Y' sightlines for a site access along this stretch requires distances of 120m, which are available and more; at 30mph the distance reduces to 90m. Sightlines are taken at the required 'X' distance back of 2.4m for the combined private access and service bay. 9. It is thus considered that development of the site represents: i. a site able to be developed and serviced without detriment to the Strathpeffer's setting or the amenity of neighbours ii. a proposal offering strong landscape containment to the town on its southern edge iii. a windfall site offering four additional houses to the village's stock iv. a layout and density comparable to neighbouring houses served by one private access compliant with location and design standards 10. It is submitted that proposal is significantly different from the planning application refused on 19th October 2010. It offers the opportunity to utilise redundant land which has no reasonable prospect of gainful other use; and creates a windfall development site offering four houses and the creation of a sizeable new woodland, all to the benefit of the local community. 11. The Inner Firth Proposed Local Development Plan for Strathpeffer should therefore be amended by designating the site as a Housing Site: Site: SP2 South of Coulwood Area: 1.1ha Uses: Housing, 4 units Requirements: Access. Woodland establishment and management proposals. Landscape master plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Plan should state at 4.87 that development will only be permitted where access, necessary to reach, develop and utilise additional land within the same zoned area, is facilitated.

Representation

Site AR2 on the plan of Ardersier at page 97 includes land that is owned by more than one owner. There is the risk that zoned land could become landlocked and hence undevelopable. The Plan should therefore make it clear that development will only be permitted if access is provided to such additional zoned land. This will enhance the ability of the Plan to achieve development in this identified preferred location.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the area currently referred to under Policy IN 49 to be safeguarded from development. In other words, I would like Policy IN 49 deleted and a new Policy written which would safeguard the land for its current natural recreational uses, habitat for flora and fauna, and essential 'green corridor' of open space, which benefits both Highland people and local wildlife.

Representation

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. (These Policies and some relevant Statements are copied in full at the end of this letter).
2. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people.
3. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected.
4. We are concerned about the threat any proposed development would have on the local wildlife. During our visits to the area we have spotted deer, hare and badger, and some of these animals are protected species. There is also a wide variety of birds and interesting pond life including newts, frogs and toads. We therefore object to the resultant loss of habitat and adverse disturbance to wildlife which would occur should this land be developed.
5. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. There is no need for artificial bunds, this land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary.
6. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies, as outlined below:- Policies and Statements referred to in Objection 1 above and final paragraph are herewith copied below as follows:- 'The Council's Vision for the Highlands':- Paragraph 5.1: "By 2030... the Highlands will have created sustainable communities, balancing population growth, economic development and the safeguarding of the environment...and have a fairer and healthier Highlands." Paragraph 5.2.2: "We will have

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

safeguarded our Environment by ensuring the special quality of the natural, built and cultural environment is protected and enhanced.” Paragraph 5.2.4: “We will have achieved a healthier Highlands by providing places that contribute to increasing healthy lifestyles, opportunities for quality open space provision and access to enjoy the outdoors; and protecting and enhancing the green network within and around settlements leading to cohesive and fit for purpose network of greenspaces...” Policy 60: Other Important Habitats: “The Council will seek to safeguard the integrity of features of the landscape which are of major importance because of their linear and continuous structure or combination as habitat “stepping stones” for the movement of wild fauna and flora.” Policy 74: Green Networks “Green networks should be protected and enhanced. Development in areas identified for the creation of green networks should seek to avoid the fragmentation of the network and take steps to improve its connectivity where this is appropriate.The main principles of the Council’s Future Guidance on Green Networks are to help promote green space linkages and to safeguard and enhance wildlife corridors in and around new and existing developments...and to set out mechanisms for delivery of projects to maintain and enhance the existing green network.” Policy 75: Open Space “The Council’s long term aim for open space provision is for: -the creation of sustainable networks of open space of high quality -areas of local open space that are accessible by foot and linked to the wider network -fit for purpose green spaces and sports facilities that support and enhance biodiversity; and -open spaces that improve the quality of life of residents and visitors. Existing areas of high quality, accessible and fit for purpose open space will be safeguarded from inappropriate development and enhancement will be sought where appropriate.” Public Access: Para 23.7.1: “Access to the outdoors is important to the Highlands for recreation tourism and to help everyone maintain a healthy lifestyle.”

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The College wishes to retain flexibility regarding potential future uses for the IN4 site and as such requests that retail (food and non food) use is specifically referred to in the list of uses in the LDP. We understand that the Council is seeking to promote mixed use development across the wider Longman Core area and consider it important that the opportunity exists for retail to be included as part of the mix of uses on the IN4 site.

Representation

Inverness College wishes to make representations on the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, specifically in relation to site IN4 on Longman Road. This site is currently owned and occupied by the College and will become surplus following the College’s relocation to its new facilities at Beechwood, as part of a major investment strategy in Inverness. The uses currently indicated for IN4 in the emerging Inner Moray Firth LDP are business, industrial, community and leisure. The Highland Wider LDP 2012 identifies the site as being within the “Longman Core” and makes reference to the relocation of the College to Beechwood, resulting in the potential for a wide range of different retail, commercial, business and office opportunities to be attracted to the area. It indicates that across the area the Council will support the development of office, leisure, service and retail uses and that SPG will be prepared, within which there will be an updated development brief or masterplan. The site also sits within the City Centre boundary, which allows retail uses. Several nearby sites within the “Longman Core” include reference to retail (amongst other uses) in the emerging Moray Firth LDP (e.g. IN5, IN6 and IN14). The College wishes to retain flexibility regarding potential future uses for the IN4 site and as such requests that retail (food and non food) use is specifically referred to in the list of uses for IN4 in the LDP. We understand that the Council is seeking to promote mixed use development across the wider Longman Core area and consider it important that the opportunity exists for retail to be included as part of the mix of uses on the IN4 site. We trust that these comments will be taken on board and that their substance will be given effect in the emerging Local Development Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The playing field, as it is, is the only amenity site in Conon Bridge and as such should be left for the use of children and young people and any other person who could make use of it. With regard to the carpark adjacent to the church - if that is built on where would cars park when using the church or church hall? It would mean more vehicles would park on the road thus leading to traffic hazards. Recently our station was reopened and a path made for pedestrians to access this from the carpark beside the church. What a complete waste of public funds if the carpark was built on!

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

It is unclear to me what retail units would be sited in this area given the close proximity of ASDA. There is already significant empty business space in the Inverness area including at Fairways, very close to this area, and it is difficult to understand who would benefit from such development other than the developers/builders. This land IN50 is already used by a significant number of people particularly dog walkers. The existing community land at IN60 now has a football pitch and is often not available for exercising dogs. In addition as a general rule it is not a good idea to mix football and dogs as despite many responsible dog owners, there is always dog mess on the the field and surrounding area. With the increasing number of houses in this area and the decreasing amount of open land more dog owners will need to drive to other suitable open areas to exercise their dogs thereby increasing the carbon footprint in a way that is avoidable by the retention of this land as mainly community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

A reduction in the number of homes proposed for this area.

Representation

The number of homes proposed for this area seems to be excessive given the size of the space and the need for access roads

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Changes to sites MO5 and MO6 on the grounds of road safety

Representation

I am very concerned about the two proposed developments near my house. I live at Windhill and the road is already very dangerous without the addition of at least 60 new homes. It is very hard to make a right turn onto the main road due to the speed and frequency of traffic. The schoolchildren waiting for buses to school take their life in their hands every day trying to cross the road. At this time of year it is dark when they leave and when they come home and it is very hard to judge how far away the traffic is. In the time I have lived here I have seen many accidents including two cars landing in my next door neighbours garden. The extra traffic will make living here almost impossible, I can already sit at the end of my road for several minutes before I can make a right turn and then a car will come tearing up behind me having ignored the sign for an approaching crossroads.I have great fears for the schoolchildren,who also, can wait some time before crossing the road and then take risks and run. Surely there are other sites which could be used for housing apart from this one which is so close to the already very busy main road? Where is the evidence of demand for the housing and the commercial aspects? The site at MO6 also concerns me. Again, this will increase the level of traffic in the area, including large vehicles. According to the plans, the site will also cut out a path which is very popular with walkers and cyclists and leads to one of Highland Councils core path networks route. I think that that is unacceptable. If the development must go ahead, at least leave pedestrian access to he network of existing paths.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Ref. dwellings Broomhill, Broomhill Cottage, St Kilda, Balnabruaich, Nigg. IV19 1 QU - The boundary drawn and published in the Nigg Master Plan is not clear when matched with areas on the ground. The Title to the land is held by the owners. The hamlet of 3 dwellings and private land at Balnabruaich between the protected woodland and B9175 has been reincluded as Industrial land. It had this designation removed around 10 years ago, allowing the easing of planning restrictions for the houses, some of which have been there for 200 years, and the new build of St Kilda. The present owners of Nigg Yard indicated that they had no need of this small corner, and indeed have fenced it off themselves along the boundary of St Kilda, earlier this year. Two of the owners of the private dwellings are 5th generation crofters of the original plots, and remained outwith the earlier development of Nigg by their firm refusal to sell their croft right. As this land is surplus to industrial requirements, present and future, could it please be returned to residential use to enable the owners to enjoy their Properties free of planning restrictions caused by inclusion within the Nigg Yard Boundary.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per Scottish Government "Cycling Action Plan Scotland" aims of "By 2020, 10% of all journeys taken in Scotland will be by bike." Clarification of The Plan is meeting those aims, and the Cycle strategy as a whole , not as individual parts, for the entire Moray Region.

Representation

As per Scottish Government "Cycling Action Plan Scotland" aims of "By 2020, 10% of all journeys taken in Scotland will be by bike." I am keen that the Plan should be more clear, or outline detailed designs, infrastructure and action(s), on how the Plan would achieve the Aim of the Scottish CAPS, in a wider context of the Outer / Satellite towns, Villages, Work places and Leisure Attraction having some kind of an Integrated cycle network structure - to allow for safer frequent Commuter Journeys across the Moray firth. It should be noted that Commuter journeys require significantly different requirements than National Cycle Network Leisure journeys. They need to be more direct - mirroring main road structures, so part of journeys can incorporate Rail/Bus network paths, and be available to use all year round. Keith Brown, Scotland's transport minister, recently announced that cyclist casualties are rising with "six in ten fatalities took place on rural roads" should be of keen importance when considering this Plan and the affect of it when considering Roads and their effect not only on CURRENT cycling commuters but how to provide BETTER commuting environment for these cyclists to prevent more fatalities. Currently the plan simply details cycle paths in each section with regards to the "Development Allocations" - and although these are always welcome, there needs to be some integration with each other, or some kind of Moray wide strategy, in order to prevent Cycle Lanes simple starting and finishing no where.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Delete 39 homes from the plan and leave it as Community only

Representation

No plans have been released to ascertain where the housing will be. Therefore, I am being asked to comment on the unknown which is not very helpful. So why is there so much secrecy about the exact lay-out plan for this area? Removal of existing car parking space, that is part of the planning consent for the railway halt, would make the Council look like wasters of the tax payers' money in that they build the footpath that connects them then they are taking away the parking. Entry and exit to the housing area is unknown but would be expected to come from the two current points. Neither point could take on this extra volume of traffic without increasing the danger to the public. The area is on the flood plain and has seen much surface water lying throughout the year. By building houses on this area the water will have to go somewhere; but where? Not easy to drain when it is at the River level already and building up would flood the surrounding properties. The loss of existing community/green area to housing when there are amply areas allocated for housing development around Conon that could be filled first. Increased cost to the Highland tax payer as the new community play area would have to be made as good as the existing. Or is it the Highland Council's proposal to remove the playing area and deprive the community of a traffic free and very safe play park in contravention of the Government's desire to encourage youngsters to get more exercise. The community representatives have all voiced their opposition to this plan for the area of land to the South West of the High Street so why has this plan even got to this stage? The reverse argument has been used on many occasions when there has been controversial decisions about Conon's development; so why is the Council ignoring local opinion? Do they like wasting money?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Produce a road network plan which makes sense. Reduce the number of houses proposed and increase only in line with production of jobs in Nairn. Scrap Nairn South plans. Introduce a green belt to the east of the proposed by-pass.

Representation

Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan I disagree completely with your proposals for the development of Nairn and its surrounding area and in particular Nairn South. There is no local demand for the number of houses postulated either now or in the future. Nor can I see any reason for Nairn to become a dormitory town for Inverness. Compare the number of jobs either now or in the future with the increased population proposed, they just do not make any sense. You profess to want Nairn to grow as a holiday destination I suggest covering the area with vast estates is not the way to do it. Many originally popular seaside towns have found it very hard to recapture their holiday markets. Allowing our High Street to become a boarded up row of shops is not the way to do it. It is therefore essential that any development has ready access to the town "by foot yes" but in particular by car. People do not go shopping on foot any more so parking and easy vehicle access is essential. Nairn and in particular Fishertown have developed slowly over the years and we should allow other areas to do the same not impose large modern estates designed by developers whose only raison d'être is to squeeze as many houses as they can get away with onto as large a site as they can find. If you are so sure jobs will come to the area then without doubt the houses will follow. Let us not do things in reverse. There are plenty of houses proposed closer to Inverness without spreading as far as Nairn. A large green belt to the west, perhaps spreading on the Nairn side of the proposed by pass would serve as a nice barrier. Preferably with plenty of trees to keep the noise from the by-pass to a minimum. Your Proposed Plan says you should safeguard and enhance special places. This particularly applies to Nairn the individual character is one of the main reasons that holiday makers and residents alike are attracted to the town. The "Town Centre First Principle" means you should look at sites within the town or with clear and easy access to it. This does not remotely apply to Nairn South. Neither can it be called "Sequential and Proportionate Growth" because these two terms certainly do not apply. That is presumably a planner's term for sticking up a lot more houses. With regard to the number of houses, 1500 in Nairn by 2021 is complete nonsense. Nowhere in the document can I see any justification for this horrendous increase. Sandown 350 Lochloy 200 plus or including the recent application for 400 and those already under construction or presently unsold say another 100 Delnies 300 1350 Without Nairn South that gives somewhere in the region of 4000 extra population. Please tell me where about 2000 or even 1000 jobs are going to be found in Nairn. All the above have access to the town centre via the existing road networks however in the case of Lochloy there will soon be an even greater problem at the junction of Lochloy Road and Forres Road. If the expansion is allowed to continue. The critical point is vehicle access, nowhere in the Plan have I seen a proposed road network for the town. We keep being fobbed off with promises of a future By Pass but that does not give us a sight of what a future road network would look like. The By Pass does not affect this. You can build a By Pass without changing any roads in Nairn, even those narrow country lanes to the west of Nairn South, which leaves us exactly where we are now. The latest proposed by-pass routes revealed by Transport Scotland show this is exactly what will happen. We really have to take notice of the fact that Nairn is segmented by the river and the railway and unless you provide vehicle access over or under these the houses must be severely limited. If we really must build at Nairn South, which as you will gather I do not agree with, then we must have a new Vehicle Railway Crossing to the west of the Station possibly joining with Duncan Drive and across the existing field to Bablair Road. The rail line is probably low enough at this point to allow a bridge over rather than a tunnel under it. Then there would be decent access to the town from Nairn South. A weight restriction would prevent heavy transport from using it to access the saw mill. This reduces the problem of the existing cramped bridge which cannot possibly cope with the increase of traffic the proposed expansion would evoke. Since all developers must contribute where there is a transport impact (Supplementary Guidance) the cost would be much reduced or ameliorated. This must be done before any building takes place, it is no good just promising to do it, we all know it never happens. Many people made very similar comments when other plans were put forward. In view of the recent planning refusal on Nairn South I hope the Council will take more notice this time. Let us also remember that once an area is designated for development someone will immediately want to build on it even if that is not really what the Council wants and may have a change of mind at a later date. Let us state firmly that some of this land will not be released until a later date or not at all, and mean it. I suggest the development plan and in particular that part relating to Nairn, be re-examined to give us a more acceptable future. [redacted]

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 04312 Name Arlene Moodie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph picture showing historic reference to the march to

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like to see IN49 left as green land that can continue to be enjoyed by the community and the natural wildlife.

Representation

I strongly object to the change of use on this land. It is well know that it is home to an array of wildlife : red deer, grouse newts, ducks, geese, red squirrels, heron, cuckoos, to name but a few. In fact the grouse appears to use this area as a breeding ground Where would all this wonderful wildlife go if you destroy their habitat? A recent news article in October 2013 told of an orphaned red squirrel being found in this area and it was only 5 weeks old. What would happen to all the trees and shrubbery? I spend a lot of time walking and running and cycling with my family in this part. I think it's very important that my children learn about the creatures on our doorstep and appreciate how they live in this environment. The local school has taken an interest in this too and arranged several nursery walks to help youngsters with Eco issues which go hand in hand with todays education. From spending so much time in Bogbain, I have discovered and enjoyed the many walks that are in place off track where I meet other dog walkers who have ventured on to others tracks. I have a real concern over road safety and believe that the introduction of further housing or even businesses would have a negative effect on the safety of my children. Already we have residents, visitors, delivery vans and heavy goods vehicles who blatantly ignore the 30MPH signs and feel that 40 and above is more appropriate. I have raised these concerns with the local council, the Police and Councillors but no-one is interested until someone dies. The local school cannot cope with the extra housing already being built at Parks Farm and although they are planning an extension, how many can you actually keep adding on. The school is already going downhill quickly which is hugely worrying as a mother with several children hear. People have already commented on the proposed land between the existing school and new Co-op being earmarked for a new school. How can this be at this stage already in proposals? It's as if there are dodgy dealings going on already and agreements made by people who don't even live here or know the needs of this community. Already there is nothing for kids to do and a village hall would be of far greater youth to the area and community. As you walk through Milton of Leys you can already see the start of vandalism and graffiti which is probably as a result of the youths having nothing to do or no where to hang out. I have heard from 2 different sources about the area being protected due to historical findings in relation to Flora McDonald and the Battle of Culloden. In deed there is a sign at the top of the Old Military Road to confirm that this was the route taken. I have attached a photo that my son took last year as part of his study on Bonnie Prince and the Battle of Culloden. How many areas can offer so much educational content for everyone to enjoy. It is hard to believe that in todays age the council and planners want to 'overlook' the history and environment so as to just make money and build another concrete jungle. We're trying to show the youth of today that we have to look after the planet and take more interest in Eco issues but if you go ahead with this development, what does that show. It shows that you have no regards for this planet or the future of our children and that only greed and money motivates the Council. It is time to stand up to the builders and listen to what the community. Stop trying to keep everything under the radar just so there are no objections and we don't know what is happening, our doorstep. The community is upset over how this IMFLDP has happened so quickly with few people actually being notified and why it has happened on the run up to Christmas in the hope that people are too busy to object. It stinks to high heavens and is wonder that people are talking about members of the Council being in the back pocket of developers. Total transparency is required and it needs to be remembered that they work for the public not the builders.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

There should be no development permitted which allows any direct access to the north of the site ie directly on to Lochloy Road

Representation

Ref: Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan Site NA2 - South Kingsteps . We write with reference to the above and would strongly urge that the following points be considered by the council in its proposed allocation of site NA2 for 90 homes. At the time of your previous request for people’s views on the possibility of allocating this land for development, we were concerned that there should be any further development in the area. We contacted the landowner of site NA2, who readily came and showed us her proposed plans for the site. Her plans were for access to be through the current development to the south, now designated as site NA5, and a housing density of no more than 6 to 10 houses. There would be no building north of the burn which runs through the site as it is a low lying marshy area on which it would prove difficult to build. This marsh was cited by the landowner as a problem and was part of her reason for excluding it for housing. She suggested also that it would be retained as a desirable and effective green area between the existing settlement of Kingsteps and the new Lochloy housing estate to the south. The current proposal for development of Site NA2 with 90 houses, with access on to Lochloy Road, we feel, is totally unacceptable for the following reasons:- 1. Lochloy Road is a narrow, winding country road which is in no way capable of coping with an additional load of upwards of 100 cars. It currently struggles to carry the increased traffic heading east from the ongoing Lochloy /Springfield development. Safety issues are already of paramount concern for existing home owners in Kingsteps for this reason. 2.Additional stress would be placed on the water supply and sewage facilities which are already under undue pressure in the area. 3.A housing allocation of this density is not in keeping with the existing pattern in the community. A recent planning application for ground at West Kingsteps for a density of 7 houses on 2.5 acres, as was requested by the landowner, was limited by the planning authority to only 5 houses. Recent development in the Kingsteps area has proved to be more than sufficient for the current level of services. Any further development as suggested for Site NA2 would be extremely hazardous for the local community and would not be commensurate with preserving Kingsteps’ current identity as a separate rural community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

ASDA Stores Limited made comment to the Call for Sites and MIR stages of the Inner Moray Firth LDP preparation in relation to this site. ASDA sought recognition of the planning permission in principle for retail development that was granted consent in February 2011. Planning permission for matters specified by conditions was subsequently granted and the store opened in Autumn 2012. ASDA is therefore supportive of the listing of the wider development site as TN5 in the Proposed Plan for homes, business, commercial and community as part of the expansion area at this part of Tain and recognises that the allocation has been removed from the Asda site given its development. Given the role the store plays in the community in this part of Tain, it is recommended that consideration of an allocation for a neighbourhood centre for the Tain is now appropriate. The role of the new Asda store at Tain together with the wider aspirations for community facilities, point towards this area having a role as a focus for community activity. The surrounding area is one characterised by significant additional growth through the housing and commercial proposals. The area therefore needs a hub which will serve the day to day needs of the community. The Asda store and the additional uses will provide this. Asda therefore seek an allocation as a centre as this allows the centre to have a clear position in the retail hierarchy and have a protected status within retail policy with recognition of its important contribution to the catchment population.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

As the Council will be aware, planning permission was granted in January 2011 (Reference NA/HLD/037) for the development of a Class 1 foodstore with petrol filling station and a number of ancillary retail units. The subsequent Matters Specified by Condition permission was granted in April 2011 (Reference 11/00402/MSC). The store opened in July 2012. The proposals map forming part of the Proposed Plan acknowledges the site's planning history and the opening of the store through the removal of the R3, a preferred site for retail development, allocation. ASDA supports the allocation of the site and its immediate surrounding area as an Inverness Neighbourhood Centre within the retail hierarchy. The mixed use facilities will provide a centre function for this growth area and will support the large-scale, proposed additional housing in this part of Inverness. As we have stated previously, the role of the new Asda store at Slackbuie and the additional retail units, together with the wider permissions in the area for a medical centre and other commercial uses, point towards this area having a role as a focus for community activity. The surrounding area is one characterised by significant additional growth through the housing proposals and two new schools. The area therefore needs a community hub which will serve the day to day needs of the community. The Asda store and the additional uses will provide this. Asda supports its allocation as a centre as this allows the centre to have a clear position in the retail hierarchy and have a protected status within retail policy with recognition of its important contribution to the catchment population.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Support Extension of Hinterland boundary to include Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Inverness-shire We have lived in Bunloit for over twenty one years and fully support the inclusion of the entire Bunloit area into the Hinterland for the following reasons: 1. Bunloit is an extremely rare and fragile area of outstanding natural value and has been fully included into the Great Glen Way project by Highland Council, SNH, The Forestry Commission, hiking groups and associations and other statutory and non-statutory groups and bodies. 2. The area has already suffered significant damage from uncontrolled "scatter development" wherein the record clearly shows that the planners have apparently rubber stamped anything and everything placed before them by speculative developers - without so much as a glance over the impact upon the area or the proper and thorough appraisal of the cumulative impact of uncontrolled development. In short, the sudden explosion of development over a few short years has the appearance of (at best) a careless attitude to development at Bunloit or (at worst) wilful commercial exploitation for a few developers at huge cost to the rest of the community and the natural landscape and environment. Recent Planning Applications in Bunloit have been for "top of the price range", very large family homes - not "affordable housing" for local people. All of these planning applications appear to have been nodded through by Highland Council planning officers - despite repeated, vociferous, highly detailed and considered objections from the local Community Council and neighbours (including fully qualified biologists with the necessary specialisations that make their submissions particularly worthy of proper respect and consideration), other local residents and interested third parties. All are agreed Bunloit requires Hinterland inclusion and protection. The long serving and popular local Councillor, Margaret Davidson, is repeatedly on record stating that there should be no further development at Bunloit. In an email to my son, Mr. Takala, dated 29th January 2012 Councillor Davidson wrote: "I have asked that the "hinterland" boundary is moved to include all of Bunloit. That will mean there is a presumption against housing unless it fits with the "revised housing in the countryside policy" You will recall we had the discussion about the hinterland boundary about 3 years ago". On 27th April 2012, Councillor Davidson wrote: "As I have said before getting Bunloit into the restricted Hinterland area is the best thing we can do just now". On 15th May 2012, Councillor Davidson wrote: "on the local plan I was at the Community Council on Monday and they will be supporting the whole of the Bunloit Hill being in the restricted Hinterland and I am sure the local plan officers will listen to that. If Not I will pursue it to the end, Bunloit needs some protection. On 13th September 2013, Councillor Davidson wrote as follows: "I have made representations as I believe you have, and the Community council has, to the local plan asking that the hill is all zoned as Hinterland , when the presumption will be against development The proposed final plan goes to committee next week and then out to public consultation When that happens...maybe October, watch for the advertisements or the press releases ...then ensure you and others that feel like you agree with any changed zoning for Bunloit After that...I would say next year the chances of new house building on the hill will be greatly diminished My real regret is that this has taken so long." In 2006 my son met with Councillor Davidson and (at that time) Chief Planning Officer, Mr. Jim Faulkner. He told both of us that he agreed (even back then) that "Bunloit had had more than its fair share of development already". In the short years since Mr. Faulkner made his comments the planners have seen fit to allow at almost a dozen new houses already – on top of the fourteen original homes. New planning applications seem to be submitted all the time now so Bunloit has seen the number of properties increase by over 50% in a few years (and the rate of growth is getting faster). Within a few years housing in Bunloit will have more than doubled (and the size of the houses is far larger than the original dwellings within the area). This fact would be alarming anywhere but in a delicate tiny rural area it is, quite frankly, extraordinary. The proposed Hinterland designation is absolutely vital to Bunloit to safeguard it into the future. Mr. Faulkner, was right to make his comments in 2006. The doubling of housing in Bunloit since then is nothing short of development storm. Speculative developers cannot complain that they have not already profited from concreting over Bunloit but this situation is not sustainable. To prevent complete transformation of this delicate rural settlement into an uncontrolled scatter development with all the consequential damage and harm that would be caused, Bunloit must be designated Hinterland. 3. Traffic and the single track "dead end" Bunloit Road: The mountainous public road is single track for its entire length of approximately five miles (from the village of Drumnadrochit). It climbs very steep gradients, includes many blind bends and few passing places. Traffic used to be light and sustainable on this tiny road but now includes many more residents with cars and delivery lorries, vans, school buses, agricultural vehicles (including tractors with trailers that cannot reverse). It is regularly smashed and gouged by heavy building construction traffic. Great Glen Way serves as an access for hill walkers wishing to climb the Mealfourvounie mountain at road end. Great Glen Way is a government project that has been marketed around the world and encourages thousands of hikers, cyclists, horse riders and others onto the route from Fort William to Inverness (including Bunloit Road). The road has not managed well under the existing usage. When it has been closed to vehicles like

ambulances, fire engines etc. safety is put in danger. One of many examples: A double trailer lorry carrying construction oak came off the road on the first steep incline at a blind bend and the entire road serving all the homes was completely closed to traffic for a very lengthy time causing serious road damage. Increased traffic caused by new houses, construction, existing residents and the use of the tiny Bunloit Road by the Great Glen Way has already pushed it well beyond its maximum capacity and usage limit. Many recently built properties do not have proper bell mouth openings or visibility splays (the entire Bunloit Road has a 60 mph speed limit and previous official road speed sensors showed this is often exceeded at several locations). Approximately 12,500 walkers use Bunloit Road section of the Great Glen Way each year. Add in rising numbers of hill walkers visiting the mountain and forest, horse riders (including frequent and scheduled uses by the Borlum Farm Riding School) and cyclists. Many of these users are young children – all placed in jeopardy on the tiny but fast, damaged and worn Bunloit Road. Bunloit Road is so tiny, steep and full of blind bends and summits because it was originally built to service a handful of farm & croft properties. It was never designed (nor ever can) service the enormous number of new houses that property speculators have already built and the sites they are now lining up for even greater expansion. Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland to recognise its limitations as a development zone and to protect its vulnerable and already inadequate road.

4. Water: This is a scarce resource in Bunloit. Since over-development of the area, water levels have dropped to the point where we have had to use emergency measures to obtain water to live. At our home (the highest Bunloit habitation) our water ran dry this summer (it has only ever run dry since the big new family houses have been built within Bunloit and started using deeper and deeper boreholes to extract their water – thereby lowering the water table for everyone else). Again, homes along Bunloit Road ran out of water for drinking and washing this summer for a very considerable period of time. New properties are forced to use ever deeper boreholes – Bunloit is high above sea level. As boreholes plunge deeper, so the water table drops and supplies to everyone are now already running short for increasing periods. It is not sustainable development to permit more boreholes to be drilled ever deeper. The proven lack of potable water is a very pertinent and material planning concern. Livestock grazing, crofting and farming are traditional and established in Bunloit and those are also placed in peril by burns, aquifers and watercourses running dry – such problems are now frequently witnessed in Bunloit. Because water is already running out, Bunloit cannot support more development and to protect this resource, which is an essential amenity and essential to life Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland protection.

5. Drainage: There appears to have been scant regard paid to the proper provision of drainage to the new homes and buildings already permitted. The Bunloit Road is frequently flooded due to poor run off design and the water poses a great hazard to road users, residents and ever increasing numbers of visitors to the Great Glen Way (hikers, cyclists, horse riders & cars etc.) Road, land and property has also been flooded at frequent intervals. The lack of sites for proper and effective septic tank soakaways and the over use of the existing ones places the limited water supplies at great risk of pollution from human waste and other toxins. Proper safe drainage is a finite resource and has been exhausted at Bunloit. Further drainage of human waste and other toxins within the fragile small area of Bunloit is not sustainable and therefore Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland.

6. Natural Environment, Bio Diversity and Outstanding Natural Landscape Bunloit is part of a Special Landscape Area. When we moved into Bunloit over twenty one years ago, the protected species bats and frogs were numerous within the area. Due to the uncontrolled over development that has already been permitted, the bats and frogs have been decimated. There are almost none left at Ancarraig or Balbeg, Bunloit. These species are, as mentioned, internationally protected. Bunloit must be protected as Hinterland to preserve what is left otherwise the bats and frogs will be followed into oblivion by other species including Black Grouse, Capercaillies, Slavonian Grebe, Great Crested Newts, Badgers, pine Martens, Voles, Water Voles, Amphibians and Reptiles, Golden Eagles (already all decimated), Red Kite, Buzzards. Schedule 1 (protected at all times) species also include Brambling, Crossbill, Fieldfare, Hen Harrier and Redwing and Schedule 2 (part1) that includes Snipe and Red Grouse which are known to be in the area. In addition to the above species of birds and animals are many different Protected and rare plants – including, for example, juniper cloudberry and wild orchids. The demise of the species speaks for itself. The damage already done to the environment and wildlife is a calamity and therefore Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland to prevent a completely preventable and irreversible catastrophe. Land and habitat Loss: The Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 prioritises biodiversity conservation over development. Bunloit is clearly an area for which such protection – including Hinterland protection – is intended by the Community and Legislators. Not a single Protected Species Walkover Survey or assessment has been carried out by a member of the Chartered Institute of Ecologists and Environmental Management (CIEEM). Consequently, no planning applications have been properly considered for ecological and environmental impact and this sets a poor and unsustainable example for the future. Placing Bunloit into Hinterland will provide the level of protection its delicate and diverse ecology and landscape requires. For all of the above reasons we respectfully request that the entire Bunloit hill and area - including the Drumnadrochit end (Bunloit Road junction with the A82) along to the Mealfourvounie mountain end and its vicinity, is all included and protected in the Hinterland.

Allocated to				Hinterland boundary
--------------	--	--	--	---------------------

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I am objecting to proposed erection of 75 houses at Bogbain Woods,Milton of Leys.Myself,husband and 2 kids use Bogbain woods,we go for walks with the dog,and as a family we frequently use the woods for cycle runs and also we are keen Cross Country runners and it is a beautiful spot.What impact will this have on the environment? Also when everyone is trying to promote health and fitness and getting kids out walking and doing more exercise.This should not be allowed to go ahead,surely you can't keep putting houses up here and no amenities.Its taken over 10 years to get a shop!!! This is a beautiful woods used daily by dog walkers,cyclists and runners.

Representation

As per comment changes.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Identify "future areas for growth" South and South East of A9 for development in future plan periods, in particular MIR site H6 - Land at Hartfield.

Representation

Scottish Planning Policy (para 73) states that Local Development Plans should identify a range of sites which are effective or capable of becoming effective to meet the strategic requirement up to year 10 (from date of adoption), and should also provide an indication of the possible scale and location of housing up to year 20. This is to provide landowners, developers, infrastructure and service providers with certainty as to where future development is likely to occur. Tain forms a fundamental part of the Ross-Shire growth area being one of the four principle town centres and the main town centre in close proximity to Nigg Fabrication Yard and the employment opportunities that are being promoted there. It is therefore reasonable to assume that it will remain a focal point for development in future LDP's and therefore future areas for growth should be identified in line with SPP. Whilst this site was not "preferred" in the Main Issues Report, one of the significant "pro's" was identified as being that is was "adjacent to existing active housing development". It is our view that, by virtue of the adjacent development, Tain has already expanded beyond the A9 and this no longer provides the defensible boundary to the settlement that it once did. Land to the north west of Tain is far more visually exposed, and would have a more significant landscape and visual impact, and more divorced from services and facilities than land to the south of the A9. It is also worth highlighting the presence of the new supermarket to the south of Tain which would make this area more sustainable than a northern expansion given the walking distance proximity to the supermarket. We have attached an example of how another Local Authority has taken this approach and would support the use of this in this instance.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reinstate settlement boundary for Barbaraville, and housing allocation 9(B), as shown in the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan with revised details to reflect planning application reference 08/00253/OUTSU (site plan/illustrative layout attached) awaiting determination.

Representation

Scottish Planning Policy (para 73) states that Local Development Plans should identify a range of sites which are effective, or capable of becoming effective, to meet the strategic requirement up to year 10 (from date of adoption), and should also provide an indication of the possible scale and location of housing up to year 20. This is to provide landowners, developers, infrastructure and service providers with certainty as to where future development is likely to occur. This site formed a reasonably significant element of the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan Strategy for this area, to provide a range and choice of housing locations, and types of development. It remains within the Rossshire Growth Area where the majority of development over this and future plan periods is likely to be focussed and is accessible to a range of current and future employment opportunities. An application was submitted in 2008 in an attempt to deliver this potential development. Issues were encountered which have proven difficult to resolve which prevented it from being approved. These issues are now in the process of being resolved with a target to have the application back before Committee in Spring 2014. We expect to see this planning permission granted before the close of the Examination and believe that this permission should be reflected on the proposals map, and within the Local Development Plan. This site is identified within the Housing Land Audit 2010 as being an “effective site without planning permission”, and therefore forms part of the “established land supply” that has been used in arriving at the requirement for new sites to be identified in this plan. Therefore, it would be of assistance in ensuring that this development comes forward as anticipated to have the context confirmed within the LDP. As the Planning Permission is “in principle” at this stage, we would take comfort in the fact that any matters specified in conditions applications by a subsequent developer would be assessed against the backdrop of an allocated site, rather than the countryside policies as currently identified in the Proposed Plan. The site has been promoted, as required by the Council for existing allocations to be carried forward, at each stage in the process starting with an initial submission in response to the call for sites. This response to the call for sites submission was the identification in the Main Issues Report of this site (Ref: H1) as a “preferred site” for housing development. This was subject to comments from 4 parties seeking amendments to the proposed development, but only one objection (from Network Rail). We understand that the safety issues relating to the Delny Crossing have been well documented in Rail Accident Investigation Branch reports as pre-existing, and necessary in the absence of this development. These reports have recommended the imposition of temporary speed restrictions pending the installation (by Network Rail) of a permanent solution to address existing safety concerns. We therefore believe that the request made by Network Rail in this instance is unnecessary, unreasonable, and not resolving a situation being created by this development, rather a pre-existing situation unrelated to this development. This crossing is an important feature locally and its closure would be very regrettable. Alternative improvements to the crossing could come forward as a result of this proposal which would require to be agreed with Network Rail. Constructive dialogue is being held with Network Rail to resolve its objection to the application which should enable it to be reported back to Committee for approval in the near future. Given the process to date, and responses received, we are therefore surprised to see the site not identified within the Proposed Plan as a housing site. Whilst we acknowledge the identification of Barbaraville as an “other settlement” this could prove problematic for future applications for matters specified in conditions, or if any future amendments to the proposal are required. Given the above, we respectfully ask that the Council specifically refer to the site in the Local Development Plan and identify it on the Proposals Map in order to provide the confidence for investment decisions to be made to bring forward and complete the proposed housing development at Barbaraville.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to oppose the proposal for 75 homes to be built in addition to the original allocated use which was Business(tourism).

Representation

I feel the proposed change in allocated use - to include 75 homes - will have a severely detrimental impact upon the immediate community in Milton of Leys in terms of loss of amenity space and upon the wider city community in terms of its impact in the overall growth of the city. The area is widely used by locals and the wider community as amenity space - dog walking, cycling, jogging, school trips, etc. It also represents the southern limit to the urban spread of Inverness and is a genuine wilderness area of great value to this and future generations. It enhances the quality of life for both the local and more widespread community. The protection of such areas is fundamental in Government Planning Policy (Policy Statement PPS1 (paragraphs 17 -19) -'Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside....A high level of protection should be given to the most valued ..landscapes..and natural resources'. There has been virtually no public consultation despite claims to the contrary by the Highland Council. The first thing most residents knew (apart from the dozen or so houses directly backing onto the land, who got letters) - was when the local community itself started talking about it. This represents a major deviation from the previous development plan and should involve a significant degree of local democracy. It seems little coincidence that this proposal comes shortly after Tulloch's bought the land - people might even believe there may be a connection between the two events.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Fully support need for SLA's, and Policy 2.6 the proposed adjustment of boundary to include the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA areas. Would suggest area between A939 and A940, including Cairn Duhie is part of Dava Moor and should be included in SLA boundary.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

It is Beaufort Castle Estate's submission that the map for Kiltarlity is changed to provide for: 1. an extension to the settlement boundary and allocation of this land identified as KT5 for mixed use development and shown on the accompanying Figure 1 – Site Plan. 2. within Section 4 Development Allocations Kiltarlity Local Centre for a mixed use site reference KT5 – land to the north of the village hall, comprising: •Area (hectares) 3 hectares •Uses – commercial building for local employment generation, including nursery, office and health centre •30 residential units, including affordable housing of various tenure •Requirements – in accordance with the general policies for determining planning applications as contained within the Highland wide Local Development Plan, a phased development of employment generating and residential uses. This should be led by a masterplan and development brief to be reviewed with the Council who may support this as supplementary guidance. Advanced landscaping along the site's northern boundary required. A new car park for the village hall and the construction of office uses prior to the commencement of residential development.

Representation

The identification of this proposed site KT5 reflects technical work undertaken by Beaufort Castle Estate which is aligned with the principles for directing development as contained within the Proposed Plan. This recognises that the pattern of the village is one of a compact layout and tight building form interspersed by several important green spaces. Beaufort Castle Estate support the Proposed Plan's position that expansion should consolidate the established shape of the village and the proposed site reflects this locational bias by virtue of its location and adjoining uses, as shown in Figure 1. Beaufort Castle Estate establishes have reviewed the constraints analysis undertaken by Highland Council in the preparation of the Main Issues Report on the site. This analysis considered that the site's merits were its close proximity to the village and facilities and its landscape characteristics. Potential constraints identified in the Main Issues Report were the size of the site and its associated proximity to the Historic Garden and Design Landscape of Beaufort Castle. Additional comment was made over the potential loss of the Village Hall car park in order to facilitate access. These potential constraints have been addressed through the proposed reduction in size of the site by 50%, combined with the provision of an enlarged and improved car park for the Village Hall. Furthermore, in response to the wider economic regeneration policies for hinterland settlements that underpin the vision in spatial strategy of the Proposed Plan, Beaufort Castle Estates are advancing a mixed use project for the site. As illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, a design framework is being advanced for the site, which would enable the delivery of four commercial properties next to the Village Hall to provide flexible, commercial floorspace for local businesses. Initial research has established potential occupier interest for a diverse range of job-creating uses including a local nursery, professional services and possibly a small healthcare facility. These uses would be within walking distance of the village and as shown within Figure 2 can be delivered in keeping with the landscape characteristics and identity of the village. It is proposed that development of the site would be led by the preparation of a masterplan for the site and that advanced landscaping would be undertaken along the site's northern boundary in order to protect the characteristics and setting of Beaufort Castle Historic Garden and Design Landscape. The commercial uses would be built prior to the commencement of residential development. It is considered that this proposed mixed use development complements allocations KT1 to KT4 as shown in Figure 1 and is closely aligned to the settlement strategy contained within the Proposed Plan, which focuses on the consolidation of the village to the north and south. Development of the scale proposed reflects the wider spatial strategy for the Inner Moray Firth Area and the role local centres have in meeting local housing demand through the Plan period. Furthermore, this proposal seeks to support the provision of job-creating uses within rural areas of a scale commensurate with demand. This proposed change would not impact upon the wider spatial strategy of the Plan. This proposed change accords with the identification of the Inverness to Nairn growth area, spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. This proposed change will deliver a site that can come forward within the Plan period in accordance with the Plan's provision for site capacities (para 2.12 – 2.13) and infrastructure (para 2.14 – 2.19). C Mark Richardson BSc (Hons) MRTPI Enclosures: Figure 1 - Site Plan Figure 2 – Development Zones Figure 3 – Precedent Images

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

A major and historical recreation facility is threatened vicariously by the proposed development. The golf course has become land locked by development. This would be one of, and possibly the only, site for expansion. (although I understand that MoOGC previously agreed not to oppose development on this site, but in different circumstances). There is potential conflict between uses around golf courses, e.g. Dornoch has had to alter the space of its third hole for at least the third time in response to adjacent housing development. Standard Golf Design Health and Safety parameters should be applied to constrain the sites of houses on any development approved.. Landscaping rarely solved the conflict problem in the long term (e.g. Inverness and Dornoch GCs) As any liability seems always to pass to the golf course (or individual players) no matter how long it has been in existence, there may be cost consequences for an organisation struggling to break even in the past few years (insurance and landscaping at least). Drainage is already a costly challenge to MoOGC and the topography of MO3 runs towards the golf course. Solutions (SUDS?) for surface and foul drainage avoiding further risks to MoOGC would seem likely to be costly. From my experience alone, both Woking and Little Aston GCs suffered significant unforeseen drainage problems and costs following housing development in non-adjacent sites.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Inclusion of appropriate and comprehensive policy on developer contributions. Inclusion of site specific details of infrastructure requirements. Inclusion of costed infrastructure requirements within the Action programme.

Representation

There is little supporting detail anywhere in the Plan to indicate to landowners and developers what infrastructure may be needed, and in particular what costs developments might have to bear. This is disappointing given the work previously carried out on costing infrastructure for the A96 corridor in particular. Scottish Planning Policy is clear that developers are entitled to reasonable levels of information in the development plan on what they may be expected to provide to make their developments acceptable in planning terms. Several Local Plan Inquiries have endorsed this principle. Midlothian Council, for instance, was required by the Reporter there to produce further information on infrastructure requirements prior to adoption of the Plan. East Ayrshire Council was required by the Reporters to include more detail in the Plan itself or in accompanying settlement statements. The role of Supplementary Planning Guidance was then defined as providing details of how contributions would be calculated, secured and paid. This Proposed Plan has little detail on infrastructure requirements related to land allocations. Chapter 4 in relation to housing sites contains some general guidance on what may be required, but is lacking in detail or any indication of costs. The Action Programme offers little more in the way of detail. In a number of cases, infrastructure requirements are couched in terms that do not make it clear whether or not developer contributions will be required – for instance a number of sites only suggest that contributions “may” be required. That lack of clarity and detail makes it very difficult for developers to carry out meaningful financial appraisals of sites and developments, and gives landowners and their agents little information on which to negotiate contracts and Missives. Until such contracts can be agreed between landowners and developers then implementation of the Plan’s proposals will not proceed. It is essential that a development plan has a clear policy on developer contributions which reflects the principles of Circular 3/2012, and which ensures that the Plan and its supporting documents give appropriate guidance at the appropriate places in the documentation. The policy wording applied by Reporters to the East Ayrshire Local Plan is a model of policy wording for this topic, and was drafted to ensure that policy was in conformity with Circular 1/2010 (as it was at that time). It sought to be clear about where and when the policy would apply, what is expected of applicants, how contributions will be secured and paid, and reasons for exceptions to the policy. It would be helpful for Highland Council to have such a policy framework. An appropriate policy would be: “Where a development, either on its own or in association with other developments, will place additional demands on community facilities or infrastructure that would necessitate new facilities or exacerbate deficiencies in existing provision, the Council will require the developer to meet or contribute to the cost of providing or improving such infrastructure or facilities. Contributions will relate to the development concerned, including in nature, scale and kind. Contributions sought under this policy will be waived or reduced only in exceptional circumstances – for example, where a developer demonstrates that there are exceptional costs or where viability is threatened, where a development would bring particular economic, social or environmental benefits or where it constitutes enabling development. In addition, developers will require to meet the costs of providing the site servicing infrastructure necessary for their development.” Thereafter, Chapter 4 needs to have more site-specific detail on the infrastructure needed to make the site acceptable in planning terms. The Action Programme then needs to have costed infrastructure requirements, even if the costs are best estimates at this stage, and clarity over when and why developers will be expected to contribute.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Inclusion of appropriate and comprehensive policy on developer contributions. Inclusion of site specific details of infrastructure requirements. Inclusion of costed infrastructure requirements within the Action programme.

Representation

There is little supporting detail anywhere in the Plan to indicate to landowners and developers what infrastructure may be needed, and in particular what costs developments might have to bear. This is disappointing given the work previously carried out on costing infrastructure for the A96 corridor in particular. Scottish Planning Policy is clear that developers are entitled to reasonable levels of information in the development plan on what they may be expected to provide to make their developments acceptable in planning terms. Several Local Plan Inquiries have endorsed this principle. Midlothian Council, for instance, was required by the Reporter there to produce further information on infrastructure requirements prior to adoption of the Plan. East Ayrshire Council was required by the Reporters to include more detail in the Plan itself or in accompanying settlement statements. The role of Supplementary Planning Guidance was then defined as providing details of how contributions would be calculated, secured and paid. This Proposed Plan has little detail on infrastructure requirements related to land allocations. Chapter 4 in relation to housing sites contains some general guidance on what may be required, but is lacking in detail or any indication of costs. The Action Programme offers little more in the way of detail. In a number of cases, infrastructure requirements are couched in terms that do not make it clear whether or not developer contributions will be required – for instance a number of sites only suggest that contributions “may” be required. That lack of clarity and detail makes it very difficult for developers to carry out meaningful financial appraisals of sites and developments, and gives landowners and their agents little information on which to negotiate contracts and Missives. Until such contracts can be agreed between landowners and developers then implementation of the Plan’s proposals will not proceed. It is essential that a development plan has a clear policy on developer contributions which reflects the principles of Circular 3/2012, and which ensures that the Plan and its supporting documents give appropriate guidance at the appropriate places in the documentation. The policy wording applied by Reporters to the East Ayrshire Local Plan is a model of policy wording for this topic, and was drafted to ensure that policy was in conformity with Circular 1/2010 (as it was at that time). It sought to be clear about where and when the policy would apply, what is expected of applicants, how contributions will be secured and paid, and reasons for exceptions to the policy. It would be helpful for Highland Council to have such a policy framework. An appropriate policy would be: “Where a development, either on its own or in association with other developments, will place additional demands on community facilities or infrastructure that would necessitate new facilities or exacerbate deficiencies in existing provision, the Council will require the developer to meet or contribute to the cost of providing or improving such infrastructure or facilities. Contributions will relate to the development concerned, including in nature, scale and kind. Contributions sought under this policy will be waived or reduced only in exceptional circumstances – for example, where a developer demonstrates that there are exceptional costs or where viability is threatened, where a development would bring particular economic, social or environmental benefits or where it constitutes enabling development. In addition, developers will require to meet the costs of providing the site servicing infrastructure necessary for their development.” Thereafter, Chapter 4 needs to have more site-specific detail on the infrastructure needed to make the site acceptable in planning terms. The Action Programme then needs to have costed infrastructure requirements, even if the costs are best estimates at this stage, and clarity over when and why developers will be expected to contribute.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

This objection is to the omission of a land allocation south-west of Maryburgh for mixed use development including approximately 270 houses. It concerns the effectiveness of the allocation MB1 as presented in the PLDP, and presents an alternative that will also facilitate delivery of MB1. (1) Add "Mixed Use; as MB3 (ie. MU3 in MIR) Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; subject to access (to the A835) to be agreed with Transport Scotland and a developer masterplan". (2) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6. (3) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (ie. MU3 as proposed at (1) above) to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for "early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity of infrastructure and services".

Representation

Grounds of Objection 1.This objection concerns the omission from the PLDP of the some 24 ha. of land at Brahan Estate, adjoining Maryburgh to the south and west. It should be read in conjunction with the representations lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate to the MIR (MU2/MU3) and with the planning authority's response; and with a representation in relation to MB2 lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate. It is not an objection to any of the Brahan Estate lands allocated at MB1 or MB2 which are available and should remain identified for development. 2.The grounds of objection are that the PLDP presents an ineffective framework for expansion of Maryburgh; and that its contribution to a Growth Area economic development strategy, as a sustainable community is suppressed as result. Specifically: •that land at MB1 was found by evidence not to be able to be assembled and delivered in the terms the PLDP proposes; •that land owned by Brahan Estate (24 ha.) which the Council acknowledges as suitable for development and the appropriate direction in which Maryburgh should grow, provides an alternative that would not be dependent on land assembly and would also facilitate development of MB1 and MB2; •that Scottish Planning Policy 2010 does enable access from the A835 to serve expansion of Maryburgh if it is found to be feasible; and that it can only be properly investigated and expansion objectives for Maryburgh delivered, if the 24 ha. of land above is allocated in the development plan, albeit with that caveat. Following from this objection the IMFLDP should allocate 24 ha. of land at Brahan Estate for mixed use (primarily housing); there should be a revised framework for phasing development; and adjustments to the Ross-shire Growth Area (Vision and Strategy) reflecting the PLDP acknowledgement that Maryburgh is identified as part of the Growth Area and offers significant potential for housing growth, consistent with Map 6. The Proposal 3.The Brahan Estate land adjoins Maryburgh to the south/west. It straddles Dunglass Road and connects with the Brahan Estate interests at MB2 and (part) MB1. The Council agrees (para. 4.156) that this is the future direction for growth, "if suitable access can be gained". On that basis and given the factors affecting MB1 - set out in the response to the MIR and as follows - the planning authority is obliged to facilitate investigation of "suitable access". 4.The land requires a new access to the A835(T). Scottish Planning Policy 2010 states "the case for such junctions will be considered where significant economic growth or regeneration benefits can be demonstrated". 5.Maryburgh is located in the strategic Ross-shire East Growth Area as identified in the PLDP (Map 6) and it is linked to the national road network, the primary transport artery within the Growth Area. The Growth Area includes the major Oil& Gas/Renewables site at Nigg recognised in the National Planning Framework as a strategic contributor to the national economy and prosperity. 6.This economic development strategy is founded on "land for 5,750 homes and 900 ha. of employment land focussed on existing settlements and employment areas". Maryburgh is an existing settlement; it lies within 3km of a "key service centre" (Dingwall) (PLDP para. 3.12), and between two "strategic allocations" for economic development (Dingwall and Muir of Ord) (para. 3.11). The role of Maryburgh in supporting that strategy and economic development objectives derives from its position within the Growth Area and is evident by the PLDP recognition that "significant potential exists for housing growth" (para. 4.152). 7.In terms of supporting economic growth - and the national economy - that is as strong a case as there could be for access to A835(T). When that access would deliver an effective and available land supply within the Growth Area that case is strengthened. 8.This gives further emphasis to the obligation on the planning authority to facilitate proper investigation of an access to the A835(T). That can be accomplished by the allocation of the Brahan Estate lands (24 ha.) for development, with appropriate caveat, subject to agreement on all relevant matters including access to the A835. An allocation of land in the development plan would give the necessary security to commit resources to a Transport Assessment ie. the evidence base for consideration by Transport Scotland. Should this be preceded by a Transport Scotland appraisal, then the development plan is the basis on which that should be initiated. Unless the land is allocated and - provided an access is proven to be acceptable - its potential for

development recognised, then that investigation would not reasonably proceed. 9.Scottish Planning Policy 2010 - in the interests of sustainable development - states (para. 77) "Planning authorities should set out a settlement strategy in the development plan to provide a long term context for development. Key considerations in a settlement strategy are:...

- the efficient use of existing...land and infrastructure,
- accessibility of homes...by a range of transport options,
- co-ordination of housing land release with investment in infrastructure including transport...;
- the deliverability of the strategy...and that (para. 166) "The relationship between transport and land use has a strong influence on sustainable economic growth, and this should be taken into account when preparing development plans and in development management decisions".

The planning authority should be pro-active and seek to facilitate development particularly in a Growth Area. Not to do so in these circumstances, especially when it agrees that growth should take place to the south-west of Maryburgh, is to frustrate development. 10.The land MB1 has already been the subject of a collaborative initiative - during 2007-11 - by the landowners in consortium to make that land effective through the masterplan approach as prescribed in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (the existing development plan) adopted 2006. The purpose was a comprehensive approach, land assembly, shared infrastructure and incremental development. 11.That initiative included the purchase of property and land to form a distributor access; obtaining a planning permission to form the access; an approved loan of £0.626m by the Highland Council to fund land assembly and feasibility/masterplanning; and a Proposed Minute of Agreement by the Highland Housing Alliance to underwrite purchase of the land (MB1) by that agency as a basis for marketing and infrastructure provision. Despite those initiatives, the land MB1 could not be assembled and it failed to deliver the expansion of Maryburgh as proposed in the development plan. 12.The PLDP makes provision for that same allocation (albeit slightly reduced to the west), same masterplan approach and the same phasing principles (from the east) with no changes to the purpose of the Ross & Cromarty East Local Development Plan. That it has been tried and failed already - and recently at that - does not make the land unsuitable for expansion per se, but it cannot be guaranteed as effective and deliverable; and for that it should be an option only. Despite the agency intervention and approved public funding, it was not possible to assemble MB1. What is required is a "generous supply of appropriate and effective sites being made available" and that "wider economic objectives are taken into account" as Scottish Planning Policy 2010 (para. 70) states, and a strategy that offers a new dimension, not dependent on land assembly and which can be delivered to the market. 13.Further to the Council's acknowledgement of its suitability, the Brahan Estate land - which is in one ownership and not dependent on any third party - would facilitate that; and accommodate a wider range of uses and activities than the PLDP proposes ie. including, business, community and structural open space, much more in keeping with the expectations of a sustainable community. 14.The new dimension the Brahan Estate land would bring would also facilitate the land the PLDP allocates ie. the delivery of MB1 and MB2 by introducing flexibility in phasing, enabling development to proceed from the west and the east. That is bound to improve the prospects of developing MB1 and represents a positive response to the constraints affecting MB1; and a fundamental enhancement of the strategy the planning authority promotes. 15.That is material also because the access and phasing plan the PLDP promotes for MB1 is understood to present a threshold at 70 houses that requires Transport Assessment in light of the implications for the A835 roundabout/Proby Street. Were a Transport Assessment to reveal a constraint and the capacity of 200 houses curtailed, that outcome would have implications for both MB1 and MB2. 16.The Brahan Estate land would facilitate wider transport and circulation advantages to Maryburgh and betterment to the A835. These include relieving the A835 roundabout/Proby Street; and the potential to rationalise existing Estate junctions with the A835 further west which facilitate access to public events, a significant outdoor recreation resource, visitor facilities, a caravan site, farm and industrial premises. 17.Given the potential it brings to resolving a confirmed "brake" on the availability MB1 and MB2, and the Council's agreement to development in principle, there is no justification for omitting a substantial land holding adjoining an existing settlement, accessible to the sub-regional transport network, and which serves a "Growth Area" founded on economic development and major employment. 18.It is even less justifiable when the MIR identified the Brahan Estate land as preferred, the community raises no substantive opposition and the Council itself endorses the Brahan Estate lands as the favoured direction for expansion of Maryburgh. The planning authority states (Schedule 4) "The delivery of this site (MB1) is key to the future expansion of Maryburgh". What is "key to the future expansion of Maryburgh" is the allocation of land that can deliver expansion. Masterplan/Development Brief 19.MB1 and MB2 appear to be subject to "a masterplan/development brief to be adopted as supplementary guidance". This should not be exclusive to the Council, but available to be prepared by landowner/developers. It should be termed a "framework for development" whose purpose should be an overview, ensuring a framework that protects the developability of all of the landholdings (MB1, MB2 and (as proposed) MB3 ie. the additional 24 ha.) involved. 20.Anything more elaborate (a masterplan as defined in PAN 83) is premature to a binding commitment of the landowners, if it is to resource and address transport impacts, delivery of a distributor, servicing (including foul drainage) and utilities, flood risk, surface water drainage and landscaping which policy prescribes. The Council has previously acknowledged these to involve considerable cost by dint of its previously approved funding commitment. That binding commitment was not able to be achieved. Conclusion 21.In relation to the Brahan Estate interest, the IMFLDP should allocate 8.2 ha. of land for housing MB2 with the scale of early development determined by spare capacity in infrastructure; a further 24 ha. for expansion subject to a suitable access to the A835; and in seeking to assimilation these lands with MB1 (including the Brahan Estate land as allocated) it should seek a "framework for development" and acknowledge that that could be prepared by landowner/developers. Recommendation (1) Add "Mixed Use; MB3 Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; Requirements: subject to access (to the A835), a developer masterplan to include a landscape framework; access to be determined by Transport Assessment and in agreement with Transport Scotland". Appropriate references (as the Council proposes at MB1) to core paths links, international conservation designations, flood risk and archaeology are not opposed. (2) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, including Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6: Ross-shire Growth Area. (3) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (as proposed at (1)

above); to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for “early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity in infrastructure and services”. Documents Proposals Map: Proposed Adjustment Report by Director of Housing and Property and Minute

Allocated to Maryburgh General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

(1) MB2 should be Maryburgh Expansion Site (“West”). (2) MB2 “Housing Capacity” should be “approximately 95”. - and as referred in relation to the proposed allocation of a further 24 ha. of land at Brahan Estate; (1) Add “Mixed Use; as MB3 (ie. MU3 in MIR) Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; subject to access (to the A835) to be agreed with Transport Scotland and a developer masterplan”. (2) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6. (3) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (ie. MU3 as proposed at (1) above) to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for “early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity of infrastructure and services”.

Representation

Grounds of Objection 1. This objection concerns the provisions made in the PLDP that affect the delivery of land at MB2; and that those “requirements” applied to MB1 are superimposed and are not clear. This representation should be read in conjunction with the representations lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate to the MIR (MU2/MU3) and with the planning authority’s response; and with a representation in relation to MB1 lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate. 2. The grounds of objection are that the PLDP presents an ineffective framework for expansion of Maryburgh; and that its contribution to a Growth Area economic development strategy and its development as a sustainable community is suppressed as result. Specifically that: • the allocation MB2 may be substantially dependent on an access distributor phased from the east; that is dependent in turn on land assembly that has not been achieved despite a recent initiative and the availability of public and agency funding to facilitate it; and thus the alternative strategy brought forward on behalf of Brahan Estate would help deliver of MB2; • that the potential for “early development on land MB2 (off Birch Drive) should be consistent with the capacity in infrastructure and services”; and; • that a framework to co-ordinate development of MB2 with adjacent allocations is required and that should be for preparation by developer/landowner interests, not exclusively by the Council. 3. The alternative strategy referred to above is proposed by Brahan Estate and set out in the corresponding representations to MB1. It would facilitate access to MB2 and MB1 from the west; and thus the phasing of development from two directions enabling access in the first instance to two of the three landholdings that comprise MB1, and ultimately enabling access to the third from the east and the west. That is a substantive improvement on the circumstances the PLDP promotes and would deliver all of MB2 without the need for an 800m distributor road. 4. The land MB2 and the westernmost 1.0 ha. of MB1 is owned by Brahan Estate. The Estate wishes that the allocation of its interests is confirmed within the development plan. 5. The policy must recognise in principle that development of MB2 (in part) should proceed in accordance with available capacity in infrastructure and services; and it is that which should determine the scale of development and the extent to which it might be “limited”. 6. The provisions for MB2 are not interchangeable with MB1. It is assumed that 200 houses is not allocated at MB2. The expectation that 17 ha. of land would accommodate 200 houses on MB1 would give a density factor of 11 homes per ha.; applying that pro-rata to MB2 would give a capacity for MB2 of some 95 houses. Whatever is meant under MB1 by “limited housing development”, a brake on development that frustrates a greater proportion of that capacity would represent a considerable loss of housing to Maryburgh. 7. That is underscored by the terms in which MB2 (as expressed in the PLDP) would develop. In that regard, MB2 as configured in policy, would be substantially dependent on phasing MB1 from the east and the provision in that context of a distributor road of some 800m in length. MB1 cannot be opened up at all from the east without the first 100m of a new distributor road. By comparison, the distance between MB2 and the A835 would be less than half of that distance. 8. The inability of an agency initiative with public funding less than four years ago to assemble the land in three ownerships and thus enable development of MB1, has serious implications for delivering the substantive part of MB1 and MB2; and a clear risk that expansion of Maryburgh and the objectives of the development plan will be stymied. 9. The Council is obliged to act in a proactive way to resolve those circumstances. That is the purpose of the development plan. It can do so compliant with Scottish Planning Policy 2010, by allocating a further 24 ha. of land within the Brahan Estate ownership, enabling proper and full investigation of access to the A835 such that an effective land bank - including the land which it wishes to promote and which would otherwise be constrained - is able to be made fully effective. That scenario would not involve land assembly nor would it involve 800m of distributor access required to open up the substantive parts of the Brahan Estate allocation in MB1 or MB2. 10. These matters and the relevant policy implications are set out in the corresponding representation to MB1 lodged on behalf of Brahan Estate. As they have implications for MB2, they are referred to below also as

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments.

recommendations in relation to MB2. Recommendation (1) MB2 is mistakenly referred as Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) whereas it should be Maryburgh Expansion Site (West). (2) The PDL is not clear as to the capacity of MB2. Applying a pro-rata calculation based on MB1 (200 homes) would give approximately 95 homes. That capacity should be applied specifically to MB2. - and as referred in relation to the proposed allocation of a further 24 ha. of land at Brahan Estate; (3) Add "Mixed Use; MB3 Maryburgh Expansion Site (South) Area: 24 ha. Uses: approximately 270 homes, business, community facilities and open space; Requirements: subject to access (to the A835), a developer masterplan to include a landscape framework; access to be determined by Transport Assessment and in agreement with Transport Scotland". Appropriate references (as the Council proposes at MB1) to core paths links, international conservation designations, flood risk and archaeology are not opposed. (4) Add reference to the supporting role of Maryburgh (and other similar centres ie, including Conon Bridge) to para. 3.10 (Vision) and 3.12 (Strategy) consistent with Map 6: Ross-shire Growth Area. (5) Adjust MB1 to reflect the requirement for a framework to co-ordinate development and phasing of MB1, MB2 and MB3 (as proposed at (1) above); to include phasing from the east and/or west; and a reference to the potential for "early development on land at the interface of MB1 and MB2 (off Birch Drive) consistent with the capacity in infrastructure and services". Documents Main Issues Report Representation on behalf of Brahan Estate

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

There should be no development of this Area NA8 /NA9 in Nairn. This has already been rejected .

Representation

The road junction at the Railway bridge is already unsafe. The pavement is also too narrow . The general area has many large trees which support a Red Squirrel community <http://www.snh.gov.uk/about-scotlands-nature/wildlife-and-you/red-squirrel/squirrels-and-the-law/>.... Nairn in itself has insufficient sevice , poor school quality and council services are already stretched.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Deletion of site

Representation

We would like to object to the outline planning submitted for 51 houses at Ardnagrask in Muir of Ord and have several objections. 1. Existing residents moved here because of the semi-rural nature of the area. The neighbourhood would be completely transformed into an inner-city housing scheme. 2. The plan is out of scale with the existing neighbourhood due to high density. 3. Visually the scheme will create a nightmarish carbuncle on the landscape. 4. Corrie Road is an unclassified and unsuitable road to take any more traffic. This has been highlighted by the additional traffic generated by the Beaully Denny Electricity Line Construction. 5. The additional traffic from 51 houses would cause unacceptable visual disturbance due to car lights at night. 6. Road users, especially pedestrian's safety would be compromised by the increased traffic. 7. Noise from traffic as well as people living in such close proximity would seriously affect the existing residents. 8. The field is very wet and some of the surrounding areas are prone to flooding. To sum up the development would destroy the appeal of the village, would create lots of issues as shown above and importantly not bring any benefits to the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of the proposed Development of East Showfield as an area for building 30 houses. No houses to be built in this area for reasons stated in Section 5

Representation

Objection to Proposed Development of East Showfield, Nairn, for the building of 30 houses. Reason 1. Loss of amenity. I lived and grew up in a house in Lodgehill Road directly opposite the Farmer's Showfield in the 1950's and 1960's. I still visit Nairn regularly and stay in this house. While I was growing up, the field was used as a play area for many schoolchildren living in the nearby vicinity, along with the secondary use by pupils of Nairn Academy, for football , hockey and the annual school sports day,when the Academy was located in the town centre. The reduction of a green field site and exercise area will be detrimental to both children and adults, with no alternative large green space in the immediate area. The remaining proposed football area is insufficient and, from personal experience, the pitch is not level ! Reason 2 Traffic Congestion Even in the 1950's and 1960's there were regular mentions of proposed major by-passes for the the A 96 but nothing ever materialised, other than improvements to King Street and, eventually the Auldearn by-pass. In June 2005 there was an A96 Corridor Master Plan which has now been replaced by the Highland Council's new plan, so it is natural to be sceptical about any proposal for a by-pass to reduce traffic congestion when it never materialises. The 30 houses proposed will result in greatly increased traffic for Lodgehil Road. This is one of the main access routes for schoolchildren travelling to and from Nairn Academy and will thus increase the risks of accidents to them. Reason 3 . Development blocked in perpetuity. My grandfather , Donald Munro, farmer, Winewell, was a contributor towards the purchase of the field and I believe told my mother that the terms of purchase were that no development of the field was allowed in perpetuity. On this basis it would appear to be illegal to develop this site. .

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Deletion of Site CB3

Representation

It troubles me that our community playing field, here in Conon Bridge is being considered for housing development. Surely we have a duty to keep this village area as it is so the youngsters, at least, have some where to meet and play games, as and when they want to? In a safe environment in the centre of the village. If this development goes ahead, it could send a message to the younger generation that we dont care about their needs in the village! To my mind the playing field, should be just that, for the villages life time.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Leaving IN32 Knockangael farm as argricultural land Leaving IN31 Ness Castle as it is

Representation

Knocknagael farm provides an important green corridor from Lochardil woods for many varieties of wildlife, any development work would spoil this regardless if provisions are made to keep a small corridor. Furthermore both Lochardil Primary and Holm Primary are full to bursting. The Lochardil Primary afterschool club had to relocate to Holm due to lack of space and may happen again next term. There is no way there are enough educational spaces for 87 more houses. In addition to this there is no way the proposed update Inverness Royal Academy could support an additional 987 families at Ness Castle IN31

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The plan's main justification is based around a significant increase in job opportunities, and consequently a significant population expansion as these jobs are filled. This section (or a supporting appendix) should expand on the important assertion in 4.18 . Particularly some specific examples in relation to: (a) what these jobs might be, how many and by when: and (b) the THC's applied weighting and/or anticipated probability of success in landing them The number of new homes currently proposed for the area will change its character forever and there will be no reversion of the land to "green field" status if the new jobs are not delivered. Not everyone has the same clarity of vision on the anticipated new jobs as the council and their advisors; and further work here may help enhance both that conversation and public engagement with the plan

Representation

The overall UK economy is still in recovery and the Scottish Govts. planned referendum is not till Sept 2104. Given that back drop, it seems very unlikely to me that any major employer (of any nationality) will make a formal commitment to move (or expand) into the Inverness area until this uncertainty is resolved. The North Sea is now mature and declining. Yes some modules may yet come out of Nigg and that's valuable work: but no one cuts major steel in this part of the world any more Flybe are pulling out of Inverness and today's (26 Nov) Inverness Courier has about 15 job ads of which 50% might just about earn enough to qualify for a mortgage. (and we know that call centre rates of pay alone won't do it either). Lets have some realism in the debate about jobs and perhaps some direct THC action to attract big employers before we hand over any more our assets to developers. Increasing service sector jobs alone will not cut-it: and construction jobs are transient with respect to long term community wealth. Given the points listed here, a request for further work to justify the assertion in section 4.18 does not seem unreasonable to me

Allocated to

Customer Number 04216 Name Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West, River and Suburban Community Councils - joi

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.36 and 4.37

Reference Nairn (general) Type Change

Comment Changes

Para 4.36 – insert after “major development sites”“but is constrained by transport and infrastructure capacity problems.” para 4.37: amend existing text to read: “The delivery of the A96(T) bypass is essential to resolve many of the existing capacity issues of the road network in and through Nairn. Approval will not be given to proceed with the development opportunities identified in the Plan until a bypass route is confirmed and a completion date determined. Delivery of improvements to the A96 and other routes in and through Nairn will require developer-contributions. All development sites will need to provide evidence that transport issues are being fully addressed - to resolve any existing constraints, to accommodate increased traffic levels, and to facilitate modal shift by providing integrated and networked alternative travel options such as cycle paths and walkways. In particular, development at Nairn South and on the eastern and western margins of the town will be dependent on, and should incorporate, appropriate access links to the realigned A96.”

Representation

see attached note of joint CC comments, specifically the introduction and section 1, headed THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BYPASS There have long been difficulties of congestion and access because the A96(T) runs through the town. The problems have become worse with the expansion of development in recent years. The existing road capacity is not adequate at present – there are particular challenges at pinch-points and certain junctions. Infrastructure improvement has not kept pace with the growth of the town and the traffic. Provision for alternative modes of travel – notably cycling and walking – are inadequate and patchy. The Plan should require delivery of footpath and cycle networks. Significant further expansion of Nairn depends on the delivery of a bypass (re-routing the A96) and long-term solutions to other access bottlenecks (eg the Cawdor Road railway underpass and the Lochloy junction). The recent incorporation of the Nairn bypass plans into a larger Inverness-Aberdeen dualling project has set aside the existing plans for a bypass, and put forward a new range of route options for consideration. There is now no agreed route and no definite timeframe for delivery of the bypass. Because the existing infrastructure is already a constraint, and because the choice of bypass route will affect the future shape of Nairn’s expansion, planning approval should not be granted for any major development sites in the town until a bypass route is agreed and a timetable for delivery is confirmed.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 04216 Name Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West, River and Suburban Community Councils - joi

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.33, 4.34, 4.35 and Site NA7

Reference Nairn Town Centre regeneration, and Site NA7

Type Change

Comment Changes

para 4.33 – insert additional final sentences, with text as indicated in the document attached. para 4.34 - add extra sentences after existing text, as provided in the attached document. para 4.35 - insert an additional phrase at end of second sentence: “ in consultation with the local community and relevant public agencies.” page 66, table-entry for Site NA7 – completely rewrite the Requirements to read as in the text recommended in the attached document.

Representation

See document attached to Comment 1, in particular the section 2, which includes proposed wording for the requested amendments and is headed THE REGENERATION OF THE TOWN CENTRE (Site NA7) AND FISHERTOWN (para 4.35) In line with current Scottish Government policy and the “Town Centres First” principles (para 2.8), action to revive and regenerate the town centre of Nairn is a higher priority than further expansion of the residential capacity of the town. A systematic and integrated regeneration plan – rather than piecemeal development of individual town-centre sites – is required. The existing “development brief” requires redrafting: at present it covers only the Council-owned land and does not take the holistic approach which a redevelopment masterplan requires. The key importance of tourism and recreation (mentioned in para 4.20 but essentially only in relation to golf) should be properly identified as a material consideration in current development planning – for both Nairn town and harbour area – and not just as a feature of Nairn’s Victorian past (para 4.33). Planning for Fishertown is subject to Conservation guidelines. Action to maintain, upgrade and enhance the harbour should take account of tourism-policy objectives and the importance of recreational and leisure activities to the local economy. There is an argument for requiring developers of sites elsewhere in and around Nairn to contribute (via section 75 agreements) to measures to improve the town centre – as was done with the Sainsburys’ development.

Allocated to Nairn

General

General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Page 66, table entry for NA4 Requirements: insert “revised and updated” before “Sandown Development Brief”. In second sentence, delete “Developer” and insert “CG Trustees, in consultation with developers and local community” after “detailed masterplan”. After “Supplementary Guidance” insert “The site should be offered for development in subdivided lots over a period of time to ensure diversity of design and function. After “Flood Risk Assessment” insert “preservation of wetlands habitat and associated amenities.”. Add at the end, “avoidance of adverse impact on landscape and views especially in relation to the Moray Firth coast.”

Representation

See attached note of jointly agreed comments for explanation and confirmation of requested amendments, in particular Section 5, headed, SANDOWN COMMON GOOD LANDS (NA4) The Development Brief requires revision and updating – not least to reflect more clearly, and to avoid any prejudice to, the opportunity for a possible excambion with the existing Showfield (NA1). There should be sufficient flexibility to allow for a reconfiguration of the allocations of land within the site for different purposes. The site is very large. It should be subdivided and offered for development in smaller parcels phased over a period of time, to afford local developers and even individuals the opportunity to build and also to ensure diversity of design, architecture and functions across the site. As this is Common Good land, the masterplan should be led by the Trustees (not a developer) and subject to consultation with the community. Given the importance of the watercourse and wetlands, and the general requirement to have regard for the impact of development on landscape and natural environment, these factors should be explicitly mentioned in the Requirements.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Page 64, table entry for Site NA1 - (PREFERABLY) remove entirely from IMFLDP, OR ALTERNATIVELY, rewrite entirely to read: "The preferred strategy subject to the willingness of all parties concerned, is an excambion of the land at this site for Common Good land of equivalent value at Sandown sufficient for a new show venue, with the present Showfield site then becoming a Common Good asset (with the objective of its retention as green space for the benefit of the community). Should such an agreement not prove possible, the alternative would be development of part of the site, tied to the retention of the remainder of the traditional Showfield as open space. Alignment of housing or other development needs careful consideration to ensure no adverse impact on existing nearby streets, and any development is subject to provision of adequate access, footpath improvements, assessment of the cumulative impact on the road network and no adverse impact on the IMFSPA/Ramsar."

Representation

For explanation and confirmation of requested amendments, see attached composite note of comments, in particular the section headed, THE FARMERS' SHOWFIELD (NA1) This long-established open site is highly valued by the community as a recreational amenity. There is a strong belief that – given the scale and volume of housing already approved and allocated around Nairn – the allocation of half of the field to provide only an additional 30 houses is a disproportionate loss of green space for a minimal gain in housing stock. The predicament of the Farming Society is however recognised. The site is their principal asset but is no longer viable as the show venue. They need either to realise the value of that site or – if possible – to find some other way of acquiring an alternative showfield in return for the present one. The option of a negotiated exchange (excambion) of the existing Showfield for a suitable part of the Sandown Common Good land (as mentioned in the Site NA1 table) would be a no-cost win-win for all parties. Making the Showfield over to the Common Good would enable it to remain a community open-space amenity and asset benefiting the people of the town, while the provision in return of an area of the Sandown Land of equivalent value and appropriate size to the Farmers' Society would deliver a new show venue and asset to the Society. This would also offer scope for a football pitch and other facilities there and would be compatible with the continuing use of the Common Good Sandown Land as a community asset. It is therefore proposed that the current zoning of the Showfield for development should be removed from the plan, on the basis that the preferable alternative is a excambion arrangement, negotiated between the Farmers Society and the Common Good trustees, for part of the Sandown land. This should be identified and pursued as the preferred option in the Local Plan. Only if such an option proves unattainable should part of the Showfield site be allocated for development. Any such development, if contemplated, should be located so as to ensure no adverse impact on Lodgehill/Waverley Roads – which points to alignment along the southern boundary facing Fraser Park.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04216 Name Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West, River and Suburban Community Councils - joi

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Nairn (paras 4.32-41 et seq, pp 63-67

Reference Site NA5 Lochloy and NA11 Balmakeith Type Change

Comment Changes

page 66, table entry for NA5 Requirements – after “wider area”, insert “including provision of a suitable crossing (bridge/tunnel?) of the railway line to give access to Balmakeith and beyond.” Page 67 table entry for Balmakeith (NA11) – amend Requirement to read “In collaboration with Lochloy housing developers, pedestrian/cycle/vehicular access between Lochloy and A96/bypass to be included in planning”.

Representation

See attached composite note of agreed CC comments, for explanation and confirmation of requested amendments, in particular Section 6, headed LOCHLOY (NA5) The final stage of this extensive development should reflect the need to deliver the essential infrastructure requirements that were placed as conditions on the earlier phases and have not yet been put in place. Principal among these, and to ensure clarity over the wider-area linkages required, access across the railway (at least for pedestrians and cyclists and preferably for vehicles) to Balmakeith and thence to the existing A96 should be identified explicitly. Delivery of this should be not only a precondition for South Kingsteps (NA2 - see above) but a requirement on the Lochloy developers (past and present). It is wrong to transfer the obligation to future developers of the Balmakeith industrial park (NA11).

Allocated to Nairn NA5 Lochloy

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

A complete rewriting of the entire plan in line with the principles set out in the Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill, to deliver a development plan which reflects the views and aspirations of local communities rather than setting out (as the present proposed IMFLDP does) a Council-imposed, developer-led checklist of mostly large-scale construction schemes on predominantly agricultural land.

Representation

The attached note sets out in its opening section (titled "Introduction") a brief summary of the fundamental misgivings shared by all Nairnshire CCs about the current approach to planning exemplified by the HwLDP and IMFLDP. We believe that local priorities have been ignored. We think that the specific needs and purposes of development in the various IMF communities have been subordinated to a strategy based on the continuing expansion of Inverness. We judge that the plans are driven by an unrealistic expectation - or targets - for housing-growth, at the expense of other desirable objectives including safeguarding of heritage assets and the quality of the rural and urban environment. We consider the assumptions underlying the present plans are ill-judged and in need of review; that the projections - notably for housing numbers - are unjustified; that the plans fail to address key questions related to infrastructure capacity and upgrading; and that the resulting plans are neither coherent nor balanced as a blueprint for the successful evolution of the area over the next 20 years. Despite all these objections and concerns, we have nevertheless offered comments on the draft IMFLDP as it stands. This is however without prejudice to our fundamental belief that there is - or should be - a better and more inclusive way of planning for development which would produce a more sensible and acceptable outcome than the present unconvincing and unimaginative checklist of building-sites.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04216 Name Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West, River and Suburban Community Councils - joi

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Nairn, paras 4.32-41 et seq, pp 63-67

Reference Sites NA8/NA9 - Nairn South Type Change

Comment Changes

Page 67, table entries for NA8 and NA9 – redraft entire text to reflect comments in Representation section and attached document, OR at the beginning of the Requirements for each, insert, “Development to be on the basis of a revised Strategic Masterplan to incorporate necessary transport and infrastructure upgrades, to include more precise guidance on housing numbers and phasing, to give greater weight to the sawmill’s requirements, and to take account of the bypass alignment when agreed. Development also subject to up-to-date transport assessment;...etc” [text continues as in present draft]. Page 67, table entry for NA12 (Sawmill expansion) – after “accordance” insert “with a revised Nairn South Strategic Masterplan (to be prepared in consultation with the sawmill owners) which gives greater weight to the needs of the operation and those who access it, and recognises the need for generous separation between this industrial operation and any residential development in the vicinity.”

Representation

See attached composite note of comments for explanation and confirmation of requested amendments, in particular Section 8 headed, NAIRN SOUTH (NA8/NA9) The Nairn South Strategic Masterplan – which drew heavily on the proposals put forward by one developer group whose application has since been refused – is no longer a credible basis for planning on this site and needs substantial rewriting.. As now recognised by the Council itself, the infrastructure and access constraints are a serious obstacle to development in present circumstances. Any development that is permitted should consist of mixed use from the outset, with housing within the limits prescribed by the HwLDP Reporter (250 in early phases). The phasing should be gradual, and working outwards from the existing perimeter of the town. It should deliver necessary transport infrastructure improvements (such as bridge over railway, and road modifications) prior to other development. The evolution of the A96/Bypass planning, with the setting-aside of the existing broadly-agreed bypass route and the presentation of several new alignment options for consideration (none of which at present incorporates new or improved access into Nairn South) is a further reason for a reassessment of the approach to Nairn South development planning which takes a more realistic and comprehensive approach to the issues of transport, access, and other infrastructure including water and drainage. The proposals for a substantial expansion of housing-development at Cawdor (sites CA 1-10) will result in a much heavier volume of traffic on the B9090 Cawdor Road which will have consequences for the railway-bridge bottleneck and add to the capacity problem. The solution will to a large extent depend on whether and how any intersection is designed between Cawdor Road and the bypass. The particular requirements (and local impact) of the sawmill’s current operations and expansion plans point to a redefinition of the development-objectives for this site. Much greater weight needs to be attached to the sawmill’s role and its current and future needs. As this area is a ‘mixed use’ allocation, and subject to careful study of the scope for links with the eventually-agreed bypass and upgrading of the local rural roads, there is a strong case for stipulating a larger buffer-zone, revised access to the industrial site, and the earmarking of the northern part of the site for business, commercial or even light-industrial development , with any housing located further from the industrial premises.

Allocated to Nairn NA8 Nairn South

Customer Number 04216 Name Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West, River and Suburban Community Councils - joi

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Nairn, paras 4.32-41 et seq, pp 63-67

Reference Delnies, Site NA6 Type Change

Comment Changes

Page 66, table entry for NA6. Under Uses, delete "Industrial, insert "Leisure/recreation". In Requirements, amend to begin "Development will not be for housing alone, but will be subject to explicit agreement on the timely development and delivery of leisure facilities and recreational green spaces." After "wider area" insert "in particular unfettered access and wherever possible shared infrastructure with any developments on the adjacent Sandown site (NA4)."

Representation

See attached composite note of comments for explanation and confirmation of requested amendments, in particular Section 7, headed, DELNIES (NA6) Priority use should be tourism, recreation and public open/green space, as foreseen in the previous Local Plan, and as in the landowner/developer's own masterplans, which indicated "leisure/tourism" allocation and facilities. If housing is to be included, this should be as a subordinate element of the overall development; and if housing is approved as an early phase, there must be explicit conditionality over the subsequent delivery of the non-housing "leisure" elements. Just as the Sandown site incorporates a requirement to take account of access and infrastructure to Delnies, this obligation should be reciprocal.

Allocated to Nairn NA6 Delnies

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

See attached composite note of jointly-agreed CC comments, in particular Section 4, headed SOUTH KINGSTEPS (NA2) – objection: development not required and not appropriate. This site should be removed from the Plan, for several reasons. “Rounding-off” the eastern margin of the town (given in the MIR as a reason for allocation) is no justification for building over the green space and watercourse of this field which have amenity value. Building housing on this field would have implications for drainage. The indicative total of 90 units is totally unacceptable. This would substantially alter the current low-density-residential character of the existing Kingsteps houses. The total of new housing elsewhere built and approved (Lochloy), likely (Delnies) and allocated (Nairn South, Sandown, etc) renders this allocation superfluous. Access is a critical constraint. The capacity of the unclassified minor road to Brodie is limited. Access to this site through the existing Lochloy site NA5 (which itself has only one entry-point already serving some 600 houses) is inappropriate. If combined with a direct link out on to the Lochloy-Brodie road, this would create an obvious “ratrun”. This road – the sole access – leads only to an already problematic junction in Nairn, and eastward as a narrow rural road with no convenient connection to the A96. Unless and until the bypass route is confirmed and there is a vehicular linkage eastward from the Lochloy residential area on to the eventual A96 bypass, there should be no development on site NA2. The shape and orientation of any further development at the eastern edge of Nairn will depend on, and should await, the alignment and junction design of the proposed re-routed A96.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Muirtown Basin is unique, and a gem in the crown of Inverness. It would be a big mistake to build any houses or other structures beside it, as it is very precious to many people as a haven of peace and tranquillity. Adjacent to the Merkinch Nature Reserve, it has an abundance of unusual wildlife, and hundreds of people regularly use it, for exercise, recreation and tourism. It is sheltered from wind and traffic noise, a place of exceptional beauty and a historic site. All of this, which is irreplaceable, would be destroyed if building is allowed, meaning that the surrounding trees would be felled, and the peaceful atmosphere ruined. PLEASE do not allow any building.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings around the village of Munloch. This includes land to the east of Cameron Crescent now allocated for housing. As previously advised BPL support and welcome this allocation in principle as well as confirm the availability of the land. In this respect discussions have been held with your colleagues in Housing and Property. That service owns the adjacent land to the west through which vehicular access will be taken and interest has been shown in its acquisition for future Council house building. This would meet the affordable housing requirement generated by potential residential development on ML3. We note that not all the land offered for allocation has been included. Although required mainly for buffer/amenity planting, the strip of ground adjacent to the A832 road is omitted and therefore the "requirements" listed area bit misleading. We also consider that based on the density of adjacent development to the west there is potential for more than the capacity of 7 listed. We suggest that this be increased to 10 houses as previously requested.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Modify capacity: change from 41 to a range of 50 to 85 dwellings. 2. Delete reference to development “in accordance with 06/00201/FULRC planning permission” and “houses to be designed in respect of the scale and height, in particular the new housing to the north of the site shall reflect scale and character, privacy and amenity of existing houses”. Replace with reference to the need for a Design Statement etc.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings around the village of Munloch. This includes land the remaining undeveloped land with planning permission at Brae Farm, which continues to be allocated for housing under ML2 with a capacity for 41 houses. Since completion of the early phases of development market conditions have changed markedly with a tendency towards the building of smaller more affordable homes. This includes a further phase of affordable housing built by the Cairn Housing Association to a higher density at Brae Farm. Proposals are also under discussion for 20 private homes on the smaller north west part of the ML2 allocation, to be constructed in the style of a close-knit traditional village street. If approved by the Council and successfully developed the hope is to seek a similar scale and density on the remaining land. However, our clients are concerned that any further development will be hindered by the capacity figure placed on the allocation and the “Requirements” listed in both the existing adopted Local Plan and the Proposed Local Development Plan. In such respects we now seek modification of the text of the Plan to give sufficient flexibility to allow for an increase in the density of development but with a high quality well designed layout in line with Designing Streets. This would require deletion of reference to development being “in accordance with 06/00201/FULRC planning permission” and “houses to be designed in respect of the scale and height, in particular the new housing to the north of the site shall reflect scale and character, privacy and amenity of existing houses”. This text could be replaced with reference to the need for a Design Statement complete with visualisations. We also request that the capacity figure is increased to allow a density range of 15 to 25 houses per hectare. This would be in line with similar increases the Proposed Plan promotes for long allocated sites in other villages such as Culbokie (CU3) and Muir of Ord (MO2). This approach would give a capacity range of 50 to 85 dwellings.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04437 Name Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL) Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alan Ogilvie G H Johnston Building Consultants

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference ML4 Type Change

Comment Changes

Change the allocation of land from Community to Mixed Use and include potential for residential development.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings in and around Munloch. At both the Call for Sites (CfS) and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages we sought clarification of the situation is with the need for improved primary school accommodation in Munloch. We consider that this is necessary to determine how realistic it is to continue to safeguard this land north of Brae Park for the building of a new school. We now see from the Council’s response to our MIR submission and the “Requirements” under ML4 that this site should be retained for community use until the Sustainable Schools Estates Review establishes whether the site is required for primary school provision. We understand that the Council commenced the strategic review of its school estate in 2010 to cover a 5 to 10 year period. However, there is no timescale indicated for the Sustainable School Estate Review of Black Isle primary schools. This is not helpful for the forward planning of housing allocations in Avoch, Munloch, Tore, Fortrose and Rosemarkie. While the Proposed Plan allocates the site for Community use it only refers to the potential for a new school. No other uses are indicated to cover the event that the Review concludes that it is not required for a school. We therefore ask what other uses, Community or otherwise, the Council has in mind for this land. In order to keep options open, including the possibility of a low density residential development or a residential care home, we suggest that the allocation be changed to Mixed Use.

Allocated to Munloch ML4 North of Brae Park

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Expand the allocation to the east or, on the basis that the enhanced development potential sought in other submissions for allocations ML 1 to 4 is reflected in the finalised Plan, seek developer contributions from ML 1 to 5 towards the full improvement of A832/ B9161 road junction.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings in and around Munloch. This includes the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Business allocation north of Fraser's Garage to the north east of the village, now indicated as ML5 in the Proposed Plan. We previously indicated BPL's support to carry forward this site into the Proposed Plan at the MIR. The original allocation was aimed at creating employment opportunities locally to help reduce the proportion of residents who commute to work in other larger settlements outwith the Black Isle in future. We are disappointed that an additional area put forward at the MIR stage as an extension to the east of this Business allocation was not supported by the Council. Our client had been encouraged to spend time and incur cost making this submission to the MIR following discussions with Knockbain Community Council and other local representations about the A832/ B9161 road junction. This was subsequently supported in writing by Knockbain CC and Mr Anthony Neil Morey. The Council also made comments on the lack of scope for some improvement to the junction leg from the village on to the A832 without approaching us or BPL to discuss the availability of adjacent land. Neither did the Council's response account for the suggestion by a TECS Roads official about moving the northern leg of the junction to the eastern edge of the requested additional business/tourism land. There is clearly local concern about the current alignment of the road junction but the Council does not have the resources to effect the preferred solution, which we previously advised could be undertaken as part of developing an expanded business site. BPL is not in a position to undertake these works in the absence of active development proposals but is willing to make the land available on both sides of the A832 road. As previously indicated, the potential of the additional land requested was more tourist related to suit the location of a well-designed commercial/visitor facility. Landscape impact of development on this more prominent land could be mitigated by significant structural tree planting. However, if the Council continues to resist this form of development the only other way of delivering the junction improvement may be in relation to the increase in the development capacity and extent of land allocations ML1, 2, 3 and 4, as now requested in separate submissions on the Proposed Plan. At the very least the land for the junction improvement can be made available but the funding of the works will depend upon the extent to which these requests for the additional development on land allocations ML1, 2, 3 and 4 are met. If met in full as requested in our other submissions then we would not object to appropriate developer contributions being sought. Given the current economic climate it is more likely that the improvements can be delivered in relation to the enhanced development potential of these sites. In this respect the need to make relevant contributions could be reflected in all five land allocations ML 1 to 5. However, we will leave that for the Council to give consideration to.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Add the field south of AV4 and 5 to the Muiralehouse master plan area.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings on the west side of the village of Avoch. This includes various sites allocated for development – AV 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7. At both the Call for Sites (CfS) and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages we sought inclusion of land to the west of Avoch House or North of Rosehaugh East Drive, indicated as “non-preferred” site option H7 in the MIR. The site is surrounded by woodland and therefore well contained in the landscape setting of the village. The presence of the woodland is in itself a factor that suggests very low density development similar to other previous developments on the north side of the village at Fletcher Gardens, Ladyhill View and Knockmuir View. The intention would be to avoid tree loss (including for access) and set buildings back the requisite hold back distance from individual trees suggesting very low density development of a single row of plots. The responses made by the Council and some other parties did not seem to recognise this approach to development and the other attributes of the site. In addition, it is not in a SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk area, is not Prime quality agricultural land, there are no other heritage features and localised road access issues will be addressed through the development of AV1. However, BPL appreciates that this site is perceived by the community as being more sensitive than MIR site H8. It is also well enclosed by trees which could limit outlook and the amount of natural light afforded to future buildings. We also refer to our comments above on sites AV3, 4 and 5, including the request to allocate some more land at Muiralehouse Farm. If this additional land is included in the finalised Plan then BPL would accept that this would help provide sufficient housing land for the Plan period and into the longer term future. In this regard BPL would not pursue the allocation of land North of the Rosehaugh East Drive allocation AV1.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

1. On the Munloch Inset Map, extend this "Mixed Use" allocation east across the western part of the adjoining field. 2. In the accompanying Written Statement, increase the site area to 4.15 (or 4.2) ha., but do not indicate the number of homes. This should be for the master plan to determine. 3. Indicate "land suitable for Residential, Commercial and Community Uses". 4. Add requirement for Transport Assessment to determine suitable access arrangements.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings in and around the village of Munloch. At the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage we sought inclusion of 4.15 ha. of land south of Millbank Road for a mix of uses including housing, employment (offices), public car park and recreation/ open space. Subsequently, this land has appeared as two site options in the MIR; "preferred" mixed uses (MU1) and "non-preferred" housing (H6). On behalf of BPL we note and welcome the inclusion of ML3 in the Proposed Plan but are obviously disappointed that the western half of the field immediately to the south of the village hall is not included as an extension of the allocation. As stated previously we consider that this will help provide additional housing potential to make the overall development feasible as well as provide more land for future community facilities, including adjacent to the village hall. We therefore object to its omission from the Proposed Plan. At the MIR stage we had provided a sketch Development Framework Plan (attached) for the combined areas of land in question showing the potential arrangement of uses but acknowledged that a master plan should be prepared with public involvement. This will give the local community an opportunity to help determine the layout and distribution of uses aided by more information on the demand for business/office space, community facilities and the ideal size of the extension to the village centre car park. As a village centre site it has potential to sustain and enhance employment and expand or improve the range of community facilities in association with traffic management measures. We note from the Council's responses that the visual impact of expansion into the western half of the adjoining field is not an issue. The Council states that "when viewed from the south already benefits from the softening of mature trees along this boundary". It is also stated that "when viewed from the north the western portion of the site is well stepped in from the houses above and will not have a significant visual impact, and when viewed from the south it already benefits from trees which screen the area." Furthermore, "it would benefit from advance planting to the east to soften the impact". The Council's response goes on to say that "there would also be some benefits to extending the MU1 site to include the eastern part of H6". These include its "very good central location, close to services and facilities" and as "a natural extension to the village helping to round off the existing built form". However, the response suddenly turns against the allocation of the land in relation to "access concerns about this level of development being served off a single access from the village hall car park" and the Geological Conservation Review (GCR) area taking up the western half of the field. Both of these reasons were not previously made known at the MIR stage and we also have cause to question them. Firstly, the proposed means of access is not from the village hall car park. It would be from the south west end of the main village centre car park which is some distance from the village hall. The point of access would be where the existing car park access is located and the visibility for this was previously agreed. Part of the car park would also be re-configured and the number of parking spaces increased into the ML3 allocation. The Development Framework Plan illustrates this. The capacity of the proposed access would also be determined by a Transport Assessment in the process of taking proposals forward under the master plan exercise. We therefore question on what grounds the Council makes the comment "concerns about this level of development being served off a single access". The Council's response continues to say that the "suggested expansion into the western part of H6 is therefore considered to be premature to this Plan and it is considered that secondary access solutions, and advance planting to the east should be explored to support its future development. Therefore it is recommended that just MU1 should be allocated, and H6 should not be included in this Plan." This part of the response seems to suggest that expansion into the next field could be considered in the future. However, there is no point in taking forward a master plan for just ML3 when access and other considerations would have to be considered for all the land. This includes a secondary vehicular access solution to Millbank Road, although we doubt this is achievable due to topography and land in different ownership. There may be path access options including to/from the village hall but again these need to be considered in relation to the overall development of the land. There is also little point in undertaking advance planting to the east against just the current ML3 allocation. The last two sentences of paragraph 4.160 of the Munloch statement state: "In future Local Development Plan reviews the landscape setting and a Geological Conservation Area will constrain the extent of future opportunities to the east. However the case for the allocation of land south of the village hall would be enhanced by advance planting to the eastern extent and by securing another vehicular access from Millbank Road." This also suggests that the additional land sought has longer term potential and despite the GCR area. The justification for "securing

another vehicular access from Millbank Road” is not provided. Reference is made in the Council’s response to our relevant MIR submission that the GCR area occupies the western half of H6. We also note from the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in support of the Plan that both ML3 and H6 lie within the Munloch Valley GCR site. The notes refer to “due consideration of the impact of the feature on the site” rather than the resistance of development as indicated in the MIR response to the western half of the H6 site. The reference in paragraph 4.160 to the western half of the field having longer term development potential is therefore inconsistent with the conclusions of that response. If this area is identified because it “is an integral member of a national network of Quaternary sites which together represent relative sea level movements in Scotland” we question if this is not present across most of Munloch, developed or otherwise. In our research into the Munloch Valley GCR area the relevant mapping does not make this clear. The Joint Nature Conservation Committee definition of Geological Conservation Review sites (England, Scotland, Wales) & Earth Science Conservation Review Sites (Northern Ireland) is as follows: - “Non-statutory sites identified by the statutory nature conservation agencies as having national or international importance for earth science conservation on the basis of their geology, palaeontology, mineralogy or geomorphology. Although GCR/ESCR identification does not itself give any statutory protection, many GCR/ESCR sites have been notified as SSSIs/ASSIs.” We were unable to find any record of this area being designated as a SSSI. The SEA advises that it is not within a designated area of natural heritage. In the absence of a SSSI designation there appears to be no statutory protection. There is also a lack of reference in the Proposed Plan or the SEA to development being discouraged or not approved on a GCR area. We are therefore puzzled by the Council’s response: “this is therefore a feature of national importance which requires protection.” In light of these considerations therefore the GCR site is not a significant constraint to development. In our view the master planning of both ML3 and the requested expansion to the east need to be considered at the same time. They are intrinsically linked, not just in terms of access and structural tree planting but also the determination and the distribution of appropriate uses, as well as overall viability. From BPL’s initial assessment it will not be feasible to deliver the community and amenity elements without additional land for open market residential development. Any community engagement exercise should cover both areas of land and not leave the eastern part to the longer term (i.e. it should be in the lifetime of this Plan). The master plan will also guide the design of buildings and indicate the number of houses, how the affordable requirement will be met and indicate phasing at a rate and scale that respects the functioning of the land, particularly in terms of traffic impact, together with its character and the viability of the development. This would also cover woodland safeguards, hold back areas from the adjacent burns, flood risk assessment, landscape assessment, open space and opportunities for path links to adjoining land, which should be considered for both areas at the same time. In conclusion we ask that the ML3 allocation is extended east to cover the western part of the adjacent field, as requested at the MIR stage.

Allocated to	Munloch	ML3	South of the Post Office	
--------------	---------	-----	--------------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Support the allocation of AV 3, 4 & 5 but seek extension to the developable area by including the field to the south as an additional housing allocation. 2. Change the capacity of AV3 from 63 to 40 houses. 3. Add new allocation of 5.3 ha with capacity of 60 houses for medium/ longer term development.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings on the west side of Avoch. At both the Call for Sites (Cfs) and Main Issue Report (MIR) stages BPL sought a planned expansion of the settlement to the west across Muiralehouse comprising land for housing, employment (business/ industry), community and recreation/open space uses. BPL therefore welcomes the allocations AV3, 4 and 5. However, BPL now object to the field to the south of Av 4 and 5 (part of H8 in the MIR) not being included as a housing allocation. The adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (R&CELP) states a requirement for 120 houses in Avoch in the period 2003 to 2017. However, in the period 2003 to 2013 only 8 houses were completed in the village on allocated land. This was due to a combination of market conditions, limited funding for affordable housing and lack of effectiveness or availability of some of the sites. The situation with the existing R&CELP allocated sites is as follows: - 2. West of Rosehaugh Crescent – 8 houses – not available; not retained as allocation in IMFLDP. 3. Knockmuir View – 3 houses – completed. 4. Former filling station – 3 flats – ineffective due to need to de-contaminate and now likely to be developed for a café; not retained in IMFLDP. 5. Station Hotel Car Park – 6 flats – not developed and permission renewed on three occasions; not retained in IMFLDP. 6. Memorial Field – 30 houses – permission pending conclusion of Section 75 Agreement; lack of commitment to affordable housing; retained as allocation AV2 in IMFLDP. 7. Rosehaugh East Drive – 20 houses – permission for 30 houses pending conclusion of Section 75 Agreement; retained as allocation AV1 for 30 houses in IMFLDP. 8. South West of Ormonde Terrace – 8-10 houses – 8 permitted of which 5 completed; not retained as allocation in IMFLDP. 9. Knockmuir East – 25-30 – not developed; two planning applications for phases of 11 and 16 plots pending decision; not retained as allocation in IMFLDP. The Proposed Plan only retains land from the adopted Plan with potential for half of the housing requirement of 120 on AV1 (30) and AV2 (30), both in the ownership of BPL. There is also potential for a further 17 dwellings on other sites which are now ‘windfall’ sites within the settlement boundary. We also note that the Proposed Plan seek attempts to make up the shortfall with a capacity of 63 houses indicated for AV3 on 3.2 hectares of land. While we have no objection to a higher level of development, this does not reflect the density of adjacent developed areas and is not consistent with the potential densities of Committee approved proposals or allocations for AV1 and AV2. As such, a figure of up to 40 houses seems more appropriate. In light of the above we feel that remainder of the “120 new homes” referred to in paragraph 4.124 should be accommodated on the field south of Av4 and 5. This will help provide a more balanced expansion to the village centred on land for community and recreation purposes. The allocation of AV3 and the additional housing land now sought will also help spread the cost of providing infrastructure and community and recreation uses at the scale indicated. The development of the additional area would follow on from AV3 and at 5.5 ha it has the potential to meet longer term housing needs, i.e. beyond the Plan period. The whole area can be covered by the master plan/ development brief referred to in AV3. This would require public engagement and so give the wider community an opportunity help plan the area and determine appropriate community uses and open space. The master plan will indicate the phasing at a rate and scale that respects the functioning of the expansion land, its character and the viability of the development. Active travel can be promoted to and from the school and village centre amenities via links through AV2. The master plan/development brief would also include a landscaping and structure planting framework to help improve the appearance of the approaches to the village, with an element of advanced planting. This additional land is already partially screened from view from the A832 road by the belt of trees along its north eastern boundary. Further softening of development could be achieved by the introduction of significant areas of deciduous structure planting that would visually relate the overall site to areas to the north and the Avoch Burn valley. Retaining and supplementing the existing woodland together with the introduction of new planting along the south and west boundaries will also help integrate the development into the landscape. A sketch Development Framework plan is again provided for the land in question. This suggests total housing land allocations at Muiralehouse for up to 100 houses on 8.5 ha of land. If this is included in the final version of the Plan, BPL would not pursue the inclusion of land to the north of AV1 (MIR site H7) to help make up the shortfall of land allocated for housing.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Increase the size of the area of the Business land allocation NK2 in line with the area indicated in the MIR.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings over the remainder of Bellfield and Lettoch Farms, North Kessock. This extensive area of land includes land allocations NK1 and 2, forming part of the planning permissions granted under 05/0466/OUTRC and 07/00876/REMRC for an integrated mixed development of housing with open space, tourism, leisure and recreation facilities. We refer to NK2, the area we previously requested be extended and re-configured. However, after agreeing to show the revised/expanded area in the MIR the Council has decided to contract the boundary to accord with the extant permission, apparently bowing to the pressure of representations from the local community. The whole point of seeking an increase in the area of land and range of uses is to help provide a mix and critical mass of development potential that would provide the greater flexibility required to make the development and a golf course more financially attractive to potential developers and therefore more marketable. This would still include land for a golf club house, indoor sports/leisure club, hotel, etc. but also additional land to offer scope for holiday apartments, offices and other business uses mainly associated with leisure and tourism. Confining this to the area that accords with the 2005 outline planning permission and R&CE Local Plan will not leave a lot of room over and above a golf clubhouse, hotel, leisure facilities and self-catering accommodation. Whilst our clients acknowledge that the 2005 Outline Planning Permission requires tourism and other associated development will also be predicated on the golf course development, and now also business uses, they also consider that the significant turn-around in the demand for new golf courses makes this approach outdated. Since the original permission was granted the implementation of proposals at Castle Stuart has taken up much of the demand for golf tourism and associated accommodation from high spending overseas visitors. Also in that time the demand from the local population has also peaked and membership levels have been dropping at most of the courses within a 25 mile radius. Waiting lists are generally a thing of the past and clubs are more welcoming than ever to encourage play, including through lower cost 'pay and play' options for casual or non-members. It may therefore be some time before sufficient demand will materialise to warrant the building of another golf course in the area and certainly not without additional development to subsidise it. We also question why reference is made in the Council's response to "the extended areas to the south east and to the north east would possibly require a Transport Assessment", particularly when access to the overall master planned land was greatly enhanced with a £2 million grade separated access. There is also every intention to retain the core path through the site, whilst maintaining or enhancing its amenity value. In addition, the loss of additional prime agricultural land is not "a key planning issue for this Plan" when the principle of developing the surrounding area for a golf course was accepted through granting the planning permissions.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Add the land to the north as requested at the previous stages of the Plan preparation. 2. Increase land area to 66 ha. and housing capacity to 500+ homes? 3. Under requirements delete the first sentence referring to development post 2021 etc. 4. Change preceding paragraphs to reflect the change.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owners of a substantial land holding at Tore and forming the largest proportion of land allocation TR2. The other owners of land in this allocation are Mr J Cameron, (Balknakyle Farm), Mr A MacRae (Tore) and Mr M Mathieson (Tore Park). We made previous submissions at the Call for Sites (CfS) and Main Issues Report (MIR) stages seeking inclusion of this substantial area of land and a further area of land to the north in the Plan for a planned sustainable expansion of the settlement. We now advise of BPL's support for the inclusion of TR2 in principle and the need for an overall master plan but object to the exclusion of land to the north of TR2 indicated as MU2 "non-preferred" in the MIR timescale and the for development "post 2021" for the reasons indicated below. Exclusion of land to the north In paragraph 4.179 of the statement, the reference to considering the inclusion of land north of TR2 in subsequent Local Development Plan reviews is not helpful to the proper master planning of the area. We are very much aware that some of it "is more sensitive from a landscape and visual perspective" and that "an advance structural planting requirement to buffer the A9, and possibly some advance additional tree planting within the site to provide some softening for proposed development areas would improve the case for" its inclusion "in a future Local Development Plan review". However, this is unrealistic if the land to the north is not part of the allocation in the first place. Indeed with a statement like that the land would be as well included from the outset. The next part of this paragraph then causes confusion particularly in relation to the land that the Proposed Plan allocates and describes under TR2. The first part of the statement under TR2 states that the land south of the Killen road is "identified for development post 2021 subject to a developer prepared masterplan to support the site's inclusion in the next Local Development Plan review." Yet the last sentence of paragraph 4.179 suggests that the land north of the Killen road is treated in the same way. "These measures alongside inclusion of this land" (i.e. north of the Killen road) "within the developer prepared masterplan as a well-balanced, designed and sited, mixed use development could ensure that the landscape and visual impact of development is suitably softened could prove sufficient to merit its inclusion in a future Local Development Plan review." If the Council views the structural landscaping on the land to the north as an integral part of the master plan area and is minded to consider its future inclusion then this land should be included as part of the TR2 allocation. In setting out how the future development of the whole area will shape up it is important that both areas of land should be considered together as part of the same master plan. They are intrinsically linked, not just in terms of access and structural tree planting but also the determination and the distribution of appropriate uses, detailed infrastructure studies and environmental assessments, as well as overall viability. In early discussions with Scottish Water it was indicated to us that they would only be prepared to make the business case for investment for one all-embracing development area. Scottish water also advised that a better case could be made if the Council supports the larger scale allocation we continue to seek. The extent and sizing of pipework to connect to the Muir of Ord WWTW will only account for allocated land and if this does not include the additional land to the north it will be more difficult to come back and accommodate it in future. Any related capacity study will also be more cost effective if it covers all the land now instead of in two parts. The same applies to detailed transport, flood risk, surface water, landscape, arboricultural implications and future school provisions assessments. It would also make sense for a community engagement exercise to cover both areas of land and not leave the northern part to the much longer term. In seeking inclusion of the additional land to the north we are not necessarily seeking an increase in the level of development commensurate with the percentage increase in land area. This is because we estimate that in view of the need for physical separation of certain uses, together with significant structural planting and open space, the land area as currently indicated may not be able to accommodate the level and range of development indicated under TR2 in the Proposed Plan. Inclusion of all the land will enable development based on a design concept that could see a village green as the commercial focus, other employment generating focal points and a choice in housing and affordable housing; set in a green context with opportunities for recreational access. Defining the northern edge of the development at the Killen road will artificially limit the achievement of these objectives as well as the ability to meet all the requirements listed in the Proposed Plan and could result in over-development of the land currently covered by the TR2 allocation. Post 2021 Timescale We note the Council's reasons for deferring the timescale for development to post 2021. However, this does not take account of the need to fully service the existing land allocation at Woodneuk in Tore (now TR1) which the Council is minded to grant approval for. In the absence of a commitment to provide a more significant foul drainage system (as part of the planned expansion area) only up to 4 of the 14 houses in this development can connect into the

existing reed bed drainage system. The postponement until after 2021 also assumes almost full development of land allocations in other Black Isle communities in advance. There may be many reasons why prior development in other settlements will not occur and in such respects we would not wish the expansion of Tore to be held back by a particular date. This could, for example, play into the hands of another developer or landowner in other settlements who could decide to delay the release land to prevent development at Tore. We also appreciate that significant investment in infrastructure and services is essential to create the development opportunities and it is such investment that will dictate the timescale. In this regard our clients seek to build on the momentum that has only recently been achieved with Scottish Water. Likewise our clients wish to be able to follow up with a more detailed Transport Assessment with Transport Scotland whilst that agency still has the resources to respond. However, our clients fear that in deferring the commencement of development until after 2021 (8 or 9 years away) the relevant momentum will be lost. It is a rather simplistic approach to seek to maximise the use of existing infrastructure and sustainably grow and support existing communities on the Black Isle, in advance of the master planning of, major public investment, and then major expansion of Tore. The investment priorities of Scottish Water and the Council's Education Service will be prone to change before 2021 and could therefore have a significant bearing on whether the development commences. The Education Service Sustainable Schools Estates Review may well be completed within the next 2 to 3 years and if there is no active development proposal to consider in that timescale, even in the form of a master plan exercise, we fear that the opportunity to properly consider options for a new primary school at Tore will be missed. The recommendation that Tore's major expansion proposal should be phased for years 2021- 2031 is also perhaps a bit simplistic. The level of development suggested compared with the growth in other Black Isle communities in the last 10 years suggests that it will take more than 10 years before the land at Tore is taken up. Furthermore, the matter of broad timescales for developing settlements is for a more strategic level of planning, such as the Highland wide LDP. Whilst we accept that the largest proportion of housing development will be longer term there are other aspects of the planned expansion of the community that could address existing issues such as the early development of more sustainable transport initiatives like park-and-ride or the creation of employment for the wider Inner Moray Firth area. The potential to undertake significant advanced structure planting will also be influenced by when development could commence. Any developer is not likely to be in a position to commit to this expense so far in advance and on land not allocated. Development funding will not be secured to cover this against the longer term timescale for commencement or until there is certainty over the extent of land allocated and. We appreciate that master planning on this scale is a major commitment in its own right but achieving the co-operation of others, notably private investors, is less likely with a timescale for development being set so far ahead. This could also be undermined over the period up to 2021 if public investment is not included in capital investment programmes of the infrastructure and service agencies and then at the next Development Plan review the Council has to consider taking the TR2 allocation out of the Plan. It will be a matter for the master plan to indicate phasing at a rate and scale that respects the functioning of the land, particularly in terms of traffic impact, together with its character and the viability of the development. This could still mean a restriction to 50 houses per annum but over a larger area. We also accept that the mix of uses indicated in the Framework Plan submitted at the CfS and MIR stages should be re-visited as part of the master planning exercise. This includes giving consideration to business and industrial uses alongside the earlier phases of stages of the housing expansion.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings on the west side of the village of Avoch. This includes land now identified for expansion of the existing industrial estate at the south end of the village. As previously advised BPL support and welcome this allocation as well as confirm the availability of the land.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Increase the size of the area of the Mixed Use land allocation NK1 to include the indicative petrol filling station site.

Representation

We act for Broadland Properties Ltd (BPL), owner of substantial land holdings over the remainder of Bellfield and Lettoch Farms, North Kessock. This extensive area of land includes land allocations NK1 and 2, forming part of the planning permissions granted under 05/0466/OUTRC and 07/00876/REMRC for an integrated mixed development of housing with open space, tourism, leisure and recreation facilities. Despite our previous submission at the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage and a change in status of the area covered by NK1 to Mixed Uses, the land allocation on the Inset Map continues to omit the area immediately to the north of the main roundabout access. This was the land indicated in the master plan as having potential for a petrol filling station in the master plan layout. Reference is made to this in the Uses part of the Written Statement but it is strange that it is missing from the Inset Map. While this use is not viable in the current market conditions and it benefits from an extant planning permission, we feel that this land should also be included within the NK1 allocation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Housing - There are two housing sites in the area already, which remain mainly undeveloped land. We do not want the area to be a building site for many years. The housing proposed for site CR2 could lead to the same. The plan for over 180 new homes means doubling the size of the existing village over a relatively short time. We feel that this should not happen. The phasing should be over a far longer period of time to allow the community to settle in. Is it possible, apart from the usual affordable homes, to include some provision for sheltered accommodation? Site CR2 We support the SPA designation of Loch Flemington. This site, CR2, is a significant part of the catchment of the Loch and we feel that the Supplementary Guidance detailed in policy 5, should be part of the IMFDP. However, we are reassured that the planners have addressed the importance of the loch. A large part of the site CR2 is wet and will clearly restrict the number of houses that we feel could go on this site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The area marked out is very close to the sewage works (which may need to be enlarged/upgraded). It is not desirable to put any part of the development so close. We would suggest the number of houses proposed should be reduced. This site, together with the first phase of site CR2, could potentially increase the village by 50%, which we do not agree with.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

A general point for future plans, we suggest that the local community is involved at the start of the process, instead of being asked to comment on proposals which are already in place. There have been two meetings in the village concerning house building. The first involved a potential developer of 100 houses by Scotia Homes. Malcolm MacLeod attended the meeting of approximately 100, in which there was clear opposition to the proposal (which did not proceed). The other meeting on 18 November 2013, at which Scott Dalgarno was present to discuss the IMFDP, was attended by approximately 50 people and again there was little or no support for the plan. The Community Council has listened to these views and have had their own discussion of the plan. The Community Council does not object in principle to house building in the village, provided that the infrastructure is in place, the development fits into a rural situation and the size of the development is in proportion to the existing size of the village. We feel that the plan, as it stands, does not address these. Roads - The road from Croy to the Airport Roundabout (Mid Coul Road) is in an unsatisfactory state. This issue has been raised before and nothing done. More people use this road because the roundabout means an easier access to the A96. We have general concerns about the housing projected for Croy/Cawdor and the increasing number of cars on the roads. The B9006 meets the UHI junction and then the Inshes roundabout, which will cause further congestion. Increasing the amount of traffic by these rural developments is contrary to many of the statements in the environmental assessment regarding car emissions. How can parents be encouraged to get children to walk/cycle to school with increased traffic on the roads? We are led to believe that the 1st phase of Tornagrain will use Croy Primary School. This means using the Mid Coul road. In the IMFDP S4.98, it indicates employment for Croy could be at the Airport Business Park, hence putting more traffic on the Mid Coul Road. Can we have assurances that this road will be upgraded before it is used for school traffic? Unfortunately, there is the perception that the planning system seems unlikely to enforce conditions placed on developers (this came through at the meeting on 18th Nov 2013). We believe there should be a review of the speed limits on these roads and also of rural transport.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amendments to Plan and Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief to reduce and minimise developable land take from road, drainage and other infrastructure at Ness-side. Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd will withdraw its objections if these amendments are guaranteed. Also additional Plan and Brief requirement for the production of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan prior to the determination of the West Link planning application.

Representation

Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd (BBH) wishes to maximise the developable portion and value of its landownership at Ness-side. It has also lodged parallel objections to the associated West Link Road Scheme planning application and its compulsory purchase orders. BBH is concerned about the construction stage effects that the West Link road scheme will have on their land (and occupiers of buildings on that land) and the consequential effect on the scope and form of development on the remainder of their land. Also concerns over economic viability given the proposed level and unjustified nature of planning gain contributions. BBH believes the earlier Charrette indicative masterplan that showed very little open space and more housing development on its land should have been followed through into statutory planning policy. BBH believes the subsequent Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief shows an excessive and unnecessary land take for road and drainage infrastructure. In particular, BBH believes the Mill Lade roundabout is too large and doesn't need 2 legs into the BBH owned land, that there is no need for a distributor road through its landownership (the route may also become a rat-run causing amenity issues), that any pedestrian/cyclist connection should be minimised, and that the surface water and waste water infrastructure areas shown on the Brief masterplan are excessive and have not been justified by any engineering study. It believes its landholding would better be developed via separate accesses from Dores Road (using the BBH existing access road) and a single West Link roundabout leg. It feels the Brief masterplan also creates ransom problems. BBH believes that its landholding does not need a distributor road connection through it because bus routes are available along Dores Road and if necessary along West Link. The Council's approval of its own Brief didn't allow any independent hearing of objections to it. BBH believes it is taking an excessive not equitable share of the funding and delivery of communal infrastructure items. BBH disputes that varying densities is an effective mechanism for equalisation of development costs and values across Ness-side because higher densities don't equal higher value. BBH believes the Council should take a stronger lead in deciding who develops and when. It also believes that the Council should produce a financial viability appraisal to prove that sites can be developed economically given the balance of development costs to development value – the Council has chosen to allocate the land so should prove that it is effective. BBH also believes that operational access should be maintained to its land north of West Link. It also believes that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan is required to mitigate for operational impacts on existing tenants during the construction phase of West Link.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amendments to Plan and Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief to reduce and minimise developable land take from road, drainage and other infrastructure at Ness-side. Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd will withdraw its objections if these amendments are guaranteed. Also additional Plan and Brief requirement for the production of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan prior to the determination of the West Link planning application.

Representation

Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd (BBH) wishes to maximise the developable portion and value of its landownership at Ness-side. It has also lodged parallel objections to the associated West Link Road Scheme planning application and its compulsory purchase orders. BBH is concerned about the construction stage effects that the West Link road scheme will have on their land (and occupiers of buildings on that land) and the consequential effect on the scope and form of development on the remainder of their land. Also concerns over economic viability given the proposed level and unjustified nature of planning gain contributions. BBH believes the earlier Charrette indicative masterplan that showed very little open space and more housing development on its land should have been followed through into statutory planning policy. BBH believes the subsequent Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief shows an excessive and unnecessary land take for road and drainage infrastructure. In particular, BBH believes the Mill Lade roundabout is too large and doesn't need 2 legs into the BBH owned land, that there is no need for a distributor road through its landownership (the route may also become a rat-run causing amenity issues), that any pedestrian/cyclist connection should be minimised, and that the surface water and waste water infrastructure areas shown on the Brief masterplan are excessive and have not been justified by any engineering study. It believes its landholding would better be developed via separate accesses from Dores Road (using the BBH existing access road) and a single West Link roundabout leg. It feels the Brief masterplan also creates ransom problems. BBH believes that its landholding does not need a distributor road connection through it because bus routes are available along Dores Road and if necessary along West Link. The Council's approval of its own Brief didn't allow any independent hearing of objections to it. BBH believes it is taking an excessive not equitable share of the funding and delivery of communal infrastructure items. BBH disputes that varying densities is an effective mechanism for equalisation of development costs and values across Ness-side because higher densities don't equal higher value. BBH believes the Council should take a stronger lead in deciding who develops and when. It also believes that the Council should produce a financial viability appraisal to prove that sites can be developed economically given the balance of development costs to development value – the Council has chosen to allocate the land so should prove that it is effective. BBH also believes that operational access should be maintained to its land north of West Link. It also believes that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan is required to mitigate for operational impacts on existing tenants during the construction phase of West Link.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Tomatin Estate wishes to support the LDP proposals for Tomatin. The Council's vision for a vibrant Inner Moray Firth depends on many factors. Whilst the success of Inverness City, the Inverness-Nairn Growth corridor and the Ross-shire Growth Corridor dominate the development strategy set out in the LDP, the Plan acknowledges the importance of a robust settlement strategy for the entire Plan area. As a free standing village designated as a Local Centre, it is important that Tomatin has suitable sites for housing development, employment and community uses. New homes will help to sustain and expand local services and facilities which have been under increasing threat over a period years. There is an ambition locally to see the reinstatement of the station at Tomatin. The campaign for the station has significant challenges in persuading Network Rail of the merits of the case. The LDP acknowledges that reopening the station may be possible. However, the Plan could go further and express support for this eventuality more directly. Reopening the railway station would help to drive growth, through new housing, employment and tourism developments, in accordance with the Council's ambitions for Tomatin. The Council has recognised the importance of the proposed dualling of the A9 north and south of the village as a driver for growth. Tomatin Estate supports the LDP's proposals for future development at the village. Road access is obviously a key factor in encouraging growth. However, the A9 road link north to Inverness and south to Aviemore and Kingussie is already of a good standard relative to some other parts of the route. Whilst expansion of Tomatin would undoubtedly benefit from upgrading of the A9, the village is already well placed to act as a growing Local Centre. The LDP recognises the fragmented settlement form at Tomatin and proposes housing development in the central part of the village as a means of creating a more integrated village. This approach has been promoted by Tomatin Estate during the earlier stages of the LDP process and is supported. Whilst Tomatin Estate supports new development in the village, it is important that it is of a good standard of design and layout. The use of briefs and master plans is supported as a means of ensuring good quality development. Para 2.12 of the LDP discusses development densities, which are set as indicative guidance, based upon a number of factors relating to specific sites and their context. Tomatin Estate notes that the three central housing sites in the village all have the same indicative density (10 dph). The LDP states that divergence from the indicative density is acceptable subject to the quality of the layout and design, and factors such as land use efficiency. This flexibility is supported and the briefs or master plans for the Tomatin sites should clarify house numbers for each site through design analysis, taking account of market conditions. The spacing, scale and density of new development should be led by placemaking principles which are set out by other development plan policies, notably Policy 28 'Sustainable Design', and Policy 29 'Design Quality and Placemaking' in the Highland-wide LDP. The TM3, TM4 and TM 5 sites are ideally located to achieve settlement consolidation over a period of time. The rate of house construction will be subject to a number of external factors, such as the prevailing market conditions. However, it is important that the scale of housing land allocation is adequate to ensure confidence in the funding of the necessary infrastructure, in particular the proposed waste water treatment works towards the north of Tomatin and upgrading of sewerage and treatment works towards the south. The housing sites are in relatively well enclosed positions and will have no significant impacts upon the wider landscape surrounding Tomatin. They can all be accessed directly from the main road through the village - the former A9. Greatly improved paths for active travel can be accommodated within the development sites, resolving a recognised lack of connectivity in Tomatin. There are no known flood issues and site investigations at the TM5 site have already confirmed that the ground has suitable porosity conditions and adequate bearing capacity for traditional development. Development at the housing sites can facilitate improved woodland management, recreational access and enhancement of habitats. Surveys can be undertaken in advance of development to assess protected species and ensure any necessary mitigation is incorporated into site layout proposals and construction programmes. It is anticipated that issues relating to habitat and protected species will be similar to those encountered at similar sites throughout the Inverness and Inner Moray Firth area. Sections 3 (Strategy for Growth Areas) and 4 (Delivering Development) of the LDP identify the infrastructure likely to be required to support the developments allocated in the Plan. The LDP Action Programme also addresses Essential Facilities and Infrastructure Projects. At Tomatin, there is a foul drainage constraint which requires to be overcome. The need for waste water treatment to keep pace with new development is obvious. The Plan notes the need for co-operation between private development interests and Scottish Water to achieve this. However, there is also an important role for the Council in driving delivery of the LDP proposals by facilitating action by Scottish Water at an appropriate time. Tomatin Estate supports the allocation of its land at the TM12 site for the development of a waste water treatment facility and requests that the Council should support discussions with Scottish Water to bring forward this treatment works. In summary, Tomatin Estate supports the LDP allocation of the following sites : TM3, TM4 and TM5 for housing use; TM7 for mixed uses; TM8 for use as sports pitches and associated facilities (subject to the development of TM5);

TM10 for business use; TM12 for development of a waste water treatment facility.

Allocated to Tomatin

General General

Customer Number 04223

Name Calum Anton Dip.Arch.,Dip.TP ret'd

Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph Para 8 Consultation Document

Reference Fortrose/Rosemarkie Ness Gap H1

Type Change

Comment Changes

Outline Consent was granted in June 2012 for 132 house units for this site, being a 25% reduction from 176. There would have been good planning reasons for this reduction in numbers and these were probably listed and reasons and conditions to the consent. It is now proposed to add 80 houses PLUS mixed use development to the site. In considering any increase in this number, have these conditions been addressed? I am not aware of such.

Representation

The Developer has at this time either built, or has detailed consents or applications submitted for his outline consented 132 units while still having approx. 1/3 of the zoned H1 site lying empty. Following the consent of June 2012 for 132 units, did the Council require the developer to submit a revised Masterplan layout to accommodate and affirm the reduced number? Was this done? It is noted that there is a revision note on the consultants drawing 023 showing "indicative outline layout removed" while the road infrastructure only remains. If a layout was required on the original Masterplan, it must surely be a requirement on the revised and consented layout. H1 Development areas A-F, extrapolated and revised to FR2, would indicate that areas A (affordable) B, and C, and approx. 1/3 of D, are either built on, consented, or applied for, for a total of 132 units. This leaves areas E,F and 1/3 of D undeveloped - or in theory, as only 132 are "consented" undevelopable for housing. The Developer is therefore saying "I have got all this ground with outline consent and detailed consent for your 132 units. Are you going to prevent me from developing this "surplus" ground?" But the good reasons and conditions why the original application of 176 units was reduced to 132 are still there, unresolved and unchanged. The final sentence in this para 8 is concerning. You state that the built, consented and applied for, amounts to 132 houses. I would suggest that these should be regarded as all "built". To say that 77 houses have been built is in fact correct at this time, built realistically misleading when the future reality is 132. To now add 80 to this figure, PLUS mixed uses as you are recommending is simply overdevelopment. This amounts to 212 house units, not to mention the mixed use additions. This may well be a possible density but it is appropriate? A quick walk around many recent similar private sector housing developments show a scene of tight packed uninspired monotony. A good and quick comparison of densities can be seen along the site's southern boundary on the 2009 Masterplan. The area lying between Ness Road and Wester Greengate and bounded the outer ends of Greengate Place and Chanonry Crescent contains 36 properties. A simple visual comparison of what 212 properties situated immediately beyond this NW boundary implies, is self evident in terms of inappropriate neighbouring development. Taking an average plot density of 3 per house would result in approx. 640 extra souls to Fortrose. Simply, can it handle it without some serious infrastructure and community improvements, particularly to education and roads/traffic. If the recent tinkering with the High Street is anything to go by then I am not hopeful.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie

FR2

Ness Gap

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Keep the whole of the former showfield as a green space.

Representation

We are writing to express our objection to the proposed zoning of the Farmer's Showfield for housing development. We have several major concerns about this: 1. If the proposed development of 30 new homes went ahead, it would potentially house 50-100+ people, and 30-50 cars spilling out onto Lodgehill Road would have a major impact on traffic and road safety in this residential area. Currently there is no pavement along the west side of Lodgehill Road that borders the showfield. There is no prospect of providing a pavement at 'Monimail' at the junction of Lodgehill Road without narrowing an already narrow road. The high walls on both sides of Lodgehill Road at the junction with Waverley Road and Westbury Road, already mean that this is a difficult and dangerous crossing. Pupils from Nairn Academy currently walk en-mass along the middle of Lodgehill Road to and from school and during lunchtimes, making Lodgehill Road difficult to drive along. With more cars there would be an added risk to their safety. 2. There are existing congestion and traffic flow problems along Waverley Road caused by cars being parked along one side of the road. This has been exacerbated by the increased level of traffic along Waverley Road due to both the Lodgehill and Ardersier doctors' practices, and the new dental facility all being relocated to Nairn Hospital. Added to this are the close proximity of Rosebank and Millbank Primary Schools which makes this a very busy area, especially Waverley Road, with pupils walking and being driven to school. Recently the new vet's surgery has just opened on Lodgehill Road, again adding to the traffic flow, and making the junction at Lodgehill Road and Waverley Road particularly difficult for pedestrians and vehicles alike. A development in the showfield would only add to this congestion, and definitely pose an added risk to pedestrians – in particular school age children. At busy times it is already very difficult to turn onto the A96 from Waverley Road – 30-50 cars would significantly increase this problem. Waverley Road, Lodgehill Road and Chattan Drive are residential roads ill-suited to high volumes of traffic. The proposed development of homes in the showfield, would add considerably to the burden of traffic and increase risk to pedestrians. 3. Green field areas are precious and should be retained wherever possible. This is particularly true when towns are growing, as the distance to green areas increases. They are the lungs of any town or city and as such should be carefully protected. In the residential area around the showfield there are no large open places for local children to play. At the moment it is easily accessed from Lodgehill Road, making it a safe place to play and for other locals to enjoy. It is a vital local amenity and to build a relatively high density residential development even on part of the field would be to change the nature of the area completely. There will always be pressure to build on central green spaces and we feel the Highland Council should have the foresight to protect this site, as a valuable green asset. If not, Nairn will end up one large housing development with little green space to enjoy, except for those areas adjacent to the seaside. This would be a sad legacy and destroy what is currently a pleasant town.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Our client, the Cardrona Charitable Trust, owns approximately 14 hectares of land allocated for Mixed Use as part of IN24. It is noted that the detailed planning policy for this area is embodied within the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief. The provisions of this Supplementary Planning Guidance were supported at the time of the relevant consultation particularly as this allocates the land for a mixture of elderly care provision accommodation, large plot single house developments and footpath and river viewing /picnic areas. In view of this favourable allocation we will shortly continue with the formal pre-application procedures commenced in November 2010 and bring forward more detailed proposals for the land. This includes undertaking the necessary environmental assessments in support. We trust that in doing so any planning application lodged will not be delayed by the finalisation of the West Link Road proposal, which our client supports in its current form.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Solution to sewerage problem (assumed), creation of employment (assumed)

Representation

I wish to comment on the proposed plans for Inver Moray Firth in particular in the Fort Augustus area. My main concerns for the planned new houses are: 1. There is already a sewage problem here. 2. There is no employment for so many new people.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

[redacted] Re: your letter dated October 2013 INNER MORAY FIRTH CONSULTATION IN75 11 December 2013 Dear Sirs The IMFLDP instructs me that development of the above land IN75 must be in accordance with planning permission 09/00231/FULIN. I do not agree with that:- Firstly, On the Resaurie Road (Caulfield Road North) it was previously enough space for two cars to pass one another without issue. To demonstrate that I attach Photo CAR ON ROAD GOOGLE 2008 (obtained via download from Google). Whereas, adhering to your suggested benchmark planning permission in the IMFLDP, the road is now narrowed in width and it is no longer possible for two cars to pass, they have to reverse on the road to find a passing place. Further, many cyclists and pedestrians still use the road, and this lack of useable road space is a concern. There is barely enough room for a car and cyclist. I attach the photo "CYCLIST ON ROAD". I also refer to email dated 17 October 2012 from Tim Stott to Malcolm Macleod, where he explains that the philosophy supporting the development of site IN75 was that any issues arising were to be managed, because they were "local" issues. In my view, if the local plan recognised Caulfield Road North as part of the National Cycle network, and that is also the main route connecting this area to the new UHI Beechwood Campus, then what happens on the site IN75 is important to both the locals and the wider public from a strategic point of view. The issues raised are therefore not local, and the presumption with planning permission 09/00231/FULIN should not be driving the local plan consultation process. Secondly, It is recorded in process for some considerable time that this situation surrounding the road/footpath was causing some concern. Whereas the Highland Council IMFLDP document produced in spring 2012 "Inverness City and Fringe" appears to ignore that fact entirely:- At 7.11 the document actually makes a virtue of the planning permission 09/00231/FULIN, classifying it as the "significant pro" in the promotion of the site in the IMFLDP. That is clearly in error, a detriment to useable road width and thereby safety directly attributed to a planning permission cannot represent a "significant pro" - that certainly does not represent a sustainable development. Further, in response to a petition signed by nearly 100 people directly who were concerned and directly affected by this loss of road space, Highland Council claim this reduction in useable road space is actually an improvement for the area, as it encourages vehicles to slow down. However given they conducted zero consultation on that - how can Highland Council understand the matter? For example, the road is used by Tractors with trailers for Farm access, Oil deliveries by 30 tonne trucks, coal deliveries and home parcel delivery by 7.5 tonne trucks. Many people at Resaurie have vans for work, there is also regular towing of horse box trailers using the road for access and horse riders. Therefore, even if the speed is reduced, the problem of reduced road space persists. In the case of this road, the vehicle is not merely 'a visitor' where the residential status must be enhanced and public transport encouraged. That is the wrong approach. Conclusion Highland Council in their local plan process continue to promote and allocate the land as suitable for housing, yet during that time, the road, a publically adopted asset that was previously capable of allowing two way traffic flow, was narrowed to a single track road. The reliance on that planning permission as a 'pro' is not appropriate as in practical terms it represents a "con" - before anyone even occupies a house on that site, the wider area experiences a detriment. That does not represent the pursuit of sustainable development planning. Yours sincerely Carol Christie

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Resaurie North IN75 (H58) no longer allocated for housing

Representation

[redacted] Highland Council Development planning Glenurquhart Road Inverness IV3 5NX Re: your letter dated October 2013 INNER MORAY FIRTH CONSULTATION IN75 29 November 2013
Dear Sirs I question the promotion of the site Resaurie North (H58) IN75 as a realistic continuing contribution to the land supply on the following grounds:- GROUND ONE – “rolling over” I refer to email 26 July 2012 where Tim Stott Highland Council explains to Paul Bova the site IN75 (H58) was allocated for development from the early 1990’s. Also the site was not included in the 2004 public inquiry and would have been rolled over in the IMFLDP as an undeveloped allocation from a previous plan, and also by 2010 benefitted from a grant of planning. Timeline and discussion If we refer to the Local Plan Map in 1994 supplied by Tim Stott, the Resaurie site IN75 was at that time part of a larger site (ref 6.1.3 c) extending to 4.8 hectares, upon which it was suggested 72 Houses was appropriate. The policies at that time required that to develop that site, the Resaurie Road (substandard in width) had to be upgraded. I attach the my first photo file entitled “Resaurie Historical” which records most of that site as it was then where obviously this entire area was open fields/farmland. (The building on site was demolished in 2010). In addition to the flooding in the photo, the land further left in front of the building was also prone to flooding. (Evidence of a large water body was subsequently acknowledged in an amphibian report conducted in respect of the North site). That larger site was then divided into two sites around 1998 in the deposit draft as “Resaurie North” and “Resaurie South”. To show that in approximate terms I now attach my second photo file entitled “Resaurie Historical Division” As can be seen, the flooded land, and the land that extended in front of the building was separated from the higher land. The preferred view I suppose would have been to build on the better land away from the flooding. The South site was allocated for 32 houses, and the North site (what is now IN75) did not carry any suggested number of houses. The Local Plan also continued to note the access constraints that in order to develop the North site, the Resaurie Road still had to be upgraded. However a new option was added where it was possible to develop the North site by taking access from the South site/Murray Road. The approximate location is marked on the photo as “phase 1 access” 68 Houses were subsequently built on the higher South site in 2004, while the North site remained undeveloped. However, the original allocation of 72 for the combined larger site had effectively been met by 2004. Indeed, Highland Council were on notice of problems with the North Site in 2004 by the Public Local Inquiry Volume 2 where Reporter Janet M McNair states at 23.14.15 "The fact that the Culloden House and Resaurie North sites, which are allocated in the adopted plan, remain undeveloped, suggests they may be ineffective" While I do not know the reasoning behind that observation, for the purposes of my letter, I would think the noted constraints would lead to a situation where developing the North site would take considerable investment, therefore any allocation suggesting the site was suitable for development for housing would likely attract an element of over development to recoup such any investment. The Highland Council’s Draft Housing Land Audit December 2005 at page 79 lists the site not in its category of effective sites, rather it is in the category of “Constrained” sites where the infrastructure issues are still present. Notably though, a figure of 60 houses has appeared as suitable for the North site. The logic supporting the allocation of the site is further in question given the Local Plan adopted in 2006 contains an explanation at 2.24 that the supply of housing was met in the area - the completion of established targets was expected by 2010. Yet again the site is included in the Local Plan with no suggested number of properties. Having set out the timeline and notable events up to 2006 I want to return to the explanation provided by Tim Stott that the site would have been rolled over into the IMFLDP as an undeveloped site and also in 2010 benefitted from a grant of planning. I want to drill a little deeper into the circumstances surrounding the land audits supporting the local plan:- Highland Council’s Draft Housing Land Audit December 2005 referred to above which at page 79 as stated lists the site not as effective, rather it is “Constrained”. If we then move forward to the “Housing Land Audit 2007 Local Plan Sites” at page 8, the North site still carries the infrastructure constraint (and there is also now an ownership constraint) but suddenly the site is now not constrained - rather it is “effective”. There also is the notable additional aspiration for 107 units on site. The Housing Land Audit 2005 explains that to assess a site as being effective, it must be demonstrated that within the period under consideration the site will be available for the construction of housing being free of constraints. However, that does not appear to be so in the instant case:- Actually, on the face of it there is no good reason why the site should be effective in 2007 because the same constraints (and the additional ownership constraint) prevail. However, it is noteworthy these changes in 2007 coincide with Barratt submitting a planning application 07/00542/FULIN for 107 Houses on the North site. (That application was considered a good idea by the planning officials who attached a recommendation for committee approval). The fact that the application was subsequently refused in 2008 is perhaps of less significance than its existence per say, which provided the benchmark from which a further

application could be measured as allegedly acceptable, which is the approval Tim Stott refers to in 2010. Evidence that the site was rolled over into the IMFLDP as an undeveloped site? Subject to a freedom of information request (and a subsequent appeal through the Scottish Information Commissioner) Highland Council (in broad agreement with the email of Tim Stott) explains there are no communications speaking to the reasoning why the site was continually allocated. Given the numerous events above, it is highly surprising that all this happened on its own, without any recorded human communication, particularly the change from constrained to effective. This begs the question – in the absence of any development planning explanation, is this site a realistic and appropriate continuing contribution to the supply of housing? The events since Barratt built phase 1 is the causal link to everything that has ensued from that point forward. It would appear the site was not rolled forward on its merits as an undeveloped site previously allocated for housing (a status which is highly questionable) rather it is only now an effective site if developed by Barratt, and accordingly the continuing contribution of the site and it being left in the development plan are called into question. GROUND TWO – “Infill” The Highland Council in their precognitions in support of the adoption of the 2006 Local Plan document “THC Issue 13 Green Wedges” state – “4.22 Existing development at Resaurie is fragmented, low density and traditional in form. It is characteristic of the urban edge - adjoins a long established public access route - and is quite separate from the predominantly public sector housing at Smithton. This pattern gives a measure of transition from the built up urban area towards the Ashton campus site identified in the Action Area. 4.23 Local residents derive considerable amenity from this situation, as does the wider public” Therefore the setting of Resaurie has historically been viewed in development planning process as an important benchmark, intertwined with green wedge areas and Ashton Farm. Therefore when considering the allocation of the site IN75 for housing, if we actually consider that in the proper context 1300 are proposed a short distance away, there is no justification for the cramming of 64 houses on a site which previously performed the established function on the urban edge. What this demonstrates is that the assumption by Tim Stott and in the IMFLDP that site IN75 is a “natural infill site” part of the “urban area of Culloden” is wrong:– According to the photo attached, the area was open land at the point of allocation of the larger site – it is not part of Culloden. However, if it is considered now as a “natural infill site” then the scale form and density of the housing that is proposed adjacent to my property, will be set in accordance with the South site phase 1, rather than the proper setting of our property that is embodied in the urban edge recognition above. That point, and indeed the reliance placed on the phase 1 providing the presumption for the development of the North site, is demonstrated by reference to the planning application 07/00542/FULIN where permission was sought for 107 houses and flats. At item 2.1 in the planning report PLI 124/08 it is explained that An approval of Reserved Matters was granted for 68 Houses to the east of the application site per consent 05/00353/REMIN and for the houses known as Rowan Grove/Court/Way. (There are no reserved matters for the North site). Further, at 7.3 it is explained that the Local Plan identifies the (North) site for residential purposes in terms of Policy 97 (V) with no restriction on the number of residential units to be developed on the site, and it is alleged that given the density in the first phase of the development and in Smithton, the mix of houses and flats is acceptable at the densities proposed, since it allegedly helps to provide for a mix of densities across the wider area. At 7.9 it is explained that 2 storey houses have already been approved in the Phase 1 scheme. That report is clearly wrong having regard to the urban transition status and the photo attached. In conclusion of this ground You are opening up my property to a comprehensive loss of residential amenity by placing immediately adjacent extensive high density two storey houses adjacent. Furthermore, you do not have any justification to do this, because you are unable to provide any reasoning for the principle of development for the site. To suggest the site was allocated as “urban infill” is a leap of faith. Conclusion of this letter While the Highland Council take the view that the successive inclusion of the site in the local plan process continued to justify the principle of development, actually that is an entirely subjective view on their part. The reality is I was not notified the site was proposed in 1994 as suitable for 72 Houses, nor was I notified in that context on each “rolling over” occasion. That is exemplified by the fact that I reacted instantly in 2007 to the notification served by Barratt, and have not acted in a taciturn manner or acquiesced since. This notification served on me dated October 2013 (which accordingly I am now responding to) is the first I have been served in the context of reference to the site and your development planning process. The above suggests following the division of the original site, the North site was no longer a meaningful contribution to the supply of land because the constraints suggest it can only be developed from phase 1, and the feasibility of achieving that is in some question. The site as an allocation from a previous local plan may be put to better use, for example, as a recreational/urban edge open space or woodland/wetland. Yours sincerely Carol Christie Note The Documents referenced are all Highland Council documents and can be obtained from the planning department.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Please see previous comments

Representation

[redacted] I wish to add to my previous comments. I made reference to planning report PL1124/08 and the local plan aspiration that the Resaurie North site would produce development, based on the philosophy adopted at that time. At 7.3 and 7.4 in that planning report, the development of the North site is apparently based on a philosophy that buildings will tie-in with the ridges of the existing phase 1 scheme. At 8.1 it also states; "The proposed flats have been reduced from 5 to 3 storeys and given the location within the site below the embankment on the east boundary, can be considered appropriate. On balance, the proposal would be acceptable". In that regard, I attach photo entitled "Barnview 14 September 2013". Phase one is visible in the background/behind the trees. It is noteworthy that the ridge line of the most recent property under construction in the foreground effectively obscures the tree line and the ridge lines of phase 1. Under your presumption for housing additional properties such as that would be placed directly adjacent to my property. When they are built, they will be the significant and dominant feature, a continuous line of ridges on the sky line. Therefore, development of the North site cannot be contained within the existing landscape, and the philosophy supporting the building work has failed to adhere to the building lines. It has also in effect re-written and set a presumption in the Local plan, where the building lines on the North site have been permitted to 'break out' from the previous setting below the hill on the east. The horizon no longer has trees or a hill, rather it is obscured full height by ridges. That also impacts in equal measure on the other neighbours here. The forward impact is on the wider area; given these buildings are overtly prominent from the public road, people using the national cycle path route to the UHI via Caulfield Road North etc. Beyond, this it also impacts on your proposed development at Ashton Farm. Unfortunately, the Highland Council IMFLDP document produced in spring 2012 "Inverness City and Fringe" appears to ignore such relevant local plan issues:- At 7.11 the document makes a virtue of the planning permission 09/00231/FULIN, classifying it as the "significant pro" in the promotion of the site. Whereas, the issues arising, directly attributed to a planning permission, cannot represent a "significant pro". To the contrary, that is a significant "con". I therefore return to my previous comments that Resaurie had historically been considered as an important traditional urban edge setting in the context of Ashton Farm and the adjoining Green Wedges. Yet, under the IMFLDP consultation these areas are now, for some inexplicable reason, divorced. For example:- Ashton Farm IN82 is 'rolled into' the IMFLDP, agreed at the PED meeting 21 September 2013 item 11 - 4.3; "The HwLDP includes some development sites that lie within the Inner Moray Firth (IMF) area. These sites have been tested through an independent Examination and so the principle of development has been accepted. The vast majority of these sites have been "rolled forward" into the Proposed Plan with little or no change. It is therefore intended that any Proposed Plan content that was previously approved through the HwLDP should not be reexamined through the IMFLDP process. At the Examination stage of the plan we will ask Reporters to acknowledge that the principle of development of these sites has already been accepted, and that only the Plan content that was not previously approved through the HwLDP should be subject to Examination through the IMFLDP process. Minor changes such as the mix of uses or phasing would be open to comment. Some of the same sites now have an extant planning permission, for example at Delnies, Tornagrain and Stratton. It is intended to take a similar approach to these sites." Therefore, the consultation is already closed down in the context of the IMFLDP, where there can only be "minor changes". People are being consulted on sites in the IMFLDP for the first time, but other sites are coming in from the HwLDP which have already been settled. That is not logical, nor is it democratic. Had you considered IN75 in the HwLDP you would have avoided this detriment. Highland Council should not be asking for a ruling from the reporter for "agreed development in principle". This is at best a piecemeal approach and not pursuing sustainable development planning, giving rise to a detriment in amenity. FURTHER POINT ARISING Your IMFLDP instructs me development of the above site is to be in accordance with planning permission 09/00231/FULIN for 64 houses. I do not agree:- Timeline Event – 5 March 2010 Planning permission for 64 houses is granted in respect of application 09/00231/FULIN Event - 9 May 2011 Highland Council received complaint drawings submitted in support of application 09/00231/FULIN were in error, where our property had been misrepresented and 'inflated' by approximately 8 feet, and other existing properties had also been inflated. Highland Council failed to provide a meaningful response at that time. Event - 3 May 2012 Eventually the fact that such discrepancies had been present during the course of the application 09/00231/FULIN was finally disclosed and accepted in an email from Allan Todd to the developer, where he explains in submitting their planning application (as a result of these discrepancies) the developer may have misled the planning committee with regard to their various assessments, the planning officer and the neighbours. Event Spring 2012 IMFLDP advises development of IN75 is now to be in accordance with 09/00231/FULIN and is promoted on that basis Event 8 June 2012

Letters from Chief Executive on the matter of discrepancies in 09/00231/FULIN. He advises that Highland Council, rather than revoke planning consent 09/00231/FULIN, are to invite the developer to submit a further application for planning. Event - 2 November 2012 Developer submits 12/04232/FULIN - application to vary consent 09/00231/FULIN. Event - 26 March 2013 Planning report for 12/04232/FULIN explains; 9.5 "It is these issues that committee needs to consider. The principle of the development is already clearly established through the allocation of the site for housing development in the Inverness Local Plan, and through the planning permission granted in 2010. Indeed, the development is already well progressed, apart from the houses at the southern end of the site. This is not an opportunity to revisit the original consent". 10.1 "The application relates solely to plots 23-34 to the southern boundary of the housing site and the only change to the house details is to reduce the roof pitches and to lower the ground levels which together result in a reduction in the ridge heights of these houses by some 600mm. The principle of the development already granted planning permission in terms of consent 09/00231/FULIN is not altered by this proposal and does not form part of the consideration. The material considerations in the context of this current application are the design changes and the extent to which the reduction in the roof pitches and ground levels is detrimental to visual amenity or affects surface water drainage/flood risk. It is considered that this is an appropriate solution which addresses the inaccuracies of the original site survey for these particular plots and maintains the expected impacts on neighbouring properties. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission is granted". Event - 26 March 2013 Application 12/04232/FULIN to vary consent 09/00231/FULIN was approved where committee resolved to grant planning - without decision being put to a vote. Event - 20 May 2013 A Highland Council report conducted by the TECS Department entitled "Barratt Homes Reconciliation of Level Information" continued to consider the impact of these discrepancies by providing a site wide analysis of the changes in floor levels. It is noteworthy that on page nine they state; "In trying to balance the needs to address the opposing constraints of flood risk and residential amenity, some compromise has to be reached. The design approach used by Barratt's is reasonable and appears to take account of the decision to reduce the level of the houses closest to the existing houses..." Discussion of timeline and events (i) The letter 8 June 2012 explains in effect that to deliver the 64 houses as originally intended 09/00231/FULIN needs the support of an application to vary, due to the fact that the existing properties at Resaurie were misrepresented. The requirement for a further application means that planning permission, in effect, does not exist for 64 houses. The explanation from the planning report 26 March 2013 is notably unambiguous - the application to vary was not an opportunity to revisit that original consent. That is in agreement with the drawing "Location Plan A3952 P (-) 21" (submitted in support of 12/04232/FULIN) where the red lined area pertaining to the application entitled "site boundary" does not include the existing development 09/00231/FULIN. The decision notice issued in respect of 12/04232/FULIN also contains instruction to submit a notice of initiation of development for this permission. Therefore, under these circumstances, 09/00231/FULIN will not necessarily deliver 64 houses:- Original application 09/00231/FULIN and 12/04232/FULIN are disconnected entities. The concerns explained in the email dated 3 May 2012 (pointing out the committee were potentially misled in terms of the information presented and their respective assessments) cannot be addressed by 12/04232/FULIN. Members resolved to grant 09/00231/FULIN based on errors of fact. Had such discrepancies been disclosed at that time, a different decision may well have been reached, because the decision is not taken solely on the proposal in terms of ridge levels and ground levels based on a few section drawings representing one boundary. Whereas, under 12/04232/FULIN one boundary is all that can be considered. Actually, the approved drawings under 09/00231/FULIN and 12/04232/FULIN permit very similar lines of vision and ridge comparisons. whereas, the fundamental error was in the representation of the existing properties. (That is accepted in internal communication) A height discrepancy of eight feet on our property also affects any comparison view across the site toward phase 1. Under 12/04232/FULIN, only the properties immediately adjacent are amended, leaving those properties forward of phase 1 in situ and not corrected. I already explained this under my comments on the building lines not fitting within the existing area. Drawing all this together The allocation of the site IN75 for 64 houses in the IMFLDP (where development is to be in accordance with 09/00231/FULIN) is not competent:- There are errors of fact presented under 09/00231/FULIN. Further, there is a misrepresentation with regards to the relationship/presentation of the existing setting of Resaurie, that planning permission and Phase 1. Additional uncertainty is introduced through planning application 12/04232/FULIN and 64 houses will not necessarily be produced. (ii) Contrary to the belief in the planning report 26 March 2013, the existence of 09/00231/FULIN does not provide a "principle of development" for any application to vary. Actually, the opposite is probably the case, in that the issues arising (the requirement to deal with discrepancies) exposes a more fundamental problem:- The TECS survey dated 20 May 2013 reveals development is effectively dependent on the "opposing constraints of flood risk and residential amenity" being resolved. Indeed, firstly on the levels issue, there have been comprehensive alterations since application 09/00231/FULIN was presented. These are not actually limited to plots 23-34 as claimed under 12/04232/FULIN. To demonstrate this, I attach PDF document entitled "Alterations in levels 2009 – 2013". These issues arise certainly in part due to the mandatory approach for developer management of flooding which is the required approach to ensure the building work can progress. There is no scope for avoidance of building in an area prone to flooding. The development management process in respect of IN75 is in taking decisions on issues which should be considered as part of the local plan consultation. Yours sincerely Carol Christie

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number 03963 Name Carole MacLeay Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.134

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

I strongly oppose this area being built on.

Representation

This area has always been integral to the Conon community.It is used for sports, mainly football and also for community fetes and gala days.It is the only public grass area within the village which can be used for these events.I am also deeply concerned about the extra traffic that this and other new developments would generate. A major change to the exit on to main Inverness road would have to be adopted.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 04286 Name CAROLINE FRASER Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN44 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduction in the number of houses allocated on this site.

Representation

Reduction in the number of houses allocated to this site. Feel the proposed planning is over development of this sit. There is also a large problem with regard to drainage, with water building up at the bottom of field and pouring into the burn this I feel is not acceptable.

Allocated to South Inverness IN44 Inshes Small Holdings (north)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Consider these comments on the development potential at Muir of Ord along the Corrie Road. We have recently been asked to prepare a planning appraisal for this site but in the light of the development plan progress, thought it important to flag up our interest in this site. The area we would like to see included within the developable area of the village is located on the west side of Muir of Ord on the Corrie Road at NH 52057 49585 (centred). It is immediately outside the area identified in the Development Plan for expansion and is 4.66 hectares of former commercial woodland (now felled) and between the existing housing at Croc na Boull, Ardnagrask Mains, Rowan Cottage and The Policies – all of which is existing residential development which strings out westwards along the south side of Corrie Road. The plot is well served by public transport with access to the station and buses by foot or cycle with links to the airport and the national railway system from Inverness and so it can help to achieve the Council’s objective of: promoting a positive and innovative approach to master planning new developments that contribute towards reducing the need to travel and encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport providing for the development of places that contribute to increasing healthy lifestyles, opportunities for quality open space provision and access to enjoy the outdoors; and protecting and enhancing the green network within and around settlements leading to a cohesive and fit for purpose network of green spaces and opportunities for active travel. It is close to the village and the amenities it provides (and has the potential to provide more in terms of local shops, cafes etc) and so any small scale development (whether residential or tourism based) in this area would not only be of a low environmental impact because of its lack of reliance on the car, but also help to introduce more local economic activity in the village and thus contribute towards local efforts to revive and enhance the historic building stock in the village centre. In particular we are keen to see a development here that would create a higher beneficial economic impact by seeking to target a higher spending element of the community to contrast with the relatively lower cost accommodation that is currently being built on the west side of the village (development plan plots 15). I would therefore like you to consider including this plot of land as a transitional development area which combines low density high quality development that creates a transitional character area between the village and the more sparsely developed hinterland. Such transitional development would have to meet high design standards and reintroduce a new vernacular for the village which, outside the 19th century core, has rather lost its way in design terms. It would merge into the countryside rather come to an abrupt stop as existing development along the village boundary does. The existing extent of development along The Corrie Road lacks local distinctiveness once the road leaves the station area, but most properties are well set back from the lane and so it is the rural lane, with plenty of tree cover from mature gardens and mossy covered drystone walls which make a positive contribution towards local character and this could be retained in this development plot. However this area has been excluded from the development plan, despite its clear advantages in terms of proximity to the village centre, the railway station and its ability to attract a higher spending resident or visitor. I suggest that development in this location is not only desirable and will help to meet the council’s objectives of sustainability but it should also set out to meet the following criteria: Retention and management of existing woodland (allowing for building regulations) Introduction of a new vernacular style of building using a combination of traditional and modern materials and referencing traditional building styles. Renewable sources to be used where practical Retention of wildlife areas such as ponds Small scale and high quality residential housing of less than 10 plots, or small scale self catering tourist accommodation (both can make a positive economic contribution to the village) The historic heart of Muir of Ord is suffering from the effects of economic decline and poor building maintenance and this has had an impact on the quality of the historic building stock in the village centre. I am keen to see more innovative new development that brings in high standards of sustainability, a reduced reliance on car travel and possibly a contribution toward economic development in the form of tourism. This in turn will help bring in the funds necessary to see better stewardship of the historic buildings in the village centre. The proximity of this plot to the local amenities means that it can make a positive contribution towards development and create a more considered transition with the countryside beyond than an abrupt halt on the edge of a housing estate. I would therefore be grateful if you would consider including this plot as a future possible developable area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We would like the village envelope boundary and residential zoning area to be extended slightly at SP1

Representation

We are supportive of the current IMFLP in respect of its provisions for Strathpeffer – and specifically at Kinellan. We would respectfully request however, that the village boundary is very slightly enlarged as shown on the accompanying plan to reach up to the existing public road. It is not currently included - reasons cited are its close proximity to the Listed Kinellan Farmhouse and to Loch Kinellan. However, we would seek permission to extend the village boundary and residential zone just a little further up to the lane but behind Kinellan Farmhouse (Attachment 1), for the following reason – we wish to restore the farmhouse to its original aspect of a farmhouse and affiliated farm buildings (Attachment 2.) The property was originally set in front of traditional steadings when we moved to the farmhouse in 1994, however these were subsequently demolished by their owner and replaced by a house of modern design. We would like the opportunity to reinstate the aggregation of farmhouse and supporting buildings by securing permission for a single development north-east of the rear of the farmhouse which replicates the stabling design and appearance of the original buildings, but using materials that will create an energy efficient home for a young family member who wishes to remain working in the Highland energy industry. The area was inspected by a planning consultant in the summer (unable to contact him today to get his permission to attribute this to him by name in this submission. He commented: ‘There is precedence for subsidiary buildings (in a cottage style), outbuildings and stables, coach houses, for instance to be associated with such a house and in this connection the new build could be designed accordingly....complementing the design....also acting as a visual link to the new development.’ The ground slopes away down from the farmhouse at this location, indeed it would be hard to see from the road or from any approach to the farmhouse and it is our intention to reflect entirely the style and aspect of the original buildings that used to stand to its rear. We take into account the natural habitat at Loch Kinellan and although, as previously stated, there are around 10 family houses more closely located to the loch which is a popular walking spot, we would be happy to commit to no further residential permission to be granted at this location within the village boundary. Also as previously stated, our reason for participating in a community purchase of the loch some years ago was to retain its value as a wildlife habitat and we would not wish to compromise this in any way.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04194 Name Caroline Walford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CR2 Type Change

Comment Changes

I seek change to the final sentence of the paragraph relating to Croy site CR2 due to lack of clarity in the current wording.

Representation

This sentence would read with more clarity as follows: "Development of the site should be phased over the period 2011 to 2031 with development progressing at a prescribed rate of no more than 50 homes delivered in each 5 year period from 2011 to 2021, and 25 homes delivered in each 5 year period from 2021 to 2031". This accurately reflects the phasing set out in the HwLDP.

Allocated to Croy CR2 West of primary school

Customer Number 04194 Name Caroline Walford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

I seek a reduction in the housing capacity of Croy site CR1 from 35 homes to 25 homes

Representation

This site was not included in the HwLDP (though it was included in the 2003 Inverness Local Plan where the slightly smaller area of 1.8 hectares was assigned a capacity of 15 houses). The Highland Council Planning & Development Service published an IMFLDP Housing Land Requirement Background Paper in November 2013. Since the paper was published in the same month as the proposed IMFLDP, it seems reasonable to expect the housing capacity of site CR1 to reflect the guidance set out in this paper. This is not the case. The Background Paper includes a Capacity Calculation Methodology for Housing Sites Not in HwLDP. This methodology gives a density figure for 10 units per hectare "where the settlement/parts of the settlement is characterised by low density development". Parts of Croy are characterised by low density development. The 40-house development completed by Scotia Homes in 2008 (the most recent large-scale development in the village) was built at a density of 10.3 units per hectare. The individual houses around the south-east corner of site CR2 are built at a similar density, as are those to the south and east of site CR1. Thus, according to the methodology, future developments in the village should be built 10 units per hectare. The appropriate capacity of the 2.5 hectare site CR1 is therefore 25 houses.

Allocated to Croy CR1 East of B9006

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I seek a reduction in the housing capacity of Croy site CR2 from 150 homes to a maximum of 114 homes

Representation

As noted in my comment on Croy site CR1, the Highland Council Planning & Development Service published an IMFLDP Housing Land Requirement Background Paper in November 2013. Since the paper was published in the same month as the proposed IMFLDP, it seems reasonable to expect the housing capacity of site CR2 to reflect the guidance set out in this paper. It does not reflect this guidance. The Methodology attached to the Background Paper states "If the site is allocated in the HwLDP, use this capacity figure unless there have been any changes since the time of adoption, for example ... the area of the site is proposed to change, etc.". There have been two changes since the HwLDP in the case of site CR2. Firstly, the area of the site has changed. The area labelled "Ardgowan" on Map 10 in the HwLDP is a different shape and size to the area marked "CR2" on the map in the IMFLDP. Secondly, the use of the site has changed. The HwLDP states that the "chief use will be residential", whereas the IMFLDP states that uses will be "homes, retail and community". In the case of such changes, the guidance given in the Background Paper is that the site capacity should be reviewed in comparison with the Capacity Calculation Methodology for Housing Sites Not in HwLDP. It sets out the method of doing this, as follows: (1) Use GIS to calculate the site area. The area is given as 15 hectares. (2) Subtract any areas of the site that are clearly undevelopable, for example areas that are constrained by excessive slope, water courses etc. Attachment 1 to this document is a copy of an OS map showing the 1 metre contours of site CR2. Since I don't have access to GIS, I have used other mapping software to arrive at the following areas. The bank marked at "A" is an excessive slope with an area of about 0.8 hectares. The area marked at "B" is a marsh from which the Croy Burn flows towards Loch Flemington and has an area of about 1.2 hectares. It is undevelopable due to its significance as the source of the Croy Burn and also due to the ecological importance and SPA status of Loch Flemington. These two areas total about 2 hectares and reduce the developable area of site CR2 to 13 hectares. Attachment 2 to this document is a copy of a proposed development layout for part of site CR2, which was presented to Croy residents by Scotia Homes. This document shows that Scotia did not intend to develop areas A or B but to leave them as "amenity" areas. I believe that an additional area of the site, marked at "C" on Attachment 1 is also undevelopable because of excessive slope. It has an area of about 0.4 hectares. If this area too is agreed to be undevelopable, then this reduces the developable area of site CR2 to approximately 12.6 hectares. (3) Determine whether the site is suitable for low, medium or high density development. As noted in my comments on site CR1, the Methodology gives a density figure of 10 units per hectare "where the settlement/parts of the settlement is characterised by low density development". Parts of Croy are characterised by low density development. The 40-house development completed by Scotia Homes in 2008 was built at the low density of 10.3 units per hectare. The individual houses around the south-east corner of site CR2 are built at a similar density, as are those to the south and east of site CR1. Thus, according to the methodology, future developments in the village should be built at low density, ie 10 units per hectare. (4) Multiply the potentially developable area of the site by the appropriate density figure to determine the capacity of the site. With a potentially developable area of 12.6 hectares, and a housing density figure of 10 units per hectare, the capacity of site CR2 is therefore 126 residential units. (5) The Methodology states that for Mixed Use sites having three uses, the percentage of site developed as housing should be 70%. Site CR2 has been identified for three uses: homes, retail and community. Applying the 70% rule, the figure of 126 residential units given in (4) above reduces to 88 residential units. Paragraph 4.98 of the IMFLDP states that "allocations in the settlement are primarily focused on housing development", so I doubt that it is envisaged that 30% of the site will be allocated for retail and community use. Nonetheless, some allowance must clearly be made for these stated uses when calculating the amount of land available for housing. If 10% of the developable area of the site is identified for retail and community use, then the area of land available for housing will reduce to 11.34 hectares. At a housing density of 10 units per hectare, the capacity of site CR2 is therefore a maximum of 114 residential units. I submit that the capacity of site CR2 should be carefully reviewed in comparison with the Capacity Calculation Methodology for Housing Sites Not in HwLDP, in compliance with the guidance set out in the Housing Land Requirement Background Paper of November 2013. Should it fail to carry out this review, and to make the appropriate adjustment to the capacity of site CR2, Highland Council Planning Department should be asked to explain why it has chosen not to follow its own newly-published guidance.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The phasing of site CR2 is front-loaded, in that two-thirds of the development is to be completed by 2021, and the remaining one-third of the development by 2031. This contrasts to Tornagrain, where 2.5 times as many homes are built in the second decade compared to the first decade, and where few employment opportunities are created until the period 2021-2026. Table 1 below illustrates this: Table 1: 2011-2016 2016-2021 2021-2026 2026-2031 2031-2036 2036-2041 Residential Units Croy CR2 50 50 25 25 0 0 Tornagrain 344 507 780 885 960 1100 Opportunities for Employment (m2) Retail 1500 0 9000 4500 500 2750 Business 500 0 2500 1750 750 1000 General Industry 0 0 500 300 200 0 Storage & Distribution 0 0 500 300 200 0 Hotel 0 0 2500 1500 0 0 Residential Institutions 0 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 Primary School 0 1418 0 1418 0 2496 The IMFLDP acknowledges in paragraph 4.98 that "local employment opportunities will continue to be limited and strong connections to local employment centres will be important, especially the nearby proposed new settlement of Tornagrain and also the Inverness Airport Business Park". Given the special importance of Tornagrain as a local employment centre, development of site CR2 should be delayed until sufficient employment opportunities in Tornagrain have been created. In the absence of sufficient employment opportunities in Tornagrain and at the Airport Business Park, residents of Croy will have to seek employment in Inverness or Nairn. The Reporters to the HwLDP determined that development of Croy was sustainable because local employment would be available at Tornagrain and the Airport Business Park. They rejected the proposed expansion of Culloden Moor on the grounds that "housing development on the site would be likely to increase commuting. This would not accord with Scottish Planning Policy". Culloden Moor is much closer to Inverness than Croy, and if the Reporters regarded it as being an excessive commuting distance from Inverness, then Croy would certainly be too remote to be considered sustainable as a commuter dormitory for Inverness. In order for new residents of Croy to be able to find employment in Tornagrain, I seek a delay to the development phasing of site CR2 as shown in Table 2 below: Table 2 Residential Units 2011-2016 2016-2021 2021-2026 2026-2031 2031-2036 2036-2041 Croy CR2 50 50 25 25 Tornagrain 344 507 780 885 960 1100 If this is not possible, because the development period for Croy would extend beyond the end of 2031, then I seek an alternative (though less appropriate) development phasing of site CR2 as shown in Table 3 below. Table 3 Residential Units 2011-2016 2016-2021 2021-2026 2026-2031 2031-2036 2036-2041 Croy CR2 25 25 50 50 Tornagrain 344 507 780 885 960 1100 The attachment to this representation shows Tables 1, 2 and 3 above properly set out for clarity.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04087 Name Caroline Wright Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR3 2 Homes and DR6 Type Change

Comment Changes

I do not want any more properties going up in West/East Lewiston/Drumnadrochit

Representation

I am completely opposed to any more buildings being built in West Lewiston. The last ten years has seen this village grow more than twice-fold with new properties. This has lost the very essence of what was once a beautiful village. Also the proposed site DR 3 will lose the boundary that exists between Drumnadrochit and West Lewiston that I was led to believe from yourselves would always remain. This area is in danger of becoming a town rather than a quaint village that attracts a good deal of visitors from around the world. This in turn would be bad news for B&B's and hotels in this area.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit General General

Customer Number 04110 Name Caspian UK Organisation Caspian UK

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Scott Mackay Mackay Planning

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN85 - West of Eastfield Way Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

The site has been refused consent twice now for alternative uses in order to protect the city centre. Inverness needs good quality available employment land kept for Class 4 and 5 uses and no other uses. This development of this site should only be for business/office uses or other uses compatible with the completion of the business park. Maintaining the Business allocation is important to achieving this. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) requires planning authorities to ensure that there is a range and choice of marketable sites and locations for business allocated in development plans. This site meets those requirements and can be well serviced and brought forward within the local plan period. It is accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.

Allocated to East Inverness IN85 West of Eastfield Way

Customer Number 04081 Name Catherine Collins Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 49 Type Change

Comment Changes

Rejection of planning for house/development Re-zoned to parkland

Representation

The following reasons -Provision of suitable access and transportation (including road safety, parking issues, effect on pedestrians and cyclists, and amount of traffic generated). The creation of hard standing areas would adversely effect the Adequacy of infrastructure (e.g. sewerage, drainage and water) into the existing rivers which are at capacity. Also Suitability of the site for the proposed development (e.g. contamination/flooding issues). Environmental Impact – such as pollution and contamination also the Impact on nature conservation as the area has a rich and diverse population of wildlife.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04081 Name Catherine Collins Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Change

Comment Changes

I object to the proposed development of Bogbain Wood in the strongest possible way. This is natural woodland and was pivotal in my families decision to settle in this area. It is part of the natural beauty and landscape of this area.

Representation

I refer you to the comments above. My property is adjacent to the proposed site and I will be directly impacted by the proposed building of any of the 75 houses.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04081 Name Catherine Collins Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference I 47 Type Change

Comment Changes

reversion to previous use as a community centre

Representation

The needs of an area (social or leisure facilities) which are non existent for a area with over 900 homes. This area needs to be ring fenced for the community as we have enough houses.

Allocated to South Inverness IN47 North East of Milton of Leys School

Customer Number 01669 Name Catriona Johnson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN82 Ashton Farm and adjoining land Type Change

Comment Changes

Allow for development of a large district park only - no further development of housing for the area

Representation

For Inverness to survive (and emerge successfully) the current global economic downturn, it must capitalize on its tourism assets. Its well-established hospitality industry will help provide long-term employment as long as it remains a tourist destination. It is, therefore, essential to protect, not only the beautiful surrounding landscape, but also the city itself. Many councils would envy open farmland and green spaces so close to a city. These must be retained preventing further urban sprawl and allowing Inverness to "breathe" and maintain its image as a "green" city. Almost 2500 houses already have planning permission in the neighbouring Stratton Farm development. Whilst new towns demand the concomitant new infrastructure, frequently development areas result in further pressure on often already overstretched services. Developer contributions cannot finance total "new builds" merely temporary additions and modifications and, since dependant on house sales, rarely materialize until a major part of the development is completed. Further development in this area will, not only put pressure on schools, surgeries, roads etc., but also exacerbate the flood risk - presently the open fields can act as a sink; the proposed creation of a park, whilst highly welcomed, would not replace these acres of fields. Whilst there is a need to identify further areas for housing, brownfield sites must be developed first. The local authority must ensure developers build in those areas which already have planning permission (rather than sitting on sites waiting for house prices to rise) before releasing more sites to them.

Allocated to East Inverness IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land

Customer Number 04044 Name Catriona Meiklejohn Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Deletion of site CB3

Representation

We would like it noted that the playing field in the middle of the village was gifted to the community in the 1960's and enclose a copy of the documents transferring the responsibility of the Playing Field to Conon Bridge Amenities Association in 1972. We ask why is it appearing still on the Inner Moray Firth development Plan as zoned for housing? We had previously objected to this when the plan was first presented and yet it remains as it was. The school grounds and MUGA are an entirely different matter. It has been suggested to us that we don't need a playing field since the school facilities can be used. Unlike the school facilities the playing field does not have to be booked. It is free and open space and indeed is used for a variety of purposes, from football to walking dogs to children playing to local community events. It must remain as part of community requirements, especially given that the Government is anxious that children should be more active outdoors. All four of our Highland Councillors intend to back our intention that it should remain a green feature of the village, with some minor improvements in the future to ensure its continued uses. With further housing being built in other parts of our community it is even more important that we have this amenity. We have to cater for the needs of our young people here rather than have them travel to other towns and villages which have had the foresight to provide such open spaces.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 03080 Name Catriona Meiklejohn Organisation Conon Bridge Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Mixed Use Sites

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Conon Bridge Community Council would like area CB3 to be removed from the IMFDP to protect the current Playing Field and Car Park.

Representation

The Community Council have proof that the field was gifted to the village in 1972 being transferred to the care of Conon Bridge Amenities Association. The field is in regular use by the community and beyond and is a vital part of the community. The new school outdoor facilities may be there but the field is open and free. There is little enough facilities in the village for play and as the population is growing it's even more important to save it for future generations. With the amount of other sites indicated on the IMFDP there will be fewer green areas within the village of Conon Bridge and it is vital that the village keeps its Playing Field. It's also important that a precedent should not be set in which areas of green can be seized in order to build houses at the expense of local feelings. With the drive to encourage children and adults to be more active, these green areas are vital to any community.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 04044 Name Catriona Meiklejohn Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.134, Mixed use

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like this area to be removed from the proposed planning development. I do not want to see the present Playing Field and Car park developed or moved with in this area. The back of this site could be used for community use ie allotments, community garden but no housing.

Representation

The playing field was gifted to the village and there is documentation to prove that it was handed over to the Conon Ammenities Association in 1972. This area is in the centre of the village and should remain in its current location where it can be seen from the main road and be kept as green space in the village. The playing field is used for community activities such as Gala days, local football training and games, children playing at the park and the community using it as a recreation area. The area is free to all users and is a fantastic area for the village to have. The car park adjacent to the playing field is used everyday by people shopping in the village, using the newly opened Station and by the church when it has services and funerals. Being situated where it is means it is in a prime sight for all areas of the centre of the village. On the proposed IMFDP there are 5 large areas earmarked for housing development. In a village the size of Conon this will give the village plenty room to develop without having to remove the existing playing field and developing that area. This is something that the community does not want.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 04402 Name Cawdor Castle Ltd Organisation Cawdor Castle Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Alistair Davidson Bowlts Chartered Surveyors

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.90 - 4.96

Reference CD11 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Confirm continued support of the inclusion of this site within the Plan.

Allocated to Cawdor CD11 Old Smithy

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The mixed use allocation at Delnies, Nairn under site reference NA6 is fully supported. Whilst no objection is made to allocations NA8 and NA9 at South Nairn, the Plan should be altered to permit development west of and adjacent to Delnies NA6 in the circumstances where allocations NA8 and/or NA9 are unable to meet land supply requirements. This change could be inserted at the end of paragraph 4.37 where a potential restriction to the long term land supply at Nairn South is identified.

Representation

The reasons for this proposed change are as follows:- 1. This will allow the Council to meet its land requirements should the development at South Nairn be restricted due to the access issues that have been documented in para 4.37 of the proposed plan (as above) and also in the adopted Highland Wide Local Development Plan paragraphs 14.12.1 and 14.13.1. 2. The land at Delnies to the west of NA6 is in a relatively advantageous position with regards to access being situated adjacent to the A96 (T) and could be developed without the need for a bypass. 3. Scope for additional development to the west of NA6 at Delnies is identified in the adopted Highland Wide Local Development Plan (Policy 17) and indeed the plans for the NA6 allocation currently being prepared allow for potential further expansion to the west.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Full support is given to the mixed-use site allocation reference NA6 Delnies on Page 66 of the Plan. There is also no objection in principle to the site allocation reference nos. NA8 Nairn South and NA9 Nairn South (long term) on Page 67 of the Plan. However, in the event that there is an issue with housing units being delivered out of Nairn South in the short to medium term as well as in the longer term on account of the well documented transport/access/network capacity issues associated with it, flexible consideration should be given in the Plan to allowing land west of Delnies to come forward to address the likely resultant shortfall in the housing land supply. Such narrative could be inserted at the end of Paragraph 4.37 on Page 64 of the Plan.

Representation

Justification for the suggested addition can be found in Paragraph 14.12.1 and Paragraph 14.13.1 - Policy 18 Nairn South on Page 56 of the adopted Highland wide Local Development Plan which highlights the potential access and traffic capacity issues associated with Nairn South in the short and medium term. Transportation/access issues in respect of the longer term development options promoted for Nairn South are further emphasised in Paragraph 4.37 on Page 64 of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan Proposed Plan. In this regard, an extended Delnies allocation could be satisfactorily accommodated without a/the need for the proposed A96 (T) bypass. Such aspects are given greater resonance by the recent decision of the Highland Council's Planning Environmental and Development Committee which refused planning permission (Ref. No 11/04355/FUL) for site NA8-Nairn South on the 18 September, 2013 primarily on the basis of access and transportation network capacity issues. The scope for further development to the west of Delnies beyond the current Plan site allocation reference NA6 Delnies for 300no. homes, is found in Paragraph 14.11.1 - Policy 17 Delnies on Page 54 of the adopted Highland wide Local Development Plan under 'westward extension' which states that although Policy 17 contains no commitment to built development on land to the west of Delnies "the possibility of such development cannot be ruled out and should be taken into account in design for development of Delnies". In this regard, the detailed plans which are currently being prepared for the Delnies development, facilitate a road network and appropriate access to accommodate a logical extension of the Nairn settlement boundary to the west of Delnies.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Correction to my previous comment. Please read last line as 3) Plant trees in the NORTHERN boundary to preserve ambience of the region

Representation

This post is for the correction to my previous comment as above.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

In respect of a small in-fill area: Land allocation should please revert to that shown as Area 1 on Map 9 of the HWLDP.

Representation

Background: I am the owner of West Kingsteps, which covers both the black and the red areas on the attached map. Planning permission in principle has been granted to erect housing on the area shown in red (08/00105/OUTNA). The attached map is taken from planning application 07/00176/FULNA, made by the owners of the adjoining major development at Balmakeith. The developer has since built housing over much of the area marked "Site" on the map. The northernmost part of "Site", bordering onto Lochloy Road, consists of a SUDS dam and an emergency access road. Both are already built and presumably are essential requirements for the development as a whole. This part of "Site" separates my land from the recreational area which has been converted from Kingsteps Quarry. The developer has recently applied for permission to extend "Site" towards the watercourse marked "Kingsteps Burn" on the attached map and HWLDP and IMFLDP both already incorporate the enlarged Site as Area 1 on Map 9 Nairn (p52) and Area NA5 (p65) respectively. Section 14.6.1. of HWLDP specifically details the extension up to the watercourse. In contrast, the current draft of IMFLDP has excluded the area in black from the land allocation marked as Area NA5 on map 4. Development Allocation Nairn (p65) Representation: I would like to make a representation to include the area in black within NA5, as was previously shown in Area 1 on the HWLDP. Reasons: a. The Highland Council encourages the use of land by in-filling between existing developments. b. The fact that "Site" and the area in black are held under different ownerships should not make a difference to the development allocation of land. c. Planning permission in principle (08/00104/OUTNA) in respect of the area in black was refused, principally on the mistaken basis that it formed part of the Recreation Area. The Recreation Area has been completed and is separated from my land by "Site". The Section 5/22(c) status, on which the refusal was based, has now been removed. d. A detailed review of any new planning application regarding the area in black must of course take place before any planning permission is granted. It would be unreasonable to prejudge the merits of such a planning application at this stage. e. The area in black is very small compared to the major changes to the previous master plan already incorporated into NA5. No preferential treatment should be extended to the much larger developer.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

a. Area NA2 should be reduced so as to incorporate only land lying to the south of the Kingsteps burn. b. A structural tree buffer running along the southern edge of the burn, to be planted before any construction takes place, should be included in IMFLDP. c. Access to NA2 south of the burn should only be via the NA4 development and not via Lochloy Road to the east of the Kingsteps settlement.

Representation

I write regarding the proposed extension of residential building onto area NA2 as shown in the current draft of IMFLDP. I am the owner of West Kingsteps, a house which shares a boundary with NA2 as currently proposed and I would like to make the following representation: a. Area NA2 should be reduced so as to incorporate only land lying to the south of the Kingsteps burn. This separation of new development from the existing settlement at Kingsteps will go some way towards preserving the character and identity of the latter, in line with the stated aims of the HWLDP. b. A structural tree buffer running along the southern edge of the burn, to be planted before any construction takes place, should be included in IMFLDP. This will reinforce the protection of the Kingsteps settlement. c. Access to NA2 south of the burn should only be via the NA4 development and not via Lochloy Road to the east of the Kingsteps settlement. The effect on the Kingsteps settlement of some 400 car journeys driving through it per day (90 two-car families making just one return journey per day) would be both dangerous and catastrophic in terms of loss of amenity for Kingsteps residents.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the proposal to build 30 houses on the Farmers Showfield site in Nairn.

Representation

The roads in the area are unsuitable for another 30 houses and the resulting addition of maybe 50 cars.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Proposed plan suggests use as Retail and Business/Tourism. I would prefer this to be housing. Proposed plan also suggests access to be taken from existing fire station access. I would want this to be taken from area BE1, as shown on planning drawing 08/00430/FULIN

Representation

The planning application 08/00430/FULIN for BE1 was submitted with consideration to area BE3 being allocated for housing in the future(given that there was no requirement for a fire station there anymore). The road layout for area BE1 was designed to provide future access to area BE3 from BE1. Access to area BE3 from the Fire station access road as suggested in the proposed plan would not be possible as the proposed SUDS device for area BE1 is to be located there. In addition Tech Services had previously advised that they would not permit access to area BE3 from the fire station access road, as this is to become the future distributor road. The current proposed access shown on planning drawing 08/00430/FULIN would not be a suitable route for serving area BE3 if it was to be used for Retail/ Business.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the proposal for the land to the south west of the High Street, CB3. Plans for this area should not include the land gifted to the village and currently used as a sports field and managed by the Amenities Association.

Representation

The sports field is a much loved and well used part of the village. The continued growth of the village requires more green space and leisure areas. Priority for housing should be given to the two eyesores in the village, the former fish processing site, CB4 and the former garage site of the High Street which does not appear to be zoned for development. Improvements to the infrastructure ie access to the A835 from Leanaig Road this already a very dangerous junction, are required before further house building.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01716 Name Chrissie Lacey Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Inverness - City Centre Type Change

Comment Changes

Improvements and reconfiguration of station square

Representation

4. On my personal wish list of developments, sooner rather than later – a circular green/garden area in station square, with the highlander statue either relocated or off-centre within the space, The ugly station entrance re-designed and parking removed from the square. I would like to see co-operation between highland council and the owners of the former macrae and dicks premises in order that the ground floor might be used for car parking (or two floors) and the upper floor for retail as at present. Entrance to car park could be from academy street and exit to Strother’s Lane, or the reverse.

Allocated to Central Inverness General General

Customer Number 01716 Name Chrissie Lacey Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Inverness -Fairways Golf Club Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

2. I support the councils preferred option (N) at H35a, b and c and I wish the presumption against development of any kind on the fairway golf course to be strengthened to a maximum.

Allocated to South Inverness General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

If High School closes site should be allocated for cultural / educational use

Representation

3. The high school grounds are designated either "mixed use" or "community" (I do not have the plan in front of me). This is an area where it is very important to keep the green space, absolutely complete, as at present, so I disagree entirely with the suggestion of mixed use. If however, the designation is for "community" use and if the school should ever move to another site, the present inverness high school site and grounds should be specifically for cultural/educational use, e.g. art gallery/museum with perhaps sculptured lawns as at the Edinburgh gallery of modern art (a former school) or otherwise suitably landscaped. The site has very adequate car parking space, is near bus routes and is accessible on foot from the city centre and from two areas of deprivation. This site has the potential to aid the transformation of these areas in future years and so must not be squandered, however pressing the need for offices shops or housing may appear to be.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Retain existing openspaces

Representation

1. All green spaces at present existing should be retained, cared for, and, if possible, enhanced, whether these are grass areas, managed or unmanaged "wild" areas, trees or shrubs, or planted roundabouts. More green areas should be created and small spaces throughout the city should be utilised for planting as it is widely recognised that this is more beneficial to the health and well-being of the citizens than any built development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of IG12 from plan.

Representation

Not identified at National Level in Scottish Planning Policy. Too much development in area already sufficient capacity in Invergordon - large parts are not utilised now Existing road access problems via Tomich access via village unacceptable - HGV's and increased traffic volume. Industry too close to housing - noise, dust, lights, odour, vibration etc. -Impact in past on other amenities. -Aluminium smelter polluted land and livestock. -Livestock slaughtered at 9 months due to build up of toxic levels of fluoride in bones resulting in fractures. -All crops removed and replaced -Vegetation - Broom and trees destroyed with pollutants. -Prevailing wind is over Broomhill. Loss of good agricultural land. SEPA raising concerns - land very prone to flooding - lots of standing water. Too close to Inner Moray Firth conservation area. Personally not allowed a house site in sight of A9 - yet massive development site proposed adjacent to A9! Highly visible.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would seek to refuse planning permission for the building of houses and businesses on the site of Bogbain West and Bogbain Woods.

Representation

This area is used by many local people as an area for recreational activities including walking, running, cross country skiing to name but a few. The local school used this area as a valuable learning resource to teach our children about nature, plants, insects and animals. We need to preserve this ideally placed and easily accessible area of striking beauty for people to enjoy as open space and access to nature. Green space is essential to preserve the area we live in and prevent the urban sprawl that is inevitable with poor planning. The Milton of Leys area is desperately short of local facilities, the school is overflowing and the a shop has opened after many years of campaigning. We need more facilities for the local community before we see yet more houses going up and more people moving into an area already woefully under serviced. To take away an area used, enjoyed and cherished by the community in order for developer to make money is disgraceful. Stop the mindless urbanisation of our green space because once its gone there is no getting it back.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Site: NA1 – Former Showfield East I wish to object to the Local Development Plan proposing that this recreational land be allocated/zoned for 30 homes. Loss of green space: • this ground, as the second largest green space in Nairn, is valued as green space at this side of the town. • Loss of this green land seems disproportionate for the relatively small town-wide gain of 30 homes, and Achareidh (17.9 hectares) is only provisionally allocated for 6 houses. • it has been previously noted that there are insufficient green spaces across the town, and • relative to the properties surrounding the Showfield, 30 homes in 1.8 hectares indicates a high density. Ownership of the Showfield: • it is my understanding that there is a specific covenant contained within the Title Deeds denying the right to build anything other than a show stand. This condition has not been, to my knowledge, legally set aside. This ground was purchased on this basis, with support through public subscription. • As the Nairn Farmers’ Society owns this land, what options have been explored with this body to “exchange” this green space for Common Good ground elsewhere in the town? The Local Plan points to this as an option with some merit - "consideration of a potential excambion of land ownership for land at Sandown for a new showfield" Access issues: Whilst I accept that these would form part of the dialogue at an outline planning point, the following would be significant issues: • suitable road access, and • pupil flow along Lodgehill Road during term time.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Further development should not be allowed beyond Torbreck Road which constitutes a natural and logical boundary to this area of Inverness. Any permitted development should be conditional on being constructed a minimum of 100 metres from existing buildings to prevent unnecessary crowding in a rural area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Proposed development in Cawdor Village at CD2 should be abandoned. Any development at Cawdor should commence on the north side of the village in the vicinity of the new school. The original intention was to restrict new build to the north side of the village - the agreed area of expansion - and carefully monitor infills in the heritage core.

Representation

Development infills in core heritage areas of Cawdor village should be strictly controlled. The proposal for 10 dwellings at CD2 is inappropriate because: 1)access by very narrow lane is already dangerously congested 2) CD2 development represents loss of much loved green space for village amenity 3) CD2 is a meadow of significant beauty and local history. Building here is unwanted and would destroy the balance and ambience of the old village which is much admired by all who know it.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site MO3

Representation

I wish to object to the above outline planning application. Although the development will not affect my own house to a great extent, (it will only be seen from my garden and not my house), I am very concerned about the impact the development would have on the area of Corry Road. This is currently on the edge of the village, with a rural aspect, greatly enjoyed by many in the village. It is a popular area for local families to walk, with beautiful trees in the area which would be developed. This open aspect will be lost for all who currently enjoy it : residents, walkers, runners and cyclists. I know this may not constitute part of the objection but it does seem very unfortunate that beautiful aspects of the village may be sacrificed for housing when housing in the High Street is being allowed to crumble. We all have to suffer looking at it and I do feel it is criminal that this is allowed to happen. I realise that this does not equal the same amount of housing but it does all come down to amenity. I appreciate that there is a need for housing but would it be possible for the scale of the proposed development to be reduced so that as much of the rural nature of the area can be retained, for the benefit of all.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03948 Name Colin Young Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Nairn Para 4.41

Reference NA3 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

This shows a proposal for just 6 houses. The site is shown as 17.9 hectares. Will there be any addition to the 6 houses in future or is this it? Where exactly in the site will the 6 houses be located?

Allocated to Nairn NA3 Achareidh

Customer Number 03972 Name Colin Morrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like to bring your attention to the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan and in particular the site marked as DW3: Dingwall north (09/00476/fulrc), also marked as area 2/3 on the developers application. The site in question is centred on NH 54334 60168 just north of Chestnut Road and encompasses around five hectares. I would like to place an objection against this particular development on the grounds that it will severely restrict local biodiversity, fragment habitats and reduce access to local green spaces.

Representation

I have attached a full and complete file on my objection to this proposal Regards, Mr Colin Morrison

Allocated to Dingwall DW3 Dingwall North

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Following the publication of the Development Plan, there was widespread concern in Conon Bridge at the proposal for 39 houses, relocation of the playing field, and provision of additional car parking on the area defined on the plan. Such was the concern that a public meeting was called by the Amenities association and this was attended by over 100 people. The unanimous feeling of the meeting was that this was a completely ill-considered proposal and that it was firstly discourteous to publish such a proposal without attempting to contact the owners of the land in question and secondly unwise to proceed with it in the face of stated opposition from local Councillors. The Amenities Association have owned the ground which comprises the current playing fields since 1971 and their predecessors since 1952 when it was gifted to the community. We had to reassure the meeting that no development would take place without the co-operation of the Amenities Association and that there could be no question of the Council using compulsory purchase powers in such a situation. The playing fields are a well used facility and you may take it from the feeling of the meeting that there is no question of the community giving it up. We shall be glad to have your assurance that the proposal will be withdrawn from the plan and an explanation of why it was put forward in the first place. We enclose a copy of a plan showing the part of the area covered by the proposal which belongs to the Association in order that you are clear about the position.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Following the publication of the Development Plan, there was widespread concern in Conon Bridge at the proposal for 39 houses, relocation of the playing field, and provision of additional car parking on the area defined on the plan. Such was the concern that a public meeting was called by the Amenities association and this was attended by over 100 people. The unanimous feeling of the meeting was that this was a completely ill-considered proposal and that it was firstly discourteous to publish such a proposal without attempting to contact the owners of the land in question and secondly unwise to proceed with it in the face of stated opposition from local Councillors. The Amenities Association have owned the ground which comprises the current playing fields since 1971 and their predecessors since 1952 when it was gifted to the community. We had to reassure the meeting that no development would take place without the co-operation of the Amenities Association and that there could be no question of the Council using compulsory purchase powers in such a situation. The playing fields are a well used facility and you may take it from the feeling of the meeting that there is no question of the community giving it up. We shall be glad to have your assurance that the proposal will be withdrawn from the plan and an explanation of why it was put forward in the first place. We enclose a copy of a plan showing the part of the area covered by the proposal which belongs to the Association in order that you are clear about the position.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

This is a major part of the village and the only place to freely play sports. I have been playing football in Conon my whole life and now that the school playing fields have gone, the pitch on CB3 is the only place left.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA11 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

NA11. Balmakith. This proposal should include a road bridge over the railway as per no. 2 above. - Page 66, NA2 South Kingsteps. There should be no further housing built to the east of Nairn until the transport links have been improved. This means a road from the A96, Balmakeith, over the railway line to link in with the current development being proposed.

Allocated to Nairn NA11 Balmakeith

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Nairn Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

There does not appear to be any land zoned for industry, other than NA12, if we are to be building more houses then we need land zoned for business and industry. This plan does not show any new zones in these categories.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Nairn Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Housing. The should be a limit of 15 houses being built on any one development site in Nairn in each year and a total of 25 houses in Nairnshire as a whole. This is to allay fears of the community being swamped by housing and gives a greater oppertunity for local employment

Allocated to Nairn Housing HousingPop

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA2 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Page 66, NA2 South Kingsteps. There should be no further housing built to the east of Nairn until the transport links have been improved. This means a road from the A96, Balmakeith, over the railway line to link in with the current development being proposed.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA3 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

NA3.Achareidh. Any proposed development should include the upgrading of Tradspark Road, road widening and a footpath on both sides of the road along with the Altonburn as required.

Allocated to Nairn NA3 Achareidh

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA13 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

NA13. South of Balmakeith. The current supermarket has had a detremintal effect on the town center since its opening. Any further development in the non food retail will only exesprate the situation. Therefor I request that there be no further development on this site and it be with drawn from the plan.

Allocated to Nairn NA13 South of Balmakeith

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA5 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Page 66, NA2 South Kingsteps. There should be no further housing built to the east of Nairn until the transport links have been improved. This means a road from the A96, Balmakeith, over the railway line to link in with the current development being proposed.

Allocated to Nairn NA5 Lochloy

Customer Number 00561 Name Councillor Laurie Fraser Organisation The Highland Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph 4.36

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Section 4.35. It would be better if the developments on these sites were prioritised in the following order. 1. Lochloy, 2. Sandown, 3. Delnies and 4. Nairn south. I note that Lochloy is on going but in relation to the other 3 sites there should be a priority in that Sandown and Delnies have both suficient infrastructure in place to start immedatly and are the preferred sites in the town for development. There should be a preference against starting Nairn South until all three of the other sites are compleat. This is because the infrastructure is poor and in need of improvement prior to starting. The community does not want development on this site and lastly it is unfair on the town/community to have on going development on all three sides at the same time. (Noise, disruption, disturbance, etc).

Allocated to Nairn NA8 Nairn South

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

NA9. Nairn South. This proposal is long term and it will be many years before any building can take place here. the site is unlikely to be developed with the proposed Nairn by-pass having no direct access link. In this case I would request to have this site removed from the development plan totally. If this were done then it would also go some way to alay local fears that Nairn was being turned into a giant development site for housing.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I have had numerous complaints from residents of Braehead Avoch and Avoch and Killen Community Council that they are not being listened too regarding amendments to the plan. The field north of Braehead should be retained as community amenity land and not for residential use. Councillor Craig Fraser

Representation

I have had numerous complaints from residents of Braehead Avoch and Avoch and Killen Community Council that they are not being listened too regarding amendments to the plan. The field north of Braehead should be retained as community amenity land and not for residential use. Councillor Craig Fraser

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I am disappointed that it appears the the area for the Black Swimming Pool has been "missed" off the plan or "removed" from the plan. I have had numerous complaints including comment from the Fortrose and Rosemarkie Community Council as they are a statutory consultee. The planned area for the pool needs to be re-instated and shown on the plan. Councillor Craig Fraser

Representation

I am disappointed that it appears the the area for the Black Swimming Pool has been "missed" off the plan or "removed" from the plan. I have had numerous complaints including comment from the Fortrose and Rosemarkie Community Council as they are a statutory consultee. The planned area for the pool needs to be re-instated and shown on the plan. Councillor Craig Fraser

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to any housing development being brought forward in the area referred to in IN49. This woodland area is a popular area for recreation, walking, cycling and has many species of wildlife resident (e.g. herons, deer, badgers, owls which I have seen there). I propose that development of this area is reconsidered so it can remain as a recreation area for the benefit of the residents of the increasingly high density housing areas in Milton of Leys.

Representation

I object to any housing development being brought forward in the area referred to in IN49. This woodland area is a popular area for recreation, walking, cycling and has many species of wildlife resident (e.g. herons, deer, badgers, owls which I have seen there). I propose that development of this area is reconsidered so it can remain as a recreation area for the benefit of the residents of the increasingly high density housing areas in Milton of Leys.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04149 Name D Kemp Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.74

Reference M03 Type Change

Comment Changes

An objection to the proposed housing development at Ardnagrask, Corrie Road, Muir-of-Ord.

Representation

1. Development would have a severe impact on the landscape/wildlife of this natural environment. 2. There are inappropriate levels of services and facilities to cater for such an increase which would adversely affect current residents. 3. Character and social balance of the community would be severely affected. 4. Housing is not similar in sense of spacing, scale and density to others in the area. 5. Corrie Road is completely unsuitable for the quantity of traffic this development would produce. Apart from accessibility to development issue, there would be road safety issues, more fumes and noise which would hugely impact current residents and adversely affect joggers, walkers, cyclists etc., and once again, the environment and wildlife. 6. The Golf Course would be severely affected by the close proximity of the development. As an important and sensitive natural asset for the village, it needs to be protected at all costs. These areas of green space need to be protected - they have amenity value that benefits locals and the wider community. 7. Some areas, the Report states, 'are being protected and enhanced with only appropriate materials allowed and only specialist housing (not mainstream) suitable for an aging population being permitted'. Perhaps this would be an alternative for Muir of Ord in a more appropriate location? 8. Unfortunately, the creation of an undesirable precedent, as stated in your Report, seems to be happening in Muir-of-Ord!

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO3 Ardnagrask, Corrie Road

Customer Number 04252 Name Dan Baraclough Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Change

Comment Changes

Abandonment of residential development Further protection of existing woodland path network Habitat protection for resident roe deer

Representation

This area is one of the few remaining areas of South Inverness with a genuine wild feel due to the topography and previous developments that have kept the built skyline low. From the perspective of the path network that links with the Wades Road path, this is a significant and well used community amenity in its current form that would be degraded by intermingled housing. As there is a large area of wetland surrounding a lochan to the north of the area I have significant concerns that this development would entail habitat loss. A wildlife survey would have to ensure that the roe deer population was not compromised. I am not a homeowner and will be leaving the area myself in a few years for other reasons, so have no vested interest other than genuine concern for the loss of wilderness. I strongly suggest the planning dept visit the site to appreciate its current amenity value.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Exclude SPI -Kinellan from the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Development Plan or if this is not accepted reduce the proposed density to 20 homes. Also, exclude any part of the high ground to the north of the proposed site from all development. Adequate undeveloped housing land is currently available in Strathpeffer to meet housing needs for the foreseeable future. The plan does not make adequate provision for dealing with the extra traffic to be generated at the junction of Kineallan Drive and GardenHill /Main Road. The proposed development SPI- Kinellan encroaches onto the important recreational/ wild life area of Loch Kinellan.

Representation

1) The proposed development is out of character with the village of Strathpeffer and if included in the Development Plan will be a continuation of the urban sprawl; which has already changed the attractiveness of this important Spa Victorian Village. It will be a shame, if Strathpeffer is to become a dormitory town; thus removing its special status, as the most northern Spa village in Europe. 2) There is no need for the release of this proposed development site (SPI-Kinellan) as there is already a substantial area of housing development land available for new homes to the north of the Strathpeffer Community Centre. 3) 67 homes is too high a density for the proposed development, as this number of houses could generate around 130 extra vehicles which will use this already overloaded junction with Garden Hill/Main Road from Kinellan Drive. Close by is the access road to Blackmuir Woods with its inadequate sightlines, where one exits onto GaredenHill /MainRoad. To increase the volume of traffic at the Kinellan Drive Gareden Hill /Main road junction does not make any sense from a Highway safety point of view! 4)The nearby Loch Kinellan is a very special area for locals/ visitors and wild life and to overcrowd this attractive recreational area with urban style housing is inappropriate.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Retain the site for a Primary School.

Representation

The Sustainable School Review is unlikely to predict for the long term and may not sanction a primary school in the shorter term. A primary school in Fortrose is more likely to attract young families to Fortrose and Rosemarkie, important to balance the population which is currently weighted towards the elderly. Potential incoming young families will see a local primary school as an essential requirement. For example, despite the recently built new Inshes Primary School in Inverness, a further new school has had to be built at Milton of Leys, only a mile or two away. Incomers could perceive having to bus very young children to Avoch both as a disadvantage and a danger. We would like to see the site used for agriculture or allotments until such time as the primary school is built.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04211 Name David Bonniface Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.122

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

The plan does not take into account the impact of dualling of the A9, particularly if improving access to Tomatin involves over or underpasses which would take up land (potentially TM10, TM11, TM12) and have strong visual impact.

Representation

I wish to object to any change to access to the A9 from Tomatin which affects the land north of the distillery along the "old" A9, particularly the residential developments at the North End known as Altdubh and Altdubhag.

Allocated to Tomatin General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

This proposal should be deferred pending the proposers submitting a credible business plan, planning application, land owners consents and funding statements for their whole project, not just Phase 1. Approval at this stage would cause planning blight on nearby houses and reduce the possibility of attracting funding for the proposed footpath/cycleway between Strathpeffer and Dingwall.

Representation

Briefly, to put into context my experience to make the following comments I have been involved in railway preservation for over 45 years; •I have done physical labouring work on steam locomotives, rolling stock and track, •I chaired the meeting which formed the Vale of Teifi Railway, south Wales' first preserved narrow gauge railway, •I was one of the authors of a successful £18 million bid for the Welsh Highland Railway. My main objection to this proposal is that it is based on the dream of a handful of people. As a project it has not been properly costed nor has any sort of viability study been carried out (or if not has it has been kept secret). Fundamentally is it right that so few people can impose 'planning blight' over so many houses in this essentially residential part of the Strathpeffer conservation area? In summary my objections to this proposal are: •Lack of Consultation. There has been no public consultation. A small number of people are involved with the project and they are happy to talk about it, but the business plan, development plan, environmental impact assessment and Health and Safety case have been kept closely guarded. •Project Cost. The average cost to reinstate a railway over an existing trackbed is £2 million per kilometre, a length of 2.5 kilometres would therefore cost in the order of £5 million. Buildings, stock and infrastructure costs would easily add a further million. •Competition. There are two Heritage Railways in the Highlands, at Strathspey and Keith and Dufftown. Both are in a precarious financial position and struggle for visitors, volunteers and donations. A third railway in the area could very well prove enough of a distraction to kill off all three. •Heritage Railway? The whole point, surely, of a Heritage Railway is to preserve the heritage. There is nothing for the SSSR to preserve – simply, there is no heritage. The locomotives and carriages that served the line are now scrapped, the original build are all gone (with the exception of the station, which has already been saved and is more financially safe under its current ownership. What would go in a museum? There are no major artefacts available.. A small 'Kyle Line' museum already exists on Kyle of Lochalsh station and this is being extended to the recently restored signal-box. This proposal will be competing with those attractions and all exhibits would be copies of material already published and freely available. •Not viable. Existing small railways are not in a financially healthy position. A number have failed or a hanging-on due to the investments of a 'fairy-godfather', some projects, such as the Meon Valley have failed losing substantial sums of money for the authorities and local investors. Established railways, such as the Tallyllyn are in financial straits. A proposal such as this is, essentially, a stand alone Interpretation Centre with no chance of ever raising enough revenue to pay for its running costs. •Grants? The most obvious source of grant funding would be the Heritage Lottery, but the lack of anything with any unique heritage in this proposal reduces the possibility of an HLF grant to zero. Nor would the SSR be eligible for a Railway Heritage Trust grant as the SSSRA cannot meet the essential eligibility criteria. EU funding would also be very unlikely when compared to the extreme rural poverty in Eastern Europe. The fund that could realistically invest is LEADER and the lack of jobs, the size of grant needed and the degree of local opposition would kill this in the water. Network Rail and Scotrail will prefer to place any spare funding in the area into the Kyle line and are likely to oppose, never mind support, anything that could take passenger numbers from their line. The cost of the proposal would rule out anything available from Highland Council and the lack of jobs, economic or tourism merit would rule out the Scottish Government. •Manning. A Heritage Railway requires a lot of man-hours, particularly if the work has to be carried out by volunteers. And a lot of volunteers –many of the jobs are specialised and highly skilled, requiring accepted professional and vocational qualifications: it is not just grown men playing trains. This is an area with a small population and such skills will not be in abundance. The railways could not recruit existing volunteers from the Strathspey or Keith & Dufftown railways as this would be a mortal blow to those lines. If it is intended to employ contractors to do the work than the costs will increase fourfold. •Visitor numbers. The railway would require large numbers of people – indeed, what would be the point of a visitor attraction that did not attract visitors? The Table below is a simple calculation assuming a capital requirement of £6, 000,000, and giving the railway loans of £225,000. A 6% interest has been used and with a pay back period of 19 years. Service the debt would cost in the region of £360,000 per year. The calculations have a maintenance charge of 10%, I have also allowed £10,000 for overheads The UK average cost for running a steam engine for a day is £3,000, if this railway could do it for half that and If we say the railway runs 100 days per year at £10-00 per person adult fare. In those circumstances the railway would have to attract an average of around 1,120 people per day. Is there any record of any local attraction drawing any near that number of visitors? Even if my figures are out by as much as 50% it can be seen that

the project would still not be viable. Item Total Total Capital Required £6,000,000 Assume 50% in grants £3,000,000 Balance £3,000,000 25% of balance raised in cash £75,000 Loans £2,250,000 Total compound interest at 6% over 10 years £1,350,000 Total Outgoings over 10 years £3,600,000 Annual Expenses Repayment of loans (Over 10 years) £225,000 Service interest £135,000 Maintenance (10% of cost capital items) £600,000 Overheads (say) £10,000 £970,000 Daily Expenses (Operating 100 days p.a.) Apportioned annual expenses £9,700 Operating costs £1,500 £11,200 At £10 per adult trip – average passengers per day 1,120 At 3 people per car – average number of cars per day 374 Say 5 trains per day – average cars per train ride 75 Car parking spaces required (half on train, half waiting) 150 Allow variation of summer peaks – total spaces required 300

- Tourism or Heavy Industry? The area around Strathpeffer station houses a number of tourism businesses and an office complex. All of which bring necessary jobs to the area and small-scale similar development would add to the mixed economy of the village. However, this proposal would require vast sums of money, not create any jobs as all the work would be carried out by volunteers and would create noise, dirt and danger incompatible with the existing businesses and the conservation area status of its surroundings. A medium sized steam locomotive consumes around 5 tons of coal per hours, a small one about half that, At 8 hours per day for 100 days that is around 2,000 tons to be delivered and stored. A small steam locomotives weighs over 30 tons, a medium sized one around 80 tons, a coach is around 60” long. They all have to be delivered (and periodically taken away for repair) which requires heavy duty articulated road vehicles and heavy lifting equipment. Such vehicles would not clear the railway bridge between Fodarty and Dingwall so all this heavy traffic would have to come through the village. All Heritage railways create a ‘linear scrap heap’ – just look at the Strathspey and Keith lines. A heritage railway is usually long enough for such ‘to be hidden from view. On this line it would have to sit alongside the line, defining the Cat’s Back and Knockfarel with a footing of ‘scrap’ metal. The coal and steam create dust and noise. Steam has to be raised for a good four hours prior to the locomotive being used. So a 10 o’clock start would mean work on the locomotive, JCB’s loading coal, stem pumps moving water, etc, would have to start around 6 a.m. unacceptable surely in this a residential area? The table above also shows that the railway has to attract around 1,200 people per day, generating and average of 374 cars and requiring around 300 car parking spaces. The existing service road for the site is unsuitable for the level of traffic it currently has to service. It is an access road to private houses. It is unsuitable for the increased levels of traffic the current businesses on the site generate – a development opposed by local people at the time. The visibility splays are unsuitable and dangerous. The access road is also unsuitable for the heavy haulage vehicles that would be required from time to time and there is nowhere within the plan for a car park with in excess of 300 spaces. All this would necessitate another entrance to the site, with better visibility splays and a more level access and hardstanding for lifting such heavy weights. Many complaints regarding visibility are made to Highland Council. Ulva, the house on the corner, regularly has to keep roadside hedges trimmed at their own expense. Horns are blasted at ‘near misses’ three or four times every day.
- Public Right-of-way. The route eastwards from Strathpeffer Station has been promoted as a public footpath for many years. The Strathpeffer Community Association is currently raising funds to develop it further as a footpath/cycleway joining Strathpeffer to Dingwall. This ambition is incompatible with that of the SSSRA yet both are currently raising money. The footpath/cycleway would be of much greater community benefit and support initiatives for safer routes to schools and to encourage walking and cycling in a safe environment. The Prescott Enquiry in Gwynedd established it is impossible to reconcile leisure trails and trains on the same track-bed. The proposal in the Murray Firth plan is no more than Phase 1 of the plans of the SSSRA, the promoting group. Their long-term aim is to “to extend the track in stages until it meets up with the main line to enable steam trains to run to Dingwall and Kyle of Lochalsh. ‘The ultimate aim is to have steam trips right through to Kyle,” said Mrs Dovey”¹. I think it therefore reasonable to consider the whole project in planning terms rather than approve Phase 1, with its implied approval of future phases. From my experience I would argue that this idea is no more than a dream. It has no chance of becoming a reality yet this proposal, if approved, would cause planning blight to a number of residences and give tacit approval for the promoters to try and raise money from the general public – all of which will come to nothing in the fullness of time. Rather than encourage this dream any further I would ask that this proposal is dropped from the Moray Firth Plan and that the promoters are asked to prepare a realistic business plan, a realistic estimate of costs and indications of where and how the necessary funding will be raised. This should be for their whole project (Not just Phase 1) and there should be extensive public consultation. Bearing in mind the SSRA; s ambition to run trains through to Kyle – meaning that Scotrail would no longer be the Train Operating Company on that line - the consultation should be across the whole of Wester Ross. It is against natural justice that local householders have to prove a negative to protect their properties against the “wonderful idea1” of a handful of people. As a final thought, their stated long-term ambition is fulfilled: steam engines already run between Dingwall and Kyle. 1 <http://www.strathpeffervillage.org.uk/ssra>

Allocated to	Strathpeffer	SP2	Railway Station	
--------------	--------------	-----	-----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The site CU1 is shown as a large section and a small section. They are not in the same ownership. They do not share the same access (The large section is accessed via Glascairn Road and the smaller section by The Cairns). Neither site can access the other. The smaller section, accessed by The Cairns, has an access road, street lighting and services in place.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Road improvements are needed here in the interests of road safety, preferably to include roundabouts at the Morangie and Knockbreck junctions with speed limits restricted to 50 mph in-between. If the proposed 3-18 School Campus goes ahead at the Craighill site, and that then goes on to direct a southerly expansion of the town, practically located underpasses and/or pedestrian bridges will be essential, again in the interests of road safety.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The Community Council wishes to continue with its strong objection to Policy 35 (Hinterland Areas) being applied within our area and would ask its boundaries be redrawn in order to exclude the countryside around Tain, and have this area re-designated Policy 36 (Development in the Wider Countryside). As you well know, the Hinterland Policy started out life with the intention of being applied to areas considered to be under greatest pressure from development and from commuters working in Inverness yet wishing to live in the rural areas. It is in effect Inverness's Green Belt Policy and has never been substantiated in any terms, neither conceptual, statistical nor practical. Its 'strength' lies only in the fact it has somehow manage to cling to each successive Local Plan with any challenge to its relevance going ignored. We are told now it has evolved into Tain and Dornoch's Green Belt, in effect. This is absolute nonsense and the policy serves only to deny local families an opportunity to live in affordable housing within their local area. It is a NIMBY policy with arbitrary boundaries and well past its 'use by date', if it ever had one to begin with. The recent 'relaxations' have done nothing to give it some relevance to the local community, only served to confuse and anger the public even more. The Highland landscape had a tremendous capacity to accommodate development and it is not being given the chance it deserves to prove that. The policy has not so much protected the countryside around Tain but helped feed the Inverness 'black hole' which has sucked the lifeblood out of the peripheries for far too long. The Community Council wishes to see a Housing in the Countryside policy tailored to Tain's needs and not that of Inverness. A shift to Policy 36 would be a start, but we are open to discussion with you as to the detail.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The highlighted green area should be extended to the other side of river and along the shore as far as The Plaids, so this land does not miss out on any potential amenity improvement projects.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00322 Name David MacDonald Organisation The Royal Burgh of Tain Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph 4.76

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

No Change

Representation

Town Centre... hopefully the Charrette application will be successful but if not then there should be some mention of commitment to enhancement of the central fabric of the town, focussed on the Conservation Area. We do not want the next Local Plan to be concentrating upon overdue policies of regeneration.

Allocated to Tain General General

Customer Number 00322 Name David MacDonald Organisation The Royal Burgh of Tain Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN8 Type Change

Comment Changes

Access Improvements

Representation

Clear boundaries for future development are required to reflect known projected development. An overall Master Plan would be a good idea. It should include measures to improve significantly the safety of the A9 access junction, a suggestion recently made by the Community Council but ignored by both developer and planning authority.

Allocated to Tain TN8 Glenmorangie

Customer Number 00322 Name David MacDonald Organisation The Royal Burgh of Tain Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.76

Reference

Type Support

Comment Changes

No Change

Representation

The Tain section is an improvement on Local Plans that have gone before in that the zonings reflect actual planning permissions and not just undeliverable developments.

Allocated to Tain General General

Customer Number 00322 Name David MacDonald Organisation The Royal Burgh of Tain Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Introduction

Paragraph

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Planning is sometimes development led.

Representation

General comment....The government, in Scottish planning Policy, wants development to be genuinely Plan led but that is unrealistic as even in Tain's very recent experience Lidl, Asda, Tesco, and Nigg prove it is and always will be Developer led. Therefore, the Local Plan should exist as a guide first and foremost, and never a strict set of rules. This basic point should be acknowledged in the Introduction to the Local Plan, as the latter approach appears to be the default setting for Development Management and risks inflexibility of planning application determination.

Allocated to Comments on the vision and spatial strategy

Customer Number 00322 Name David MacDonald Organisation The Royal Burgh of Tain Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Access to good land

Representation

Mention should be made of access to the lower part which is in CGF ownership, and physically quite separate from the land above the escarpment . We would also ask the area of land between the railway line and beach to be brought into the Settlement Development Area.

Allocated to Tain TN7 Blarliath

Customer Number 00322 Name David MacDonald Organisation The Royal Burgh of Tain Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN5 Type Change

Comment Changes

Location of Business uses elsewhere

Representation

The Community Council has already dismissed this area as being quite unsuitable for Business and Commercial uses and we would wish to reaffirm that opinion. We have already asked for a designated Business Park and given the reasons therefor, but that request appears to have fallen on deaf ears

Allocated to Tain TN5 Knockbreck Road

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site from the Plan & retention of greenspace

Representation

We are writing to you as office bearers of 'Save our Showfield' – a group of people who formed a committee in 1998 following great public concern regarding the proposed building of a supermarket on the showfield. Through local public support, with several public meetings, many letters of objection and over 3000 signatures on a petition to “keep the showfield green” we ran a campaign for 2 years and the planning proposal for a supermarket was rejected by a Scottish Office Reporter in 2000. We object to the present planning proposal of a housing development of the showfield for these reasons: 1. This is a valued green field space used by the public for general recreation where people walk their dogs, children play, as well as being the location of the Nairn St Ninian’s Football pitch. It is also in regular use as the location of car boot sales, a vintage car rally, a circus and is crossed by the public at all times. In 2000 it was noted that there was a deficit of 45% of available recreational land in Nairn. Since then the town has grown and so the deficit will now be greater. This space is a vital green lung for Nairn as it expands and a housing development would not only cause loss of this local amenity space, but also change the character of the town. 2. Viscount Finlay of Newton sold the field to the Farming Society in 1928 for £1000 with money paid by the Farming Society and public subscription. There is a restriction in the title that no house building will take place without the consent of Viscount Finlay or his descendants. In 1998 Lady Hays, his grand-daughter, was not willing to grant that consent and we see no reason why this will have changed now. 3. We consider the high density housing development now proposed for the green space is inappropriate and not in accordance with the existing surrounding houses in the area. What would be left of the field would be unsuitable for much of its current use, especially for football. 4. The Draft plan projects approximately 1900 new houses in 20 years. The removal of 30 from this total is not going to significantly affect the plan. 5. Our concerns are also for the detrimental impact such a development will have on the surrounding roads and as a direct result on the safety of pedestrians. The local residential roads - Lodgehill Road, Chattan Drive, Waverley and Westbury Roads are already struggling with the volume of existing traffic. There has been an increase in traffic flow since the relocation of both GP surgeries to the Nairn Hospital, and this, combined with the new Vet’s Surgery on Lodgehill Road and the existing traffic to the 2 local primary schools means that congestion is a problem as well as road safety. The junction of Lodgehill Road and Waverley/Westbury Road is particularly dangerous and of concern, especially for school-aged children. As Lodgehill Road itself ends in a cul-de-sac the quickest access to the A96 will be via Waverley Road. With the proposed development of houses there could potentially be up to 30-60 extra cars using this junction and these local roads, which are totally inadequate to cope. We are aware that the field is owned by the Nairnshire Farming Society, and we have members of the Society on our committee. If the Society should decide to relocate within the town we would be happy to support their relocation proposals, on the basis that the whole field remains green, and its amenity is maintained. This is supported by the Council’s own evidence stated in 2000 which emphasised the showfield’s importance as a structural open space derived from its use, its scale and position and as we have already mentioned, this is also within the terms of the existing legal title granted to the Nairnshire Farming Society in 1928

Allocated to

Customer Number 04189 Name David Munrot Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site NA1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Retain former Showfield as green open space.

Representation

It is important for communities to have areas of green open space. This Showfield is an important green open space for Nairn. If developed it would be lost to the community forever. These spaces benefit the whole community. They should not be sacrificed.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 04334 Name David Paterson Organisation Member of Muir of Ord Golf Club

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

No house or garden to be built within range of a miss hit drive from the 11th tee.

Representation

As I have previous experience of urban development buildings and gardens being built right up to the boundary of a golf course. I am aware of the dangers to both the building i.e. slates,tiles,windows etc and to adults and children and animals in the gardens if they are struck by a miss it golf shot. This could lead to liability problems for both the golf club and golfers and even those who permitted the development to take place. It ingenders bad feelings between the occupier and the golfclub and can lead to serious litigation problems.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO3 Ardnagrask, Corrie Road

Customer Number 03999 Name David Rendell Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CB2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Development of site CB2 should not commence until the junction of the B9163 and the A835 has been upgraded.

Representation

The junction of the B9163 and the A835 is becoming increasingly dangerous due to a number of factors. a1. poor lines of sight. Traffic turning left towards Maryburgh is unsighted by vehicles turning right towards Tore. a2. the low winter sun makes sight of traffic coming down the hill from Tore difficult in the mornings between late October and early March. a3. lack of attention to the cutting back of trees and shrubs on the western side of the A835 above the junction can obscure traffic coming down the hill from Tore. a4. Traffic, travelling at excessive speeds from the Maryburgh roundabout towards Tore, makes it difficult for vehicles crossing to Alcaig or turning right up the hill towards Tore. The problems outlined above will be made worse by increased amounts of traffic created by the projected growth of Conon Bridge outlined in paragraph 4.128

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB2 Braes of Conon

Customer Number 03999 Name David Rendell Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CB5 Type Change

Comment Changes

1. Provide a roundabout at school road before the completion of phase 1 2. Reinstate the provision of tree planting along the whole of the access to Conon Brae Farm

Representation

1. The original submission (Plan 3) which I was asked to comment on, living adjacent to site CB5, showed a roundabout at the junction of School Road, B9163 and Leanaig Road. I was assured that, in the interests of road safety and increased traffic flows, this would be built prior to the building of houses on Phase 1 of the project. The problem of traffic flows at this corner have been exacerbated by the increasing number of vehicles accessing the Conon Braes development, the proximity of traffic calming measures to the junction and lack of clear sight down Leanaig Road when exiting School Road. This problem is further compounded by vehicles speeding up, out the traffic calmed area outside the school in Leanaig Road. 2. Plan 3, which householders adjacent to site CB5 were asked to comment on clearly shows tree planting down the complete length of the eastern side of the farm access road to Conon Braes. On the basis of this 'screen' of trees I raised no objection to the development at that time. I would ask that this provision of a 'shelter belt' be reinstated.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB5 Braes of Conon

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

[redacted] Object to land at Resaurie IN75 for 64 houses. We have lived here 30 years and our property 'Ashville' adjoins that land and sits below the level of Caulfield Road North. Houses have already been put on that land at the Tower Burn end which are way above the existing houses here see photo RIDGE DECEMBER 2013 and that cannot be right. Housing on that land will also look straight into our bedrooms and conservatory there will be a serious loss of privacy for us. Another point is Caulfield Road is a blind bend and barely room for one car. See photo ROAD CORNRIGGS ASHVILLE 2013 that is taken beside our timber fence. There was accident with injury in summer 2013 when a car and a motorbike were in collision. More accidents are likely. Your plans mean more people coming and going from that site making road safety worse when it continues to be a problem to this day. Yours sincerely David Riach

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reduction in number of houses in the proposed site to allow some landscaping along the boundary with the golf course.

Representation

I am the Greens convener of Muir of Ord Golf Course and I am concerned with the housing proposal for the following reasons: The golf club club has invested a significant sum of money rectifying drainage problems throughout the course but particularly on the 11th fairway which is adjacent to the proposed development). Given the topography and proximity of the site to the course, how will the Council and any developer ensure the golf course are not subjected to increased risk of flooding and /or drainage problems re-occurring or indeed worsening? · How will the golf club and individual golfers be protected against the increased possibility and cost of litigation should any damage occur to persons or property within a new housing development at this location? To cope with these Health and Safety issues, industry standard Golf Design Health and Safety parameters should be adopted and taken into consideration. These parameters normally include a 60 metres gap from the centre of the fairway to any proposed development · Should these concerns not be addressed at the outset, who will bear responsibility for the cost of any remedial work required to rectify either, or both, of these issues? · The golf club are slowly becoming land locked by housing, if the club ever wish to expand this would be an ideal site. Density of housing seems over ambitious when taking the local build fabric into consideration. If you look at an aerial image (gmaps), the existing 12-15 private houses adjacent to the site would potentially fill the whole site if superimposed onto the proposed area. Is this the correct location to adopt another high density Cairns style development? The topography of the site runs towards the golf course, creating a hydrological issue and sewage connection issue. There would be a visual impact for existing home owners and additional noise from the road would be created. An existing green corridor would become urban sprawl which would in turn create a precedent for further expansion of development in the rural landscape in the future. Corrie Road is mostly single track with only the first mile or so from the village being two lanes.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The site AL6 Milnafua Farm has all the infastruture roads etc. And it has been allowed to become overgrown where fly tipping and prowlers in the dark making it at the present a health hazard and danger to the public and it is a must Houses should be built on the site

Allocated to

Customer Number 04371 Name David Smart Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph MO6

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Plan to specify hours of noise related activity during construction ie should not normally take place outwith 08.00 -19.00 Mon to Fri, 08.00 - 13.00 Sat. No Sunday or bank holiday working

Representation

Environmental Impact, Noise disturbance to residential property

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO6 Muir of Ord Industrial Estate Expansion

Customer Number 04371 Name David Smart Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference MO6 Muir of Ord Industrial Estate Type Change

Comment Changes

Retention of exisiting mature trees to the east of 2 Tomich, assurances that these will not be reduced to 25m. Expansion of 25m belt around development to 50m

Representation

Environmental impact, noise reduction, visual impact. Stronger belt of trees would withstand stronger winds

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO6 Muir of Ord Industrial Estate Expansion

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would recoment that this area should not be built on,that it should remain a green area and it is part of the community's heritage.

Representation

I reside at this area,and have known this area for around all 48 years of my life. This area has the following fauna; roe deer,red squirrel,tawny owl,snowy owl,wood pigeon,heron,bees,butterfies,moths,dragonflies,it has a unique diversity,and other animals that I do not know There are many established trees,shrubs,flowers of various types.Which is great to see on the outskirts of the ever encroaching city.To build on this area would reduce habitats for all these things,maybe there are rare species in this place. I know there is also the invasive plant species Japanese Knot Weed growing ii this area.These are the reasons I would like it to remain a " Green Space" for generations to come,I would like a wild life survey to be undertaken to find out what we have in here. This area at one time was a quarry from which stone was taken to use on the Caledonian Canal, and also some of the surrounding buildings.So this area is part of The Caledonian Canal and Clachnaharry heritage.Whose to say thatThomas Telford did not visit this site The new developement would not blend in with the existing buildings,particularly the close by category "B" listed Thomas Telford cottages and Georgian Period " Dunollie House". The traffic on this road has greatly increased over that few years.And I am afraid to say that drivers very seldom stick to speed limit and with the number of people parking on the street this can cause congestion. Early morning traffic sometimes queues from this bad corner all the way down to the canal bridge at Muirtown Locks. This corner at Clachnaharry has zero visibility,and as I have said people do not abide by The Highway Code,this would mean more cars in a limited space. It is very difficult to get in and out of my drive,because of motorists speeding.So if we have more houses here we will have more traffic so adding to this problem.You could not even lower the speed limit as this would only make these matters worse.Recently there was a child clipped by a vehicle on this corner.Therefore I think it is not safe because of this bad corner.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Firstly I would like to point out that the map sent to us is inaccurate in that the road leading to Culcairn House-Cottage is shown as much wider than it is. The rough track is bordered by a burn which frequently overflows and the other side of the road is shown hard against the houses known as Burnside and Fyrish. Are their gardens going to be subject to a compulsory purchase order simply to placate the owner of Novar Estate. There is a perfectly adequate road at the other side of the development. In addition I do not see the need for a development here when there is an area in Teandallon purchased many years ago for the purpose of house building. This area is much closer to the school and would from a road safety point of view be a much more suitable site.

Representation

There is no need for the amount of housing envisaged in this village. There is little enough work in the area to support this. Additionally the school could not possibly meet the needs of this extra amount of people without extensive additions to it. Parking is an additional problem at the school. Would the developer at Culcairn be willing to pay for this additional infrastructure. At peak times there is already a large volume of traffic within the village and I would also point out that at times I have waited 10 minutes to access the A9 leaving Evanton at its south approach. How much worse is this going to be with an extra 200 plus cars leaving what is already a commuter village. It would be necessary to put a roundabout on the A9 at this exit. Why has the culcairn proposed development risen from 83 houses as per the previous amendment, to 160 homes. I would ask that these comments, together with my original objections, be taken into consideration when considering these proposed plans.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish the building of houses in this green space to be prevented.

Representation

I do not wish to see this green space in Nairn town center eroded or depleted. It is a public amenity, used consistently and enjoyed by all. There are several other areas ear marked for housing which do not involve the loss of green space public amenities in the town center. They should be used instead.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04389 Name David Vaughan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.96

Reference CD4 Type Change

Comment Changes

That this space is essentially retained as farmland with a small area that relates to the rear of the existing West End cottages having the potential for a small number of houses .

Representation

This land is good quality farmland and should be preserved as such. Any building on this land would be visible from the Western approaches. The hidden nature of the village would be lost. The number of houses in this area alone would dwarf the existing village. A development here , on its own , is entirely out of keeping with the unique village that exists.

Allocated to Cawdor CD4 CD4 Cawdor expansion

Customer Number 04389 Name David Vaughan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.96

Reference CD1 and CD2 Type Change

Comment Changes

CD1 and CD2 should be removed from the development plan and preserved as green space upon which development is not permitted. CD1 should be become the village green.

Representation

Both of these sites represent an integral part of the green space that that is historic to , and interwoven with, the structure of the village. CD1 (the old school playground) is the space to which the other houses relate to .It has always been accessible and open. It is the only such green space within the existing village. It must be preserved as such.This is the space around which the village was constructed or has developed.This space should be developed as a village green in such a way that people can use and enjoy it. CD2 is the space that links the village to the Big Wood. The slope of the field leads right into the wood. It is historic rough grazing and borders close to the castle. The elevation would mean any development looked down on the village. It has important conservation value (e.g. barn owls feed here) and it has unique amenity value. Both of these open spaces provide the context within which the village sits. The village is a compact settlement but it is also a ribbon development i.e. houses are built along the single street which winds around the playground and beside the field that CD2 is. If you remove these spaces the whole nature of the village is lost. Cawdor Village is hidden until you find it but then , because of the spaces it opens up. These green spaces are essential to preserve the uniqueness of this village.

Allocated to Cawdor CD1 Old School Playground

Customer Number 04389 Name David Vaughan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.96

Reference CD3,5,6,7,9,10 Type Change

Comment Changes

The overall scale of development is not commensurate with conserving the existing settlement. The number of proposed houses should be reduced by a factor of 10 i.e. a maximum of 30 houses.

Representation

The effect of this proposal would be to destroy the existing settlement. It would constitute a complete disregard for any kind of conservation. The uniqueness of this village would be lost in the face of such a massive development. The proposal represents a whole new settlement. It must be scaled down so that it is in keeping with what is here just now.

Allocated to Cawdor General General

Customer Number 04226 Name Dean Clark Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph

Reference NA2 - South Kingsteps Type Change

Comment Changes

Different access not through Kingsteps Less housing density

Representation

NAIRN – DEVELOPMENT SITE NA2 – SOUTH KINGSTEPS Your Ref – IMFLDP/PP/NN Proposed Access The junction where the Lochloy Road meets the A96 can be very congested at peak times with tailbacks going as far back as Bona Vista Road. There should be a direct access route from the existing development (NA-5) over the railway line to meet with the A96 before consent is given for any more housing development in this area. The proposed access onto the Lochloy Road at the East end of Kingsteps is unsuitable for a development of this size, the road is a single track country road as is evident by the use of driveways for passing places. The Lochloy Road is part of the National Cycle Network and as such is regularly used by cyclists Horse Riders frequently use the route through Kingsteps from the nearby stables and paddocks for access to the beach Lorries and tractors frequently use this route to service the agricultural and forestry industries in the area. School bus route with a 48 seat bus taking pupils to school. The only sensible access to this site would be through the existing development at NA-5. Over development of the area The proposed site adjoins the existing rural housing forming Kingsteps (22 houses), consequently this should reflect the rural nature of the existing housing. Most of the houses in Kingsteps sit on at least 0.5 acre plots, some quite a bit more. Any development of the site should reflect the nature of the neighbouring properties in line with the Scottish Governments Planning Policy and advice.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 04500 Name Dennis Simpson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TM9 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Business - TM9 - Rail Halt -Representation - Upgrading of road to Adoptive Standards is to be welcomed, and is particularly required at the northern end of station road. This section although passing 4 Council Tax Properties is a disgrace and is not "Adopted" even council snowploughs and gritters (although using this section as a winter shortcut to the old A9) will not clear the road even in passing!!! Reason? Road not "Adopted"!! In winter, the residents of said properties are Frequently victims of late deliveries (Mail Etc) and quite often cancelled refuse collections. Yes please, adopt the Whole Road.

Allocated to Tomatin TM9 Land at former railway station

Customer Number 04500 Name Dennis Simpson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TM13 Type Change

Comment Changes

Change requirements to: Additional planting and improvements of the boarded warehouses and or tourism related uses.

Representation

TM 13 Tomatin Distillery - Seeking to Change -Terms such as "Reconfiguration of Distillery" or related operations should be removed. Replace with Additional planting and improvements of the Bonded Warehouses and or Tourism, related Uses. Representation If relative ,these will only encourage renewed applications for a transport depot, or similar, at TM13which have already been rejected,

Allocated to Tomatin TM13 Tomatin Distillery

Customer Number 02209 Name Derek Clunas Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alan R Farningham Farningham Planning Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN24 - Torvean and Ness Side Southern Part Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Support Plan as written.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number 04104 Name Des Scholes Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Nairn sites Type Change

Comment Changes

The development allocations for Nairn are simply OTT. In the light of the refusal of Highland Council in September to grant planning permission to the South Nairn development these plans should be revised immediately in the light of the Council's realisation that areas of Nairn cannot cope with traffic flow. I would particularly suggest that any Call for sites submissions be reexamined (particularly any traffic assesments accompanying them) and a more sober plan more in line with the current economic climate be produced.

Representation

Please see above section. Further to this I wish to strongly object to the proposal to put houses on the Showfield in Nairn. This would be an unacceptable trade off for a piece of common good land in Sandown. Nairn has to keep its established green spaces.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Build the road proposed in previous Black Isle Plan for this area. The 50 proposed houses are 45 houses too many for this conservation area – see paragraphs 4.60 (1st sentence) and 4.61 (1st sentence) on Pg 80 of the Development Allocations. A road to relieve the congestion of traffic in Rosemarkie High Street is far more necessary than extra housing. CU2 - No change sought here but see attached

Representation

What has happened to the green belt? This is part of the best agricultural land on the Black Isle and should not be used to build houses. We have lived in this house since it was built in 1978/79 and it amazes me at the number of vehicles which stop opposite my window people get out, admire the view and take photographs of the animals in the field or the round bales at harvest or even the trees and wildlife at the top of the hill. I doubt they would stop to photograph a housing estate. Since we moved here in July 1979 we have had water pressure problems. The water treatment plant was sited in the wrong place at the beginning. The local infrastructure is not working for the community at present far or less the proposed influx of people. The roads have not been constructed to survive the wear and tear caused by the increasing size of heavy vehicles and are badly maintained once potholes appear. The public transport does not cater for working population who do not have their own vehicle or those in Rosemarkie who need to use bus to get to doctor, post office, shops and leisure centre in Fortrose. Carry on building at Ness Gap and leave Rosemarkie alone. This site CU2 at Culbokie has an area of 2.3ha and a proposed housing capacity of 4. The FR1 Greenside Farm Site in Rosemarkie has an area of 1.9ha and a proposed housing capacity of 50 – this is farmland not forestry. Also Site ML2 Brae Farm at Munloch has an area of 3.4ha housing capacity 41. How do you explain 50 houses in 1.9ha at Rosemarkie?

Allocated to

Customer Number 04468 Name Diane Kinnear Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Riarachaidhean Leasachaidh Paragraph 4.62

Reference FR3 Cemetery Extension Type Change

Comment Changes

The surrounding area next to the cemetery was allocated for housing in the previous Black Isle Plan. Cemetery would need to expand northwards rather than eastwards due to ground table water extending from Manse Loch, nest to wrongly sited water treatment plant.

Representation

The north west and west side of FR1 Greenside Farm would make a better cemetery next to Hawkshill than a housing estate. It would look better as well. On page 145 of 4. Development Allocations it states 4.159 In accommodating development there is a need to maintain the landscape setting particularly open sloping land on the east that provides attractive public views towards the Bay. The same can be said of the view from our house in Rosemarkie although the view is to the north and north east oat Greenside Farm looking up the hill to the trees at the top

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number 00867 Name Dietrich Pannwitz Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph The land at Artafallie Farm, East of the A9

Reference Land East of A9 (Artafallie) Suitbale for Infill Type Change

Comment Changes

The land East of ther A9 is suitable for infill development, especially land based, rural, green development and associated buildings and housing. This would reduce traffic pressure into Inverness by maintaining and creating jobs locally and allow rural business to restructure/diversify into other businesses.

Representation

As part of the Scottish Government policies rural business should be supported as they form the backbone of rural Scotland. Diversification into fruit farming, nursery, renewable energy, farm shop etc, business should be supported. In order to maintain these local business and reduce travel distance to and through from work, local housing should be supported especially where it could be considered as infill rather than "hinterland" development. The land East of the A9 at Artafallie farm is excatly this - infill for a rural business and should be supported. This related to land at NH629494, land between the current and old A9 and adjacent (West) of the Toll House.

Allocated to Tore General General

Customer Number 01068 Name Dingwall Auction Mart Limited Organisation Dingwall Auction Mart Limited

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Martin Mackay Martin Mackay Solicitors

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DW9 Type Change

Comment Changes

Additional provision of land allocated for business use to be made available.

Representation

With reference to Site DW9, there is significant concern as to the lack of an allocation of sufficient land for a material future expansion of the Dingwall Business Park. This lack of allocated land may lead to a curtailment of new business investment in Dingwall. There is substantial undeveloped land lying to the north of Site DW9 which has never been known or shown to flood which would comprise a natural and, indeed, a logical option for extension of the Dingwall Business Park and consideration ought to be given to the inclusion of this area for future business expansion. Given the clay nature of the land, it is thought that the top soil stripped in any development could be usefully utilised in enhancing existing flood prevention measures on or adjacent to the River Peffery. If the representations to extend DW9 northwards are not favourably received, then active consideration should be given to locating additional land outwith the current settlement boundaries for future business expansions as all reasonable efforts should be made to encourage investment and business location to the Dingwall area. There is an area of land to the north of DW7 behind and adjacent to the McConechys Tyre Depot about which several enquiries for redevelopment have already been received and in the absence of an expansion of DW9, this area ought to be considered for future business expansion.

Allocated to Dingwall DW9 Land to East of Dingwall Business Park

Customer Number 01068 Name Dingwall Auction Mart Limited Organisation Dingwall Auction Mart Limited

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Martin Mackay Martin Mackay Solicitors

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DW7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Suggest clarification regarding extent of likely contaminated area and propose amended use within proximity to town centre.

Representation

With reference to Site DW7, this comprises part brown field and part green field sites. The land lying to the north and east beyond the existing developed area has never been developed and it is not known to be the subject of any historic contamination or pollution issues. Due to the proximity of this area as a whole to the town centre, consideration should be given to allocating parts of this site to affordable, sheltered or retirement housing.

Allocated to Dingwall DW7 Dingwall Riverside (North)

Customer Number 04008 Name Don Leith Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.87 ardersier

Reference AR6 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like the statement "built development to be limited to Caravan accomodation and changing block" not to have the word "limited". I would like to see Manager's house, Toilet facilities, Reception, shop and perhaps small coffee shop added to the description.

Representation

Limiting the proposal to only Caravan accomodation and changing block severely hampers the proposal. It could perhaps lead to future problems.

Allocated to Ardersier AR6 North of village

Customer Number 04467 Name Donald Campbell Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Keep the field

Representation

I want the field in CB3 left as it is as this field was gifted to conon Bridge and to which they have the title deeds.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

the reduced density of the development and the areas of hard development relative to the site area. The provision of a two lane road up Corrie Road paid for by the developer. The provision of a ball fence along the whole length of muir of ord golf club provided by the developer to safeguard golf club members from the householders for damage to their person and property caused by wayward balls. Provide surface water drainage so that the golf club subterrain does not get more saturated than it is at present.

Representation

I am a member of Muir of Ord golf club and have been for many years. Golf Clubs throughout the Highland Area have been badly hampered by planning and development decisions.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

A Change to boundary of development area to protect existing, established woodland B Change to ensure existing hundred year old trees are protected C Concern at potential destruction of historic drove road D Concerns at drainage of site once developed E Concern at possible road access from Ross Place.

Representation

A The current plan suggests that significant removal of old deciduous woodland is planned. This is not acceptable and the boundary of the development area should be redrawn as indicated on the attached map, DW3 and marked at 1 & 3. This takes the boundary along the existing fence line protecting some exceptionally old trees (oak, beech and chestnut). Amending the boundary will protect the woodland which is a valuable and well used community asset. The woodland is also part of the old Tulloch Castle estate and the network of paths is well over 100 years old. Consideration should be given to transferring the whole of the woodland area, including "Maggie's Drive to community ownership to ensure its protection and management. It would also be preferred if the DW3 area could be split in two pieces at its narrowest point along a small green belt from the top of Maggie's Drive to the drove road. B There are several very old single trees within the development areas which should also be protected, oak, chestnut, beech and Scots pine. Marked as 2 on the attached map. C At the northern boundary of the development area (marked 4 on the map) is the historic drove road. This is under serious threat of destruction with this development. It is inevitable that if the DW4 development area is approved then the drove road will be lost which will be pure vandalism. D There are significant drainage problems with the DW3 area with much of the western part of the area boggy for a good portion of the year. Currently the main burn in the woods is fed by runoff from the field. Properties at 39,40, 41 Chestnut Road have this burn at the rear of their houses and any increase in runoff as a result of a housing development could well lead to flooding after prolonged periods of rain. In addition any loss of woodland as mention at A would add to this problem. E When planning consent was sought for the houses on Ross Place in the 1990s it was a condition that no additional vehicular access would be permitted from a development in DW3. This was for safety reasons given the proximity of Dingwall Primary School.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I OBJECT to the Proposed Local Development Plan with regards to Beauly Village in general and Site BE1 (Beauly East) in particular. My representations are outlined below. Many parts of the proposals for our village need further serious consideration and consultation before the adoption of this plan as it affects Beauly can be considered. Here we are ten years on from our last approved Local Plan and our village has grown with total disregard to the recommendations of The Reporter to that Plan. Ref 4.26 · Housing expansion within railway line In July 2003 I raised objections to the Inverness Area Draft Local Plan with regard to some of the policies, which affected Beauly Village. There were many other objections at that time and as I stated then the opinions of several well-respected local professional people went unheeded. The Community Council representations were also ignored at that time regarding the expansion and development of our village. When that local plan was adopted The Reporter recommended that future development should be well-designed, landscaped, drawn up with consideration for its surroundings, the amenity of neighbouring residents, and not be intrusive or impact adversely on individual or community residential amenity. The reporter also stated that the local infrastructure of the village should be improved before further large-scale development takes place. The development at Farlie View to the southwest of the village is a particular instance of poor planning with many varying house types, visual intrusion into neighbouring properties etc. and all visible from the A862 to visitors entering or leaving our village. The planning application for part of Site BE1 where 37 houses were granted permission in 2009 indicated two storey Flat Type development bounding the properties No's 7 to 11 Croyard Drive. The private residences in Croyard Drive (No's 1 to 11) were restricted to single storey bungalow type development when built in the early nineties. Only the objections of the affected adjoining proprietors with support from other sympathetic householders within the village had this facet of the planning application altered. · Ease congestion within Beauly by completion of link road "Link road" or "Loop Road"? Local Distributor? Your text on this is rather confusing and I don't believe that any of these options will relieve central congestion in our village. What transportation, traffic or parking surveys have been done to justify this statement? The junction at Priory Way is already congested during peak hours and with the re-development of "House of Beauly" by The Cooperative, traffic movement at this junction can only deteriorate. Congestion still exists in the speed-restricted length of Croyard Road particularly at the southeast end due to the servicing of shops, access to doctors surgery and access to Aird Motors/Croyard Park. The northwest end of Croyard Road is congested daily (Mon/Fri) due to Beauly Primary School. Congestion occurs 8:50/09:30, 12:15/12:45 and 15:00/1545. The major topic regarding congestion in our village occurs daily in the 'Village Square'. The recent Streetscape Scheme has only been successful on the northwest side of the 'Village Square'. The southeast side of the 'Village Square' was designed as a one-way system but during consultation local traders, householders and others objected to this element of the scheme and it was removed from the plan. However the physical elements of the scheme were never altered to take account of two way turning movements at both entrances to our 'Village Square'. The result is chaotic to say the least and requires to be amended as soon as possible. Ref Site: BE1 – Beauly East My objection to this site is covered in a letter from BE1 Adjoining Tenants Association. In summary no development of this site should be considered until the watercourse to the North of Croyard Drive is diverted or the culvert at the southeast end of the open watercourse is redesigned to take the upstream flow. In conclusion I accept that some land requires to be zoned for housing, retail and business development but in my opinion there should be no further large-scale housing development within our village. The maintenance of the rural nature of our village has already become unbalanced since the implementation of the current Local Plan and generally existing residents are fearful for the manner in which our village is being developed and expanded. When did Beauly become a Town? Beauly has always been a village and existing residents have no wish to become a Dormitory Town of Inverness.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Would like to see the proposal for IN49 rejected.

Representation

The use of the area marked IN49 Bogbain Wood for housing would be of significant detriment to the people of the Milton of Leys area. This is a place of much valued green space in an increasingly densely populated area. I along with many others also believe that such an application is in clear contravention to Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1 Para 17-19 in relation to your commitment to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside as a whole. Covering this piece of ground with yet more and more houses fails to meet that objective and deprives the people and children of this area of a site that currently provides much needed recreational use for many. It is used for sporting purposes as well as trips and field work for the local schools. There are plenty houses on the market in Inverness just now, so why do we need even more? I would also point out that this area is currently deprived of many of the amenities required for such a large population anyway. The opening of our new Co-op shop today, some 12 years after I moved here just shows how little the council cares for the people of the community, yet how willing them seem to be to pander to the whims of developers who want to tear up the few remaining green spaces in and around this lovely city. No further development should be considered in this area until such time as the much promised shops and amenities are completed, as we were promised when we moved here back in 2001. The council should not fall for any further deception and hollow promises offered by developers in relation to new builds and should rather compel them to deliver on previous promises as a condition for even considering any further expansion in this place. Thank you.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Remove site from plan

Representation

I wish to object strongly to the proposal. I have lived at the old manse', Corrie Road for over 30 years. Over this period I have noticed a steady increase In the amount of traffic using the Corrie Road, outside the house in which I live. I am concerned about both the volume of traffic and the dangerous speed at which vehicles use the road. It troubles me particularly when my grandchildren and great grandchildren are home on holiday. The situation would become intolerable if the proposed development of MO3 ardnagrask, Corrie Road, muir of ord was allowed to proceed.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site is to dense. Consideration should be given to infra-structure, already unable to cope with the population.

Representation

As a resident of the area, I have objected on various occasions before to this development on various grounds, ie. density, infra-structure, green-belt, public amenities, wildlife. The roads in the area cannot cope with any more traffic nor can the schools cope with any more pupils! Pure greed - integrity should prevail!

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

'potential access from both Fettes Road and site AR3' This information appears to be partially incorrect. When will a correct and more detailed plan be available. I would like the plans for AR2 to be scrapped.

Representation

I purchased my property in Fettes Road overlooking fields (AR2 planned site) in July 2012 from Tullock AFTER being assured by them that building work on this site, would not and could not go ahead due to ground water retention, tests had proved that building on this land would be unviable. Firstly - Building on this site would not only block my view (which was the main reason for the purchase of this house) but also reduce it's value. Secondly - Within days of moving into this property, I had to report to the council a large hole that had appeared in the road (Fettes is one of your proposed access roads). It was repaired within days but it was obvious that the road, and/ or the ground beneath, is not suitable for heavy traffic. Thirdly - Why build more houses in Ardersier when there are already many empty (derelict) properties which should be renovated and brought back into use. There are also many properties to rent and for sale. The building of new homes would greatly reduce their chances of finding new tenants/owners.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

That No development should be allowed on this site - no housing of any type.

Representation

I object to the development of the Showfield for the following reasons :

1. The field is an existing green space which clearly fulfills the criteria given in section 2, paragraph 2.16 - in that it is regularly used for recreation and leisure by residents and visitors to Nairn. It is used by children, dog walkers, a Football Club, Car Boot Sales, Vintage Car Rallies, Circuses, Motor shows to name but a few. As stated in paragraph 2.16 - there is a real need to provide (green) spaces for Nairn residents to ".....meet friends and neighbours, take part in in sport, recreation and play while also making a significant contribution to the diversity of an area."
2. Vehicular access to the proposed housing development would cause severe congestion problems on Lodgehill Road, Waverly Road, the junction of these two roads, and the junction of Lodgehill Road and Chattan Drive. There are already problems on these roads. Lodgehill Road is quite a narrow road - so it would have to be widened to allow access to the proposed housing site - this would also cause substantial safety problems, severe disruption to the area and a probable worsening of the already poor drainage in this area.
3. Safety issues - Lodgehill Road is a major walking route to and from Nairn Academy. Nairn Academy pupils' safety would be at risk with extra traffic . Similarly, many young children walk from the local Primary Schools to Tradespark estate along Lodgehill Road.
4. I would question the need for such housing. Where is the evidence that a demand for so much housing exists?
5. I would refer you to the proposed Nairnshire Plan of 1998 where the owners of the showfield - Trustees of the Nairnshire Farming Society made and application to the Lands Tribunal for Scotland for discharge of a perpetual land obligation affecting the Showfield. This obligation I believe - is that no development be allowed on this land. The proposal then was to build a supermarket on the Showfield - and the local opposition to this proposal was huge. Such was the opposition that the application went no further.
6. Another application by the Nairnshire Farming Society to the Lands Tribunal would have to be made. once again I feel sure that local opposition would affect any subsequent hearing and the application rejected.
7. In 2000, Nairn Council published their plan which included Para 10.(f) says, "0.6 ha at the Showfield – 8-10 houses, 2 storey, design and form should be compatible with the proposed Conservation Area; access from Lodgehill Road including to the Showfield for maintenance and pedestrians; and adequate distance from trees and the sub-station. The Council will seek Section 75 agreement with the landowner to secure the remainder of the Showfield as public open space." It is disturbing and puzzling how a possible plan of 8 - 10 houses has suddenly grown to the present proposal of 30 houses!!!
8. I refer you to some proposals by Nairn Improvement Community Enterprise regarding the Showfield on 8/3/2011:- "One possible way forward would be for the Council, as custodians of the Common Good, to do a deal whereby they accepted the Showfield into the Common Good in exchange for a suitably-sized part of the Sandown Common Good land, given to the farmers (perhaps with some associated financial arrangement) and designated specifically for use as a new Show venue." I believe this option would receive considerable support from Nairn residents.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04161 Name Doreen Callaghan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph 2.16 infrastructure

Reference

Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

This paragraph clearly supports my argument (to follow) AGAINST the proposed development of the Farmers' Showfield in Nairn.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 04461 Name Doreen Wright Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference NA2

Type Change

Comment Changes

The area of the site North of the existing drainage burn was not to be proposed for building. The current landowners had intimated on at least two occasions that this piece of land would not be used for housing.

Representation

The site is low lying and has water drainage issues. Surface water lies there for most of the year. The burn running through the site should be retained. 1) For drainage of the land 2) For the good of the environment of the area i.e. tadpoles, birds, and other water wild life 3) There ought to be a buffer zone between the new housing and the present hamlet of Kingsteps. Buffer zones in the past in the area have not been strictly adhered to.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Any development of this site should reflect the nature of the adjoining houses in Kingsteps. Therefore a change of plan from 90 houses to 20 houses would be more appropriate.

Representation

This plan is of too high density for a semi rural area. It is a higher density than any other proposed development plan for Nairn. A development of 20 houses would be acceptable.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change of access from Lochloy Road to site NA2. Access should be via Montgomery Drive.

Representation

Lochloy Road, through Kingsteps is a narrow road. The through traffic is made up of timber lorries, tractors, delivery vans, school buses plus the use of private vehicles from Kingsteps and beyond. Passing areas are not designated, therefore private driveways are used. Exit on to A96 from Lochloy Road at the junction at certain times results in long queues forming on Lochloy Road. This would be made worse by the addition of 90 plus more cars joining the exit to work. This would not be alleviated by the new proposed trunk road as traffic would still have to travel on Lochloy Road.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04035 Name DOUGAL MACDOUGALL Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN24 Type Change

Comment Changes

WOULD PREFER THE ROAD CONNECTING DORES ROAD TO A82 TO BE MORE DIRECT. HOW IS THE INCREASE IN WASTE WATER TO BE DEALT WITH?

Representation

OP 4 DISTRIBUTOR ROAD WOULD SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT WELL BUT WOULD NOT DIVERT TRAFFIC FROM THE CITY. KINMYLIES ROAD MAY TAKE SOME TIME. SERIOUSLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE MASSIVE INCREASE IN WASTE WATER GOING TO THE ALREADY OVER CAPACITY OF THE ALLAN FEARN TREATMENT PLANT. A MAJOR SYSTEM TO PUMP SEWAGE TO THE NEW ARDERSIER TREATMENT PLANT AND DISCHARGED TO THE OPEN SEA COULD BE THE ANSWER.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

We act for and are instructed by Mr Douglas Barker of Eden Lodge, Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose.

Our client has instructed us to make representations on his behalf in respect of the Proposed Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.

Our client wishes to make the following representations:

Fortrose and Rosemarkie

1. Housing: FRI Greenside Farm

Our client does not object to this allocation but because of the sensitive nature of the location - which encroaches on the hinterland - he would have to object in the strongest possible terms if the proposed site boundary were to be moved even marginally.

2. Housing: FR2 Ness gap

Our client does not object to this allocation as presently stated.

3. Community: FR3 Cemetery expansion

Any expansion should be designed/landscaped in a manner which respects the proposed use of this site.

Our client would request better screening of the existing facility (e.g. hedging) as part of any proposed development. The existing site is directly overlooked by the houses next door, which can be distressing for people who are visiting the cemetery (particularly at the top left corner) who would obviously appreciate privacy when paying respects.

4. Options for growth: paragraph 4.60

Our client notes and agrees with the draft text which states that Fortrose and Rosemarkie both benefit from significant natural, heritage, and leisure assets, making them very attractive and popular with residents and visitors alike.

Our client also notes and supports the draft text which states that opportunities for the growth of Fortrose and Rosemarkie are influenced by the desire to maintain a clear visual and physical break in the built environment between them, to retain their distinct identities and avoid coalescence.

Further, expansion of Fortrose is also constrained by steep and very prominent topography and amenity woodland to the west. Land with planning permission at Ness Gap therefore represents the best option for growth.

Lastly, expansion of Rosemarkie is also constrained by the wooded gorge and steep rising farmland to the north and west, with land at Greenside Farm continuing to represent the best option for growth.

These statements in the Proposed Local Development Plan are taken as appropriate recognition by the Highland Council of a long standing principle. This principle of maintaining a clear visual and physical break in the built environment between Fortrose and Rosemarkie, retaining their distinct identities and avoiding coalescence, must be taken as a cornerstone for any future development. Only in this way can the Council act consistently with its approach to supporting the development of housing at FR1 Greenside Farm.

We note, in particular, the Council has in previous publications chosen to place particular emphasis on the following foundations:

“The emerging draft Scottish Planning Policy identifies a focus on positive place

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

making with one of the six qualities being “Distinctive: places that complement local landscapes...”

"At the MIR stage the Council did not prefer many of the options within the gap other than preferring expansion at the cemetery which is considered only to have a marginal impact, as it preserves the land here as a form of open space, and also preferring the lower Wards Farm site for limited housing".

One of the most common concerns expressed about future development in this locality is of course about potential loss of identity for Rosemarkie and Fortrose if development is allowed on the open land between the settlements. This open land - which provides a clear visual and physical break in the built environment - forms a strategic gap protecting the setting of both settlements and their separate identities.

5. 4.62 Waste Water Treatment works

Our client objected to the expansion of the existing Waste Water Treatment works on land to West of Greenside Farm. In our client's view, this expansion seemed to become necessary because of the poor planning of the original plant.

Our client's firmly held view is that the Council has - again - failed to ensure that the proposals for the current expansion are adequate.

As has been highlighted in correspondence over a considerable period, it is reasonable for our client to be concerned that the recently-consented expansion has again reaffirmed a precedent upon which Scottish Water will rely when seeking to expand the plant further in the future, should the current proposals prove again to be inadequate.

In its report on representations made on the Main Issues Report, amongst other similar statements, the Council noted that:

"There is capacity in the Waste Water Treatment Works for the supported allocations at Ness Gap in Fortrose and for Greenside Rosemarkie, subject to investments in upgrades to the water mains and/or sewer extension/upgrade for phases of development 2017 and onwards. The Plan also identifies that early engagement is required between developers and Scottish Water to ensure sufficient capacity can be delivered in the Assynt Water Treatment Works. Also at Fortrose the link water main between Black Isle Trunk and the service reservoir has very limited capacity, and assessment will be required to establish extent of water network and storage upgrades. In Rosemarkie new development is likely to have water pressure issues, and a possible solution is installation of a new link main to service. Therefore developers here will need early engagement with Scottish Water to establish an appropriate solution."

Our client calls upon the Council to confirm in the Proposed Local Development Plan that no provision will be made for the further expansion of the Waste Water Treatment works at its present location. Our client objects to any inference that the facility may be expanded.

In the event the Council again chooses to ignore our client's requests, despite a growing industrial facility (having undergone one remedial expansion already) being unnecessarily sited right next to a long standing residential area regardless of the abundance of free available land elsewhere, and despite our client being the nearest neighbour, then (notwithstanding our client's continued abject objection) it must only be expanded towards the hillside, in the opposite direction, and away from, people's homes.

If bad design in the past has sited equipment within the facility, on the residential side of the facility, such that any future expansion would merit siting further equipment/infrastructure on the same side, this is most strongly objected to. This would demonstrate a complete absence of consideration, in earlier designs, for future impact on where people live.

Moreover, the Council will wish to abide by its stated desire to ensure that:

"a focus on positive place making with one of the six qualities being “Distinctive: places that complement local landscapes...”

"the Council did not prefer many of the options within the gap other than preferring expansion at the cemetery which is considered only to have a marginal impact, as it preserves the land here as a form of open space, and

also preferring the lower Wards Farm site for limited housing”.

And we also note that this stated desire amounts to a recognition, by the Council, that the original sewage treatment should not, in fact, be located where it currently is.

6. Main Issues Report and Alternative sites and uses consultation

For the sake of completeness, we attach copies of our letters dated 25 September 2012 on the Main Issues Report consultation, and 24 June 2013 on the Alternative Sites and Uses Consultation. We would ask that the comments in these letters also be taken into account at this stage.

We act for and are instructed by Mr Douglas Barker of Eden Lodge, Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose.

Our client has instructed us to make representations on his behalf in respect of the Main Issues Report which will be used to inform the preparation of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.

Unfortunately, our client did not become aware of the Main Issues Report until after the period for consultation expired at the beginning of July 2012. Our client would request that you still consider his comments at this stage or, failing this, include this letter when considering the terms of the draft Local Development Plan.

Our client wishes to make the following representations:

1. MU2

In the Council's site options the area marked MU2 in the Fortrose and Rosemarkie plan has been designated a mixed use space for retail and small business. Our client is concerned that this mixed use designation will include light industrial units. While the area is designated retail and not industrial, our client notes that mixed use areas in other locations, for example Milton, include light industrial use.

Our client calls upon the Council to provide assurances that MU2 will not become a site for light industrial use, which in turn will ruin the amenity of the area.

Moreover, our client has grave misgivings that the allocation of the mixed use site will set a precedent allowing for future industrial development in the area between Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Our client submits that the housing development proposed at H6 should be located at MU2. This would adjoin H6 to the already established residential area and move the proposed business park (possible light industrial area) away from the residential areas and thus minimise the impact to the area's amenity.

2. Sewage Plant

Our client objected to the expansion of the Scottish Water Waste Water Treatment Plant (“WWTP”) located beside MU2. In our client's view, this expansion seemed to become necessary because of the poor planning of the original plant.

It is also our client's view that the Council has failed to ensure that the proposals for the current expansion are adequate.

It is reasonable for our client to be concerned that the recently-consented expansion has set a precedent upon which Scottish Water will rely when seeking to expand the plant further in the future, should the current proposals prove again to be inadequate.

Our client calls upon the Council to allay his fears by confirming that no provision will be made for the further expansion of the WWTP at its present location.

3. H5

Our client cannot understand why the area marked H5 is proposed for development.

This area is part of the long standing land buffer between Fortrose and Rosemarkie, in which both communities have placed great importance for the past 30 years. This buffer is considered an important feature of the local area, and any reduction in this buffer will have a serious impact on the amenity of the area and the character of the locality.

Moreover, the area in question is also grade 1 agricultural land and our client is alarmed that this is being eliminated despite the national importance placed in retaining high quality agricultural land. Our client views this action as a severe lack of foresight which will only benefit a few parties.

4. Increase in housing

Our client is concerned by the lack of consideration given to the increase of housing. In total there are seven areas designated for proposed housing. Yet, there has been no

plans made for upgrading the services of the area to accommodate the large increase in population, including the upgrade of the road between Rosemarkie, Fortrose and Inverness.

Moreover, as the WTP (referred to above) already struggles to service the area in compliance with its CAR Licence, it is logical to assume further expansion will be required. What safeguards are in place to prevent this plant being extended further toward the residential areas? We refer to our comments above.

Any expansion of the WWTP will significantly impact on the amenity of the area and will likely cause a nuisance to the surrounding properties. Our client calls upon the Council to provide assurances that the plant will not be expanded further.

Conclusion

Our client reserves the right to make further comments on the draft local development plan once it has been issued.

We act for and are instructed by Mr Douglas Barker of Eden Lodge, Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose.

Our client has instructed us to make representations on his behalf in respect of the Local Development Plan - Alternative Sites and Uses Consultation which recently opened for consultation and is available until 30th June 2013.

Accordingly, our client wishes to make the following representations concerning:-

Fortrose NS47, Land North of Caravan Park (non-preferred)

Description: Land North of Caravan Park, suggested change from proposed use to use as a Housing Site to tourist related uses.

Our client's comments are:

1 This would result in the irreversible loss of prime grade 1 agricultural land, which is particularly short sighted when a global food crisis looms and this is not just the loss of any agricultural land but some of the best agricultural land in Scotland. Our client views this action as a severe lack of foresight which results in the long term loss by many to the short term benefit of only a few.

2 Our client considers this area is part of the long standing land buffer between Fortrose and Rosemarkie, in which both communities have placed great importance for the past 30+ years. If permitted, this would be the start of the erosion of the age old land barrier that ensures the distinct identities between Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Any reduction in this buffer will have a serious impact on the amenity of the area and the character of the locality.

In addition our client emphatically agrees with the further 'cons' identified by the Council, which are:

Access issues; sensitive site for landscape impact, outwith settlement boundary, not within easy walkable distance of village facilities and possible odour nuisance.

These comments shall be lodged online on the Local Development Plan website.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie

General

General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Stop development in IN 44 It council decides to proceed with approval please consider applying following preconditions. 1) Develop adequate drainage arrangements for rain water to avoid flooding of the road before starting any construction 2) Density of houses to be reduced and development should be moved 18 meters away from the greenery and the present properties. 3) Plant trees in the southern boundary to preserve the ambience of the region.

Representation

This development is a major threat to environment and present dwellings. The project has potential to affect the greenery in the region We choose to live in this region for the country living ambience inside the city limits. Present development will destroy this unique ambience. Highland water supply has dropped to 20% of what it was in 2010. Recently tap water flow has come down to a trickle. New developments are going to access water from same supply. I doubt if the council or developer has alternate plans. There had been regular flooding of road in front of Willow Banks house during rain due to improper drainage arrangements of water seeping from IN 44. The developer has not kept previous commitment to improve drainage. This has lead to road damage. Several old people living in the region have fallen due to ice formation and uneven road surface. Building 134 houses will increase flooding. This road is the only access to my house. The density of houses being developed though with in the recommended limits can have detrimental effect to the present residents comfort and access to water supply.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Under no circumstances do I think any development of this site should take place.

Representation

1. Nairn Showfield acts as an area of green space for the town. It is used by many for recreation, exercise and dog walking. Even to half this space isn't acceptable. 2. The surrounding roads are already extremely busy. The current infrastructure of this are does not support existing traffic far less more. Since the installation of traffic lights on the A96 through Nairn, the levels of traffic up the High Street, Cawdor Road, Waverly, Westbury and Wellington Road have already increased. Having young children this concerns me. 3. Much of the surrounding are is made up of beautiful period houses. I can only imagine any development will struggle to blend in or enhance the area and instead will continue to further dilute the areas character.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04272 Name Douglas Johnston Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.13

Reference IN68 Type Change

Comment Changes

Rejection of the proposed development at this site.

Representation

I wish to object to the proposal for site IN68 at Culduthel Avenue for Retail units as contained in the planning application 09/00074/FULIN. The application and proposal provide for neighbourhood shops on this site, but the absence of any development since the application was approved in September 2010 demonstrate that the plan was and remains a folly. Since then of course Tesco and Asda have opened large stores less than a mile from site IN68 and a small number of retail operations have opened at Fairways. The Asda development contains empty retail units and Tesco at Holm is not busy. Clearly then there is little demand from the neighbourhood for additional retail facilities on top of Asda and Tesco, and any demand there was has probably been satisfied at Fairways. Equally clearly there is no appetite from retailers to pursue speculative endeavours with competition from national operations in such close proximity. The deficits in the original plan were pointed out by myself and others such as Lochardil and Drummond Community Council and included inadequate traffic and parking arrangements and the industrial design of the units which are out of character with the locality and to my mind contrary to the Local Plan at that time. While the application that was approved was for four retail units, the original application included a fast food unit. I have no doubt that the developer will continue to attempt to establish such a facility on the site which would severely compromise the amenity of the adjoining Lochardil woodland and undermine healthy eating efforts at the nearby Inverness Royal Academy. The Lochardil woodland is a fantastic and very popular amenity and I would encourage the Council to seek to maintain and enhance that facility and access to it rather than pursue a retail option that was never viable and is now clearly redundant.

Allocated to South Inverness IN68 Culduthel Avenue

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

In the Statement of Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 on same area had 85 houses compared with 165 houses now. This should be reduced back to original size. Traffic access into the proposed development EV2 can only be from the north end of the development ie after Fyrish Crescent. The road shown to the east of Glenglass Road is in fact a single track farm road to Culcairn Cottage. The study indicates major structural landscaping between development EV2 and housing at east side of development. This is confusing. This landscaping should be to all existing housing as per the Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 ie Culcairn, Glenglass Road, Station Road and Fyrish Crescent The landscaping should also negate direct access between proposed development EV2 and Glenglass Road to discourage access and maintain a rural atmosphere as much as possible.

Representation

[redacted] As one of the residents most affected by the development plan for Zone EV2 in Evanton, I have attached some comments, possibly some too detailed at this time, but highly important to myself: Personally as a pensioner I am already finding this proposed development both daunting and stressful. I realise that development is essential and inevitable but the size of the developments EV1, EV2 & E3 with approx 300 homes and with a potential increase in population of say 1000+ people, effectively doubling the village size, will have a massive impact on the village and particularly the east end of the village. I purchased my home 2 years ago for my retirement and the home report showed no planning permission indicated. I was swayed into buying the property based on its quiet location and beautiful setting with unrestricted views of fields, trees and Fyrish hill. This proposed development will turn this beautiful rural setting into just another urban location The residents of Glenglass Road are all village/rural orientated people of mature age. It is highly important to protect Glenglass Road and its residents as much as possible to negate the intrusion of development EV2 with its massive population increase. This is a life changing development. I would ask the Development Team to answer and consider the following Size of development Is it the case that the size of development EV2 is purely based on the amount of land being offered by the Novar estate under the "Call for Sites". In the Statement of Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 on same area had 85 houses compared with 165 houses now. This should be reduced back to original size. Development Priorities What type of housing is planned? Is it private or rental? Development EV1 should take 1st priority as the land is already owned by the council and the area is already integrated into the Evanton community and closer to existing facilities and schooling. What are the approximate timings and priorities for development of EV1, EV2 & EV3. i.e. 5 years/10 years/20years. Will the infrastructure changes be carried out in parallel with development? Segregation of new development EV2 Traffic access into the proposed development EV2 can only be from the north end of the development ie after Fyrish Crescent. The road shown to the east of Glenglass Road is in fact a single track farm road to Culcairn Cottage. The study indicates major structural landscaping between development EV2 and housing at east side of development. This is confusing. This landscaping should be to all existing housing as per the Observations by Director of Planning issue 28 of May 2005 ie Culcairn, Glenglass Road, Station Road and Fyrish Crescent The landscaping should also negate direct access between proposed development EV2 and Glenglass Road to discourage access and maintain a rural atmosphere as much as possible. Existing Pathway There is a narrow pathway running between my property and my neighbours on to the farm road between Glenglass Road and the proposed development EV2 This was put in during construction of the Glenglass Road houses. This pathway is unsurfaced and unmaintained and I am unsure if it is an official pathway. I am extremely concerned that this pathway would be used as a "rat run" to the football pitch at north side of Glenglass Road, to the Black Rock Gorge or for dog walkers. Much of the above may appear trivial to others but could have major consequences to myself and possibly other residents of Glenglass Road. I would appreciate your review of my comments and trust there can be a positive outcome. Regards Doug McFee

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Development EV1 should take 1st priority as the land is already owned by the council and the area is already integrated into the Evanton community and closer to existing facilities and schooling.

Representation

As one of the residents most affected by the development plan for Zone EV2 in Evanton, I have attached some comments, possibly some too detailed at this time, but highly important to myself: Personally as a pensioner I am already finding this proposed development both daunting and stressful. I realise that development is essential and inevitable but the size of the developments EV1, EV2 & E3 with approx 300 homes and with a potential increase in population of say 1000+ people, effectively doubling the village size, will have a massive impact on the village and particularly the east end of the village. I purchased my home 2 years ago for my retirement and the home report showed no planning permission indicated. I was swayed into buying the property based on its quiet location and beautiful setting with unrestricted views of fields, trees and Fyrish hill. This proposed development will turn this beautiful rural setting into just another urban location The residents of Glenglass Road are all village/rural orientated people of mature age. It is highly important to protect Glenglass Road and its residents as much as possible to negate the intrusion of development EV2 with its massive population increase. This is a life changing development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Strathpeffer Spa Railway Association will not now enter into the old station but are planning to re-open a stretch of the old track, with an opartion base next to the Scottish Water Waster Water Treatment plant. See our planning application 13/03899/FUL

Representation

The area shown in blue in the current plan is therefore incorrect.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01282 Name Dr And Mrs Pumford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.14

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Like the idea of green corridors by the Burns which are many in the area. Would like to see the Flood relief scheme continued to the A9 before any more large areas allocated for housing

Allocated to South Inverness General General

Customer Number 01282 Name Dr And Mrs Pumford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

The area is enjoyed by locals for wildlife, walks & the pond.. Any development should be sensitive to be above

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 01282 Name Dr And Mrs Pumford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.11

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Delighted that Fairways Golf Course is protected as Green Space, also Inshes Park is progressing looking forward to Phase 2 & 3. Would have liked to see allocation of space for Primary School at Slackbuie as feel that the existing Primary Schools across a very busy distributor Rd is dangerous & children can not walk or bike which they should be able & encouraged to do.

Allocated to South Inverness General General

Customer Number 01282 Name Dr And Mrs Pumford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 47 N/E Milton of Leys School Type Change

Comment Changes

Delete housing Capacity of 16

Representation

This area is for Amenity use not residential. Facilities are much needed & there is ample land zoned for housing. Homes for heroes went to the Reporter who stated he only passed this as it was a social need & if it had been for normal housing would have been refused.

Allocated to South Inverness IN47 North East of Milton of Leys School

Customer Number 01282 Name Dr And Mrs Pumford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IN40 Parks Farm

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

concern re comment about possible Rd connecting Parks Farm across Old Edinburgh Rd to possible new site . Rd to remain as now

Representation

Will cut off Farms & houses to the South, ? their access. Well used Road by cyclists & walkers in the area.

Allocated to South Inverness IN40 Parks Farm

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The site is too small for shop & parking. It is at a junction of a busy Rd ,Stevenson Rd & single track Old Edinburg Rd with potential safety problems. There has been recent provision for more shops in the area & these are readily accessible for residents. The need is no longer there.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Para 4.17 IN 88 Easter Muckovie - Caravan Campsite We note the "requirement for site access visibility improvements", but we continue to express our concerns about road safety because the suggested improvements only address visibility. There should be more consideration to the road layout and the speed limit in order to improve road safety at the entrance. We note that the Settlement Boundary was moved to accomode this solitary business development on the south side of Inverness, and planning permission was granted on 14/9/2010, contrary to the expressed wishes of many residents in the Westhill Community Council letter of 19/3/2010. This is a solitary business development on the tourist route to the historic Culloden Battlefield. We hope that this will not set a precednet for future development outside the Settlement Boundary.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00324 Name Dr Donald Boyd Organisation Westhill Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IN80

Reference Inverness Campus, Beechwood (Para 3.7 and IN80) Type Change

Comment Changes

Additional Access to the Inverness Campus, Beechwood (Para 3.7 and IN80) Beechwood/Inverness Rail Shuttle and Halt (IN80)

Representation

We advise an additional access to the Beechwood Campus should be included in the final Plan, for reasons of road safety on the A9 (South) carriageway, relieving traffic congestion, improving the entrance to the University of the Highlands for buses, distant travellers and commuters in general, as well improving the general amenity for such a prestigious building. WCC, in conjunction with Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), has been promoting with Transport Scotland the strong case for an additional road access point to the developing Campus from the A96 Raigmore Interchange roundabout/A9 South slip-road (not from the southbound carriageway itself). "Pressure continues at the Raigmore junction on the A96" (Transport Appraisal Nov 2013, p. 17). As Transport Scotland needs to address this, as well as continued safety issues on the A9 (South) at the slip-road to the Campus, we recommend that the new and improved access to Beechwood be considered at the same time as a matter of priority. Beechwood/Inverness Rail Shuttle and Halt (IN80) We would welcome the inclusion of a specific provision to be added to the Plan for a rail shuttle service and halt between Inverness City centre and Beechwood. The case for this facility is strong, and growing stronger, particularly with the recent planning application for student accommodation at Rose Street, Inverness.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

An 'East Link' road connecting the A9 with the A96 (Inverness to Nairn Growth Area Para 3.7; IN80; IN82; IN83) The phrase 'proposals for an 'East Link' road, connecting the A9 with the A96' should be deleted from the draft Plan and replaced with "proposals for improving the roundabout at Raigmore Interchange for A96 to A9 traffic".

Representation

An 'East Link' road connecting the A9 with the A96 (Inverness to Nairn Growth Area Para 3.7; IN80; IN82; IN83) The phrase 'proposals for an 'East Link' road, connecting the A9 with the A96' should be deleted from the draft Plan and replaced with "proposals for improving the roundabout at Raigmore Interchange for A96 to A9 traffic". We see no case at all for this proposal, whether it be a trunk road or local road. As far as we can see, the IMFPLDP makes no business case for the proposal, which is not surprising because Transport Scotland, at its earlier public exhibition in Balloch of its A96 upgrade proposals, openly admitted that there was little traffic travelling between the A96 and the A9 (South). Even the proposed West link will not create the demand that would necessitate this East Link. Furthermore, any form of link road will cut a swathe through the area earmarked for the proposed East Inverness District Park in the IMFPLDP, and it will unnecessarily confine the already restricted Beechwood campus, as well as restrict its probable future expansion. It is imperative that there is room for future expansion of the Beechwood Campus, instead of being hemmed in by a new East Link Trunk Road. Transport Scotland will be able to redirect the savings allocated for this East Link to the much-needed upgrade of the Raigmore Interchange.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

WCC has opposed this proposed distributor road for many reasons. In light of new information and public concerns, we call for a moratorium until the new alternatives are properly considered.

Representation

West Inverness (Para 4.9; IN24) and South Inverness (Para 4.11; IN24) distributor road We assume that these are the west and south end of the same 'new' distributor road. WCC has opposed this proposed distributor road for many reasons: its damage to Canal Park, the road noise and pollution to Queen's Park and Whin Park, its disputed benefits on traffic relief, the questionable costing of the options offered for public consideration, the ignoring of considerable public objection to The Highland Council's chosen route, and the inappropriate speed and lack of transparency in the decision-making process. The initial stakeholder groups, which considered the project, did not include the public, who since then have gained the impression that the public consultation was a tick-box exercise, only exacerbated by the dismissal of public objections. As this West Link is in two phases, with uncertain linking to a new sports hub with uncostered benefits, there is no guarantee that the second phase will ever be completed in the foreseeable future, which results in only one of the two main reasons for this link being satisfied – providing a road for developers to build houses (Para 4.11; Combined Action Plan 2013) – while the main ostensible reason is left unsolved – “linking the south and west part of Inverness” for traffic relief “resolving one of the existing canal queuing pinchpoints” (Para 4.9), which depends upon the completion of phase two. We are concerned about the conflict of interest between Highland Councillors as Trustees of the Common Good Fund and their role as Councillors in requesting permission for the use of Common Good property. In the light of new information about the costing of a cut and cover tunnel and alternative, very competitive costings of two high-level bridge options (which the public overwhelmingly endorsed as its preferred option), challenges to the costs and funding of the current project (contingent upon unsecured developer funds), and questions being raised with Audit Scotland, we have grave concerns that the decision is not safe and it will be yet another example of short-term vision from quick-fire decision-making. Considering the strategic nature and need for a west link crossing, the Inverness public is asking for the optimum solution, not a short-term fix, which may yet prove to be costly in terms of finance and amenity. In light of new information and public concerns, we call for a moratorium until the new alternatives are properly considered.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00324 Name Dr Donald Boyd Organisation Westhill Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IN82

Reference Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

East Inverness District Park: Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land (IN82) We invite the Highland Council to initiate a specific action plan immediately for the District Park itself, so that the park can be established without further delay. We particularly welcome the Council’s intention in the Proposed Action Programme Nov 2013 to prepare Supplementary Guidance on this and other Ashton Farm-related issues by Summer 2014. Provision for a District Park in East Inverness was also included in the Inverness Local Plan adopted in March 2006, so that action to initiate its provision is long overdue. As the IMFPLDP states concerning West Inverness: “The best way to protect greenspace is to make positive use of it.” (Para 4.10). The recognition that parkland is useful for flood control is particularly relevant in view of the established flooding risk. Ashton Farm (IN82), Stratton (IN83), Housing (Para 2.10) and East Inverness expansion (Para 4.15) We continue to oppose the proposed expansion of the city into the East Inverness area for the reasons described in detail in our former responses to the Main Issues Report 2012 and the HwLDP adopted on 5 April 2012. "Green corridors" through open farmland must be retained in East Inverness and not only adjacent to the A96 corridor developments. The planned park at Ashton Farm is welcome but not sufficient. The open farmland and green space so close to the city would be the envy of many councils. It must remain undeveloped to give the city space to "breathe" and retain its image as "green Inverness". If the city moves eastward, we will need this green area within the city and not only on its outskirts. We strongly object to any further housing in the Ashton Farm area since approval has been granted already for 2475 houses in the neighbouring Stratton Farm development. The established flood risk in this area should influence the decision in favour of retail, business and even industrial development rather than residential housing, and this should be considered along with our comments on industrial development at the former Longman Landfill site. Historically, developer contributions rarely materialized until a large part of the development was completed, being dependant on house sales. Infrastructure such as schools, medical surgeries, roads, water and sewerage have struggled to cope with extra housing. The argument that developer contributions cannot finance "new builds" is inadequate and there needs to be a scheme of phased development so that infrastructure can keep pace with development. We note the attempt to do so in the Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions adopted by the PED Committee on 13 March 2013. The public perception is that infrastructure lags too far behind development. The credit crisis teaches us the importance of the correct balance between profit for private companies and the risk of failure being carried by the public purse. The uncertainty about developer funds in the West Link teaches us that developer contributions need to be secured in a manner that minimises risk to the Council. In our submission to the Main Issues Report Spring 2012 (Annex B) our collective community council submission said: “We have been told by planning officials that the previous 25% settlement expansion policy will be removed because local communities used it too often against the wishes of developers. We are concerned that these earlier principles of sustainable development are being replaced with exponential growth.” This was said in the context of Croy and Cawdor, and we note that some redress is planned for Croy. This should not be ad hoc, but consistent, sustainable and testable principles need to be available for all developments to limit the current "urban sprawl" which is putting pressure on existing services.

Allocated to East Inverness IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land

Customer Number 00324 Name Dr Donald Boyd Organisation Westhill Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.17

Reference IN 74 Caulfield Road Type Change

Comment Changes

Housing over-capacity.

Representation

Para 4.17 IN 74 Caulfield Road We note that our earlier suggestion that this should be open space has not prevailed. We are concerned that eight houses is over-capacity in view of the proximity to mature woodland with a risk of falling, and existing footpaths.

Allocated to East Inverness IN74 Caulfield Road

Customer Number 00324 Name Dr Donald Boyd Organisation Westhill Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph 2.2

Reference Safeguarding Our Natural Environment Type Change

Comment Changes

New Gateway Policy proposed

Representation

New Gateway Policy proposed Safeguarding Our Natural Environment Para 2.2 As a general principle, Westhill Community Council does not think that the former Longman Landfill site is suitable as an industrial site. We believe the whole area should come under a Gateway Policy, which we believe does not currently exist. We recommend a Gateway Policy as a new, additional Policy for the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, taking into consideration principles applied to strategically identified Gateways to Inverness and the Highlands. Some of these principles may be contained within other policies, such as Policy 28 Sustainable Design, Policy 49 Coastal Development, Policy 56 Travel, Policy 57 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Policy, Policy 61 Landscape, Policy 75 Open Space, Policy 77 Public Access, Policy 78 Long Distance Routes, etc., in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, but they are better collated under a Gateway Policy, which is not simply an Amenity Policy applicable to all situations, because it would apply to identified sites and may involved graded categories.

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number 00324 Name Dr Donald Boyd Organisation Westhill Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.17

Reference IN73 Easterfield Farm Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Easterfield Farm (Para 4:17; IN73) We welcome this being allocated for junction improvements.

Allocated to East Inverness IN73 Easterfield Farm

Customer Number 00324 Name Dr Donald Boyd Organisation Westhill Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph 2.8

Reference Promoting and Protecting City and Town Centres Type Change

Comment Changes

New Community Policy proposed

Representation

New Community Policy proposed Para 2.8 Promoting and Protecting City and Town Centres We believe that a new Community Policy is necessary. The fact that areas of Inverness are more like building sites with few local amenities in terms of shops, medical surgeries, pharmacies, churches and community halls, highlights the need for a policy which seeks to incorporate into the planning process the readiness to build communities and foster community relationships and involvement, both in terms of buildings, amenities and road infrastructure. As a Community Council we are very aware of the need to reach out to our community in order to represent them. It is a pity that our greatest use to them is in fighting inappropriate planning applications and fighting for amenities such as a local pharmacy. The expansion of villages and communities needs a Community Policy to maintain cohesion and balance.

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Ashton Farm (IN82), Stratton (IN83), Housing (Para 2.10) and East Inverness expansion (Para 4.15) We continue to oppose the proposed expansion of the city into the East Inverness area for the reasons described in detail in our former responses to the Main Issues Report 2012 and the HwLDP adopted on 5 April 2012.

Representation

Ashton Farm (IN82), Stratton (IN83), Housing (Para 2.10) and East Inverness expansion (Para 4.15) We continue to oppose the proposed expansion of the city into the East Inverness area for the reasons described in detail in our former responses to the Main Issues Report 2012 and the HwLDP adopted on 5 April 2012. "Green corridors" through open farmland must be retained in East Inverness and not only adjacent to the A96 corridor developments. The planned park at Ashton Farm is welcome but not sufficient. The open farmland and green space so close to the city would be the envy of many councils. It must remain undeveloped to give the city space to "breathe" and retain its image as "green Inverness". If the city moves eastward, we will need this green area within the city and not only on its outskirts. We strongly object to any further housing in the Ashton Farm area since approval has been granted already for 2475 houses in the neighbouring Stratton Farm development. The established flood risk in this area should influence the decision in favour of retail, business and even industrial development rather than residential housing, and this should be considered along with our comments on industrial development at the former Longman Landfill site. Historically, developer contributions rarely materialized until a large part of the development was completed, being dependant on house sales. Infrastructure such as schools, medical surgeries, roads, water and sewerage have struggled to cope with extra housing. The argument that developer contributions cannot finance "new builds" is inadequate and there needs to be a scheme of phased development so that infrastructure can keep pace with development. We note the attempt to do so in the Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions adopted by the PED Committee on 13 March 2013. The public perception is that infrastructure lags too far behind development. The credit crisis teaches us the importance of the correct balance between profit for private companies and the risk of failure being carried by the public purse. The uncertainty about developer funds in the West Link teaches us that developer contributions need to be secured in a manner that minimises risk to the Council. In our submission to the Main Issues Report Spring 2012 (Annex B) our collective community council submission said: "We have been told by planning officials that the previous 25% settlement expansion policy will be removed because local communities used it too often against the wishes of developers. We are concerned that these earlier principles of sustainable development are being replaced with exponential growth." This was said in the context of Croy and Cawdor, and we note that some redress is planned for Croy. This should not be ad hoc, but consistent, sustainable and testable principles need to be available for all developments to limit the current "urban sprawl" which is putting pressure on existing services.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00324 Name Dr Donald Boyd Organisation Westhill Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.17

Reference IN81 and IN89 Type Change

Comment Changes

We object to the proposed use of this agricultural area for housing.

Representation

Para 4.17 IN81 West of Castlehill Road We note that WCC's view has not prevailed. We object to the proposed use of this agricultural area for housing, and we wholeheartedly endorse the 'significant cons' listed in the Main Issues Report Spring 2012 against this proposal. Para 4.17 IN89 Land south east of Drumossie Hotel We note that this site was not mentioned in the Main Issues Report. As it can be seen from the A9 on the approach to Inverness, we recommend that our proposed new Gateway criteria should apply to it (see other entry). We are grateful to have the opportunity to record our opinions. We appreciate the new interactive online facility, with the hyperlinking of the downloadable PDF file, but we encourage more robust testing that all hyperlinks are active and correct. We take this opportunity to congratulate all those involved in the preparation of this complex and detailed draft Plan, the associated Action Plan, and the objective summary of responses to the previous consultation round.

Allocated to East Inverness IN81 West of Castlehill Road

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The introductory sentence: 'Particularly suited to waste management facilities including an Energy from Waste facility' is an inappropriate heading for this section and it should be deleted from the text.

Representation

Para 4.8 Central Inverness IN12 Harbour Road and IN13 Former Longman Landfill The introductory sentence: 'Particularly suited to waste management facilities including an Energy from Waste facility' is an inappropriate heading for this section and it should be deleted from the text. We do not oppose an energy-from-waste facility as such, but we see no reason to designate in principle any part of this area, here or elsewhere in Inverness, for an energy-from-waste facility. In the absence of information, public discussion and consultation, we object to this in the strongest possible terms. There has been no prior public consultation on this, a well-known controversial issue, with wide ranging impacts, and no business case is provided in the draft Plan. We note that the Main Issues Report Spring 2012 says at I4 that it was not recommended in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, but Highland Council preferred it and has since adopted it into the Highland-wide Local Development Plan on 5 April 2012. We welcome the statement in the Action Programme that "the Council intends to prepare and subsequently adopt as Supplementary Guidance a development brief/framework plan for the site [IN8 & IN13], which may include the wider former landfill area". This will provide a useful starting point for any public debate on the detailed future use of the site. In this regard, we question the proposals in the draft Plan to make more use of the Longman area for industrial purposes. We do not think that an industrial site is the best use of this site from the point of view of visual impact and landscape setting. It is central to all approach views to Inverness, from the south A9, from the Kessock Bridge, the Black Isle and the Moray Firth, as well as from Inverness itself. In addition, the Inverness-Nairn Coast Trail should not have an industrial complex as its first encounter upon leaving Inverness, although we are led to believe that the recreational and links area on the seaward side will be well-screened from the A9 landward side of the site. Prolonged gaseous dangers from landfill waste only support the need to maintain an open mind and take time to reflect upon the use of this prime location. We develop this further in our next paragraph, but careful thought should be given to the principles employed to avoid a piecemeal approach to its development. New Gateway Policy proposed As a general principle, Westhill Community Council does not think that the former Longman Landfill site is suitable as an industrial site. We believe the whole area should come under a Gateway Policy, which we believe does not currently exist. We recommend a Gateway Policy as a new, additional Policy for the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, taking into consideration principles applied to strategically identified Gateways to Inverness and the Highlands. Some of these principles may be contained within other policies, such as Policy 28 Sustainable Design, Policy 49 Coastal Development, Policy 56 Travel, Policy 57 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Policy, Policy 61 Landscape, Policy 75 Open Space, Policy 77 Public Access, Policy 78 Long Distance Routes, etc., in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, but they are better collated under a Gateway Policy, which is not simply an Amenity Policy applicable to all situations, because it would apply to identified sites and may involved graded categories.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

“ The deletion of Site of Site DO4 from the Plan based upon its inability to deliver the form of development envisaged under the terms of this land allocation. ”

Representation

Site DO4 forms a small part of a much larger area of flat and open agricultural land, which extends northwards from the village of Dores, on the west side of the B862. This land is managed and farmed under the terms of an assured long term agricultural tenancy, which affords a high degree of protection and security for the tenant farmer. Whilst the terms of this tenancy agreement make ongoing provision for the annual hosting of the Rock Ness Festival, it would not allow for the resumption of the land for the purposes of accommodating any permanent development. Although the proposed use of the land for the provision of alternative playing field facilities is unlikely to include any significant built elements, it would result in the permanent loss of the agricultural use of the land, which would be at significant odds with the terms and purpose of the tenancy agreement. Given the matters outlined above, the ability to deliver this land for the purposes envisaged under the terms of allocation DO4 cannot under any circumstances be guaranteed and as such, the effectiveness of the allocation must be drawn seriously into question. On the basis that the village will require new playing field facilities if the existing site to the north of the Dores Inn is redeveloped, it is respectfully submitted that an alternative to Site DO4, which is effective and can be delivered for the intended purpose, will require to be identified. Aside from the matters set out above, it is further submitted that Site DO4 is not suited for the provision of playing field facilities on the basis of the adverse landscape impacts that would arise from this form of development. As is noted above, the site forms part of a much larger area of flat, open agricultural field. Open panoramic views over Loch Ness can be gained from the north, looking over the site. The introduction of the form of fencing that is likely to be required in relation to use of the land as a playing field and the probable introduction of changing facilities, even if they are of a non-permanent nature, are considered likely to give rise to significant and adverse impacts upon the landscape quality and character of the site and the area surrounding the same. For this further reason, it is respectfully submitted that the allocation of Site DO4 should be deleted from the Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

“ To increase the indicative capacity of the proposed allocation to circa 15-18 units, which would allow for a more sustainable and beneficial use to be made of the land being brought forward for development under this allocation, thus ensuring that the site is capable of accommodating an appropriate range of housing opportunities; to allow for the suggested landscape planting to take place out with and to the immediate north of the allocated site, on land falling within the same ownership and control as the allocated site, which would not impact upon the ability of the site to contribute towards the enhancement of the setting of the village; and, to delete any linkage between the development of the site and the provision of new playing field facilities.”

Representation

Whilst full support is given to the allocation of Site Reference DO2 for proposed residential development purposes, objection is made to the indicative capacity of 8 units, which has been set against the development of the site. This figure represents a density of only 10 units to the hectare, which is considered to be unduly low and as a consequence of which, would severely restrict the nature and form of the housing that could be brought forward in line with the terms of the allocation. Notwithstanding the fact that at paragraph 2.12 of the Proposed Plan, it is acknowledged that the capacity figures shown within the tables in Section 4 of the Plan are indicative only and that different capacities to those stated may be acceptable subject to the assessment of detailed design considerations that demonstrate the efficient use of land and a satisfactory site layout, it is submitted that the Proposed Plan should provide for a more reasonable indicative capacity for the site. Support for an increase in the indicative capacity of the site can be drawn from the terms of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), which, at paragraph 77, advises that one of the key considerations that requires to be addressed by development plans when setting out their settlement strategies is the need to make efficient use of land and infrastructure. The need to promote the efficient use of land and infrastructure is further reinforced by the matters set out within paragraph 80 of SPP. It is respectfully submitted that the allocation of this site for only 8 units would neither make the most efficient use of the land, which is being brought forward under this allocation, nor would it make maximum sustainable use of the additional infrastructure that would require to be put in place to service the development of the site. If a more reasonable spread of potential development densities were to be applied to the site, for example densities falling within the range of 25 to 30 units per hectare, the notional capacity of the site would rise to somewhere in the range of 15 – 18 units. These figures are based upon the assumption that the net developable area of the site will be in the order of 75% of the gross site area, that is 0.6ha. Increasing the potential capacity of the site at the outset, rather than having to rely upon the statement contained within paragraph 2.12 of the Proposed Plan, as discussed above, would provide a greater degree of certainty to potential developers and would enable the site to provide for the full range of potential housing types, this being distinctly different from the form of housing which would otherwise arise as a result of a development that were restricted to 8 units. At paragraph 83 of SPP, it is made clear that through good design, it is possible to achieve higher density living environments without, amongst other things, giving rise to any loss of amenity. Consequently there is no basis upon which, subject to securing a high quality design solution for the development of the site, it can be reasonably argued that increasing the capacity of the site would give rise to any reduction in the level of amenity which is presently enjoyed within the existing residential development which bounds the site to the south. Within paragraph 4.102 of the Proposed Plan it is stated, amongst other things, that there will, in pursuit of the Placemaking agenda, be a requirement placed upon developers to deliver new woodland to augment the setting of the village. In relation to this specific requirement, it is submitted that as a matter of principle, it is not necessary to totally screen any new development on the edge of an existing settlement, and that a well designed and executed development which is visible from out with the settlement boundary can contribute more in terms of Placemaking than a poor quality development which is simply hidden from view. This issue aside, the northern boundary of the proposed allocation is not defined on the ground by any existing features and as such, this boundary of the site will be defined, in due course, by the northern extent of the development itself. On this basis, there is no reason why any new woodland planting need necessarily take place within the boundary of the site with it being submitted that the creation of an area of woodland planting immediately to the north of the allocated site would achieve the same effect as would be the case for woodland planting within the actual boundary of the site itself. The land to the north of the proposed allocation falls within the same ownership and control as the site itself and as such, there is no reason why the provision of new woodland planting to the north of the allocated site would not be suitably controlled by way of conditions attached to any planning permission granted pursuant to the development of the site. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that for the reasons given, the capacity of Site Reference DO2 should be increased to 15 – 18 units, with it being further submitted that any required woodland planting could take place on land lying

to the immediate north side of the northern boundary of the allocated site. The requirements listed in relation to the development of site DO2 include the need for discussions to take place with the community over the release of Site DO4 for sports use. Objection is made in the strongest possible terms to any suggestion a linkage exists between these two sites. It is understood that the requirement for the provision of the new playing field facility to serve the village is a direct result of the anticipated development of the existing playing field. This encroaching development is unrelated to the development of Site DO2 and as such, the onus for the provision of alternative playing field facilities should fall upon the party who is responsible for the development which impacts upon the existing playing fields. The suggestion that the delivery of the development of Site DO2 dependent upon the implementation of an unrelated development does not meet any test of reasonableness, including those relating to the use of planning conditions and the matters which can be addressed within Section 75 Agreements, and cannot be justifiably supported. Given the above, it is submitted that this matter must be deleted as a requirement related to the development of Site DO2.

Allocated to	Dores	DO2	Land north of Mill Croft	
--------------	-------	-----	--------------------------	--

Customer Number 01061 Name Dr William Erskine Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alastair Campbell Bidwells

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Paragraphs 4.101 - 4.102.

Reference Site Reference DO2, Land North of Mill Croft. Type Change

Comment Changes

“ To increase the indicative capacity of the proposed allocation to circa 15-18 units, which would allow for a more sustainable and beneficial use to be made of the land being brought forward for development under this allocation, thus ensuring that the site is capable of accommodating an appropriate range of housing opportunities; to allow for the suggested landscape planting to take place out with and to the immediate north of the allocated site, on land falling within the same ownership and control as the allocated site, which would not impact upon the ability of the site to contribute towards the enhancement of the setting of the village; and, to delete any linkage between the development of the site and the provision of new playing field facilities.”

Representation

Whilst full support is given to the allocation of Site Reference DO2 for proposed residential development purposes, objection is made to the indicative capacity of 8 units, which has been set against the development of the site. This figure represents a density of only 10 units to the hectare, which is considered to be unduly low and as a consequence of which, would severely restrict the nature and form of the housing that could be brought forward in line with the terms of the allocation. Notwithstanding the fact that at paragraph 2.12 of the Proposed Plan, it is acknowledged that the capacity figures shown within the tables in Section 4 of the Plan are indicative only and that different capacities to those stated may be acceptable subject to the assessment of detailed design considerations that demonstrate the efficient use of land and a satisfactory site layout, it is submitted that the Proposed Plan should provide for a more reasonable indicative capacity for the site. Support for an increase in the indicative capacity of the site can be drawn from the terms of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), which, at paragraph 77, advises that one of the key considerations that requires to be addressed by development plans when setting out their settlement strategies is the need to make efficient use of land and infrastructure. The need to promote the efficient use of land and infrastructure is further reinforced by the matters set out within paragraph 80 of SPP. It is respectfully submitted that the allocation of this site for only 8 units would neither make the most efficient use of the land, which is being brought forward under this allocation, nor would it make maximum sustainable use of the additional infrastructure that would require to be put in place to service the development of the site. If a more reasonable spread of potential development densities were to be applied to the site, for example densities falling within the range of 25 to 30 units per hectare, the notional capacity of the site would rise to somewhere in the range of 15 – 18 units. These figures are based upon the assumption that the net developable area of the site will be in the order of 75% of the gross site area, that is 0.6ha. Increasing the potential capacity of the site at the outset, rather than having to rely upon the statement contained within paragraph 2.12 of the Proposed Plan, as discussed above, would provide a greater degree of certainty to potential developers and would enable the site to provide for the full range of potential housing types, this being distinctly different from the form of housing which would otherwise arise as a result of a development that were restricted to 8 units. At paragraph 83 of SPP, it is made clear that through good design, it is possible to achieve higher density living environments without, amongst other things, giving rise to any loss of amenity. Consequently there is no basis upon which, subject to securing a high quality design solution for the development of the site, it can be reasonably argued that increasing the capacity of the site would give rise to any reduction in the level of amenity which is presently enjoyed within the existing residential development which bounds the site to the south. Within paragraph 4.102 of the Proposed Plan it is stated, amongst other things, that there will, in pursuit of the Placemaking agenda, be a requirement placed upon developers to deliver new woodland to augment the setting of the village. In relation to this specific requirement, it is submitted that as a matter of principle, it is not necessary to totally screen any new development on the edge of an existing settlement, and that a well designed and executed development which is visible from out with the settlement boundary can contribute more in terms of Placemaking than a poor quality development which is simply hidden from view. This issue aside, the northern boundary of the proposed allocation is not defined on the ground by any existing features and as such, this boundary of the site will be defined, in due course, by the northern extent of the development itself. On this basis, there is no reason why any new woodland planting need necessarily take place within the boundary of the site with it being submitted that the creation of an area of woodland planting immediately to the north of the allocated site would achieve the same effect as would be the case for woodland planting within the actual boundary of the site itself. The land to the north of the proposed allocation falls within the same ownership and control as the site itself and as such, there is no reason why the provision of new woodland planting to the north of the allocated site would not be suitably controlled by way of conditions attached to any planning permission granted pursuant to the development of the site. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that for the reasons given, the capacity of Site Reference DO2 should be increased to 15 – 18 units, with it being further submitted that any required woodland planting could take place on land lying

to the immediate north side of the northern boundary of the allocated site. The requirements listed in relation to the development of site DO2 include the need for discussions to take place with the community over the release of Site DO4 for sports use. Objection is made in the strongest possible terms to any suggestion a linkage exists between these two sites. It is understood that the requirement for the provision of the new playing field facility to serve the village is a direct result of the anticipated development of the existing playing field. This encroaching development is unrelated to the development of Site DO2 and as such, the onus for the provision of alternative playing field facilities should fall upon the party who is responsible for the development which impacts upon the existing playing fields. The suggestion that the delivery of the development of Site DO2 dependent upon the implementation of an unrelated development does not meet any test of reasonableness, including those relating to the use of planning conditions and the matters which can be addressed within Section 75 Agreements, and cannot be justifiably supported. Given the above, it is submitted that this matter must be deleted as a requirement related to the development of Site DO2.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Site DO4 forms a small part of an much larger area of flat and open agricultural land, which extends northwards from the village of Dores, on the west side of the B862. This land is managed and farmed under the terms of an assured long terms agricultural tenancy, which affords a high degree of protection and security for the tenant farmer. Whilst the terms of this tenancy agreement make ongoing provision for the annual hosting of the Rock Ness Festival, it would not allow for the resumption of the land for the purposes of accommodating any permanent development. Although the proposed use of the land for the provision of alternative playing field facilities is unlikely to include any significant built elements, it would result in the permanent loss of the agricultural use of the land, which would be at significant odds with the terms and purpose of the tenancy agreement. Given the matters outlined above, the ability to deliver this land for the purposes envisaged under the terms of allocation DO4 cannot under any circumstances be guaranteed and as such, the effectiveness of the allocation must be drawn seriously into question. On the basis that the village will require new playing filed facilities if the existing site to the north of the Dores Inn is redeveloped, it is respectfully submitted that an alternative to Site DO4, which is effective and can be delivered for the intended purpose, will require to be identified. Aside from the matters set out above, it is further submitted that Site DO4 is not suited for the provision of playing field facilities on the basis of the adverse landscape impacts that would arise from this form of development. As is noted above, the site forms part of a much larger area of flat, open agricultural field. Open panoramic views over Loch Ness can be gained from the north, looking over the site. The introduction of the form of fencing that is likely to be required in relation to use of the land as a playing field and the probable introduction of changing facilities, even if they are of a non-permanent nature, are considered likely to give rise to significant and adverse impacts upon the landscape quality and character of the site and the area surrounding the same. For this further reason, it is respectfully submitted that the allocation of Site DO4 should be deleted from the Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The changes I would like to see is specific to MO2 (Tore Road). This development has been continually objected to by Community Assoc, Community Council and members of the public based on safety, road safety, prostitution of the village, previous history of lack of industry and morals by the developer. Therefore I am now concerns that this is still being raised as an active proposition.

Representation

The changes I would like to see is specific to MO2 (Tore Road). This development has been continually objected to by Community Assoc, Community Council and members of the public based on safety, road safety, prostitution of the village, previous history of lack of industry and morals by the developer. Therefore I am now concerns that this is still being raised as an active proposition.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reduce/cancel application

Representation

The application does not clearly define the proportion of business, retail and community development, so it is hard to comment on such a vague proposal. However, whatever was built here would put further pressure on the dwindling open spaces used for recreation and dog walking. There is already an accumulation of dog mess along the cyle path and on the IN60 footbal field. With the increase in housing density, this will only get worse, as will the amount of litter. There is also a concern about litter and pollution from IN50 adversely affecting existing houses and the surrounding area, which was once a quiet secluded location and is now being encroached upon from all directions and losing its character.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04318 Name duncan marshall Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN36 Type Change

Comment Changes

cancel planning application or greatly reduce capacity from 16.

Representation

This land is surrounded by roads on three sides, and two other roads feed directly into these roads, making a total of five roads around the land. Severe congestion, with traffic and parking problems could result from vehicles from 16 properties using these roads. It would also put extra pressure on remaining open space in the area if this high-density and inappropriate development went ahead. Access roads have not been shown on the plan, and there is great concern about this for the reasons given. the developmenet is out of character for the area and would have an adverse effect.

Allocated to South Inverness IN36 Morning Field Road / B861

Customer Number 03935 Name Dwynwen Hopcroft Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN48 Type Change

Comment Changes

The proposed number of houses (40), for area IN48 is far too many for this small site. Request a significant reduction in the number of proposed houses and a commitment that houses approved for planning will be in keeping with the established architecture of the site, which is a leading example of design, sustainability, innovation and efficiency.

Representation

As a site resident my quality of life would significantly effected by the large number of houses proposed for this small site. The community feeling would also be diminished, and the site would become very noisy with the increase of traffic. Parking would become difficult as the site has no additional space. The site has a well established green and play area which is enjoyed by young children and families. The large number of proposed houses would significantly increase traffic in the local area and create a safety concern. Finally the site has made a commitment to using sustainable materials and innovative design. Any addition to the site must continue in this way, which has won awards and international recognition.

Allocated to Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

For reference, item A) in Section 3 is cross-referred with item A) in Section 5. _____ A) Why not leave IN44 as it always has been over many years B) Flooding and drainage issues over recent years C) Possible dumping of 'white goods' D) Possible resultant contamination E) Clarification of the area for the proposed dwellings F) Over concentration of affordable housing

Representation

A) Rather than having a 'blanket' policy of building uphill, section by section, why not leave IN44 as it always has been over many years, providing natural countryside, which would not only reduce the load on adjacent housing for essential services, but provide a leisure amenity. B) As residents since February this year, my wife and I have heard mention of flooding and drainage issues over recent years. As two streams run through IN44, my wife and I are rather concerned that there could be an increase in flooding should any further building take place. C) We have also overhead remarks with regards to a pit(s) being dug and freezer(s) and/or refrigerator(s) being buried. We must stress that we have no actual proof of such behaviour being accurate. D) We dread to think what pollution could have contaminated the land. E) To clarify, the area of IN44 is 4.6 Hectares, and thus the maximum number of dwellings would be 92, based upon the land being level, which is certainly not the case. The gradient can be more accurately observed when standing on the road alongside IN44. With an apparent policy of building affordable housing at the bottom end of each 'parcel' of land, followed by larger private dwellings at the top, as put forward for, e.g. IN44, any subsequent 'parcels would see affordable housing adjacent to the IN44 larger private dwellings. F) Drawings have been seen, showing between 32 and 34 affordable dwellings, close together, giving the indication of 'over population'.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

On behalf of our Clients, Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group, and further to our representations at the earlier stages of this LDP (and on the accompanying Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief) we wish to support the inclusion of our Client's existing Holm Mills Retail Centre within the IN24 Site, and the recognition of its existing retail and tourism use. The reference under Site IN24 to the approved Development Brief is similarly welcomed and supported, and we support the reference at paragraph 5.27 of the Development Brief to the opportunities for "an expansion of the business/tourism facilities at Holm Mills Shopping Centre which is an important retail and tourism destination for the City".

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

1-Looking at the proposed map regarding the industrial estate in Muir of Ord (MO6) it appears the unnamed track which extends beyond my house to Bellvue is blocked by the development. This road is used daily by myself and lots of other people as a walking and running route. If it is blocked will there be any provision to create a new route so access will be unhindered? 2-Some of the unit sites are in an untidy condition. What provisions will there be to ensure the place is kept tidy? The un kept condition of some of them has a visual impact on our local environment. Also throughout the year I collect rubbish blown into the lane leading down to my house which comes from the industrial estate. I do not wish to see the expansion increase the problem. 3- Recently a new unit was built directly opposite my house. The amount of noise at times was intolerable and the vibration caused during the construction could be felt throughout my house. What provisions will be in place should the development expand as it is so close to my property to curtail the noise impact during the construction phase? 4-Would we be informed when any new development will take place? 5-As the new development is so close to our property what screening will be in place to afford us privacy? 6-To limit the impact on our lives what restrictions will be in place to the working hours and noise levels generated by the industrial estate post expansion? 7-At present the main use of the access road to my house is limited to ourselves, my neighbour and a local farmer. With young children I do not wish to see an increase in traffic along this road. Will all access points for the estate come from the Black Isle show ground as they do at present?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

MCC are disappointed that the area to the south of Maryburgh along Dunglass Road was removed from the original proposed IMFDP. Given the long term nature of this plan, we would like the council to reconsider and ask that it be reinstated as an area for future development.

Representation

We ask that the area be considered for mixed use, with preference given to MB1 and MB2 being developed ahead of this area.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04041 Name Elaine Thoms Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.163

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Extend the boundry/settlement line north west of Rover Cottage, Craigton. What degree of development will the road network require for future residential development

Representation

Looking to place a planning application for one dwelling house on land above Rover Cottage. (North West). It looks as if the land in question is not on the proposed plans. The land at present is owned by my mother, Mrs H Henderson, Rover Cottage. I wish to build a property behind her house and relocate to North Kessock due to ill health of family members.

Allocated to North Kessock General General

Customer Number 04494 Name Elaine Fraser Organisation Dingwall Petition

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DW7 Dingwall Riverside North Type Change

Comment Changes

As per Petition Response.

Representation

44 co-signatories. Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan Dingwall Riverside Development Brief Site DW7. As residents of Old River Road we wish to have recorded by Highland Council our concerns for any future developments in site DW7 Dingwall Riverside North. 1. Why are SEPA carrying out another flood assessment? 2. What was the results of the 2008 survey by SEPA? 3. Old River Road is built on heavy clay soil which causes water to lie on top of the ground all around this area following heavy rain. 4. Residents would be compelled to safeguard their houses against increased risk of flooding caused by any future development in this site. 5. The junction at the top of Old River Road is very hazardous due to poor visibility and not enough access for 2 cars therefore it is not safe for any increase in traffic flow. 6. There are no excess car parking spaces in this area. 7. The residents would have to object if any further development plan arose in the Reith and Anderson field due to further flooding. We have a street representative Elaine Fraser [redacted] who we are happy for you to correspond with and she will keep us up-to-date on future findings. signed dated 12/2013

Allocated to Dingwall DW7 Dingwall Riverside (North)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Comment re Inner Moray Firth proposed local development plan. Conon Bridge Site CB3 Land to SW of High Street. 1. Site unsuitable for housing- potential drainage problems difficult to overcome. Low lying, surrounded by higher ground and bounded by railway embankment, very wet, floods in winter – see photos attached.. 2. Sewer from upper village crossing the site has caused problems over the years, overflowing after heavy rain. Problem still not remedied in spite of recent work. 3. Access. If this requires relocation or removal of the playing field this would cause considerable anger in the village. This was gifted to the community and is used by children and adults and is a valued recreational facility. 4.CB3 is a green open space – much used by dog walkers and others. It bounds the recently created Conon Station path, which is used as a pleasant walk by an open field. It would be a retrograde step to destroy this amenity. There is a lot of wild life in this area. 5. I would respectfully suggest that CB3 be kept as an open green space with some tree planting to replace the trees that will be lost in the housing areas.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04404 Name Elizabeth Fraser Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Lee Murphy Harper Macleod LLP

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.41

Reference NA2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Change sought to Section 4 Development Allocations Removal of the Site NA2 South Kingsteps from the Proposed LDP

Representation

The inclusion of the Site NA2 is premature in the context of the existing infrastructure constraints in the location, particularly vehicular access. Not only is there little, if any, capacity at the Lochloy Road/A96 junction, the section of Lochloy Road between Montgomerie Drive and the Site is currently inadequate and unable to accommodate additional traffic flow. That section of the road would be unsuitable for the provision of emergency access for further development on NA5 Lochloy without significant and costly improvements. The Proposed LDP does not include a commitment or programme of improvements to the local road system, nor does the Transport Appraisal or other related documents provide any degree of certainty that the requisite works will be implemented in the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. The Proposed LDP states that the focus is on "where development should and should not occur in the Inner Moray Firth area over the next 10-20 years." Nonetheless, in terms of Scottish Government policy and guidance the IMF LDP should be in place for a period of 5 years only, although it is required to take a longer term view of potential development. In addition, in terms of the Scottish Government guidance and advice (regarding the allocation of housing sites and the inclusion of such sites in the housing land supply) only those sites which meet the criteria required to render a site as "effective" should be included in the housing land supply. Constraints Road Access - The site is landlocked save for the narrow strip of land extending northwards to the Lochloy Road at the north-eastern extremity of the site. The stretch of Lochloy Road from that point westwards to the junction with Montgomerie Drive is narrow, has a number of tight bends and is without pathway provision. It is currently severely constrained in terms of the road geometry and the topography; consequently current traffic levels give rise to safety concerns. Additional traffic on the stretch of road would exacerbate those road safety concerns for all road users: vehicle drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. The Transport Appraisal for the IMF Proposed LDP acknowledges that the level of cycling in Nairn is well above average (7%). The stretch of Lochloy Road referred to above forms part of National Cycle Route 1 and Eurovelo 1. These factors alone are sufficient to prevent access to the site being taken from Lochloy Road without significant and costly improvements to the stretch of the road referred to above. The proposed LDP refers to a notional capacity of 90 housing units. In the absence of an alternative access, Site NA2 is ineffective and should not be included in the housing allocation as there is no prospect of development within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. Site NA5 Lochloy has potential to provide an alternative access to Site NA2. However there are significant constraints affecting the effectiveness of Site NA5, not least the existing traffic congestion experienced at the Lochloy Road A96 junction. It is considered that it is premature to allocate NA2 until it has been demonstrated that Site NA2 is effective. Flood - There is a history of flooding on the site. No evidence is available to demonstrate that the Site would be capable of development in accordance with both the current Scottish Planning Policy and the emerging Scottish Planning Policy. In the absence of evidence demonstrating that Site NA2 can be made capable of development during the lifetime of the Proposed LDP, all in accordance with current and emerging Scottish Planning Policy on flooding, the Site ought not to be included in the Proposed LDP. Drainage - There is evidence that the existing Treatment Plant is at capacity and will require to be upgraded in advance of further development. Acknowledgement of that status is included in Policy 4 in the Strategy for Growth Areas. This factor, along with the existing constraint on site access, serves to further diminish the prospect that Site NA2 is capable of becoming effective within 5 years. Other Factors Site NA2 is a greenfield site and there is no evidence to demonstrate that the Site can be developed within the required timescale. Accordingly the inclusion of the Site is not in accordance with paragraph 80 of the Scottish Planning Policy. In addition to the specific factors set out above it is considered that in allocating Site NA2 the planning authority has failed to take proper account of the extant policy, guidance and advice. Specific attention is drawn to the following elements and comments stated below as examples. Scottish Planning Policy Paragraph 15 - no likely sequence of development is set out in the Proposed LDP. Paragraph 38 - The decisions on new development are required to take account of a number of factors including the reduction of the need to travel, prioritise sustainable travel opportunities, promotion of sustainable travel opportunities and to prevent further development at risk from flooding. The inclusion of Site NA2 fails to do so. Specific policies on flooding are relevant to the inclusion of the Site in the Proposed LDP but are inadequately addressed in the overall context of Site NA2. Paragraph 77 - There is no context provided for development of Site NA2, particularly taking into account the access constraint and the need for improvement of the road network in the Nairn area generally. Paragraph 79 - In the absence of a satisfactory transport network including footpaths and cycle provision, the allocation of Site NA2 fails to demonstrate compliance with the policy. That failure is of particular significance given the constraints issues referred to above. Paragraph 80 - Site NA2 is a greenfield site and should not be allocated in preference to brownfield or other similar sites. There is no evidence that the Site can be developed within

the required timeframe owing to the current infrastructure constraints. Draft Scottish Planning Policy Principal Policies Paragraph 20 - The Proposed LDP does not provide any evidence to demonstrate that Site NA2 can be developed within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. Building Policy Principles Paragraph 80, 90 and 91 - Maintaining a 5-year Effective Land Supply The Proposed LDP does not demonstrate that Site NA2 will become effective and free from constraints and effective or capable of development within five years of the adoption of the Proposed LDP or the lifetime of that LDP. Paragraph 92 - The Proposed LDP fails to set out the key actions necessary to bring Site NA2 forward for housing development, or to identify the lead partner. Planning Advice Note 2/2010 Paragraph 55 - Site NA2 cannot be considered to be effective in terms of the Advice set out in the Note as a consequence of the existing constraints and the absence of an effective strategy which has the reasonable prospect of removing those constraints within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. The inclusion of Site NA2 does not assist in providing a realistic picture of the available land supply. The Proposed LDP does not include specific commitments to the removal of the physical constraints affecting the Site.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 04301 Name Elizabeth Maclean Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.107

Reference Site FA1 Type Change

Comment Changes

I am opposed to the proposed building of 58 houses within the FA1 area. The boundaries in the plan are also wrong and your proposed development encroaches into my property. I also don't want access to my croft land in FA5 from FA1. I feel that there is no need for a development of this size in Fort Augustus due to very limited employment in the area. All my neighbours have voiced concerns that these houses could be used to home problem families from other areas and that they would have no realistic prospect of finding employment. I also object to the whole housing plan for Fort Augustus. We DON'T need them.

Representation

Donald Maclean for Mrs Elizabeth Maclean.

Allocated to Fort Augustus FA1 Markethill

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I am disappointed that in the last 3 years we had an issue with the planning office re our croft being classed as "amenity land." When we contacted HRC Planning to ask what "amenity land" was, nobody could or would tell us what it meant. Now we know why!

Representation

Donald Maclean for Elizabeth Maclean

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We cannot possibly support a plan that means we would lose ALL of our croft land at FA5 and are disappointed that this plan was hatched behind our backs. We already provide land to Fort Augustus Golf Club and can't afford to lose any more.

Representation

Donald Maclean representing Mrs Elizabeth Maclean

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Housing to be well away from No. 8 Essich Gardens fence. No high buildings permitted.

Representation

Regarding your proposal to erect 87 houses on the above land (directly beside Essich Gardens) I am very alarmed and annoyed at this plan. I live at No 8 Essich Gardens. My bungalow looks out over this land and any housing of more than 2 storeys would overlook my house, depriving me of privacy AND more seriously, block out any sunlight from my property. If you must build in that field take note that the ground in the field is ALREADY HIGHER than the level of my property. I would wish any housing be well away from my boundary fence and CERTAINLY NOT high buildings!!!! I hope you will put my mind at rest and change your plans accordingly! I am an OAP and live on my own.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change

Representation

I am objecting to this plan as it stands - our grounds of - a) Access to traffic b) noise c) area has an on going flooding problem. D) industrial project too close to conservation area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site from the Plan & retention of greenspace

Representation

We are writing to you as office bearers of 'Save our Showfield' – a group of people who formed a committee in 1998 following great public concern regarding the proposed building of a supermarket on the showfield. Through local public support, with several public meetings, many letters of objection and over 3000 signatures on a petition to “keep the showfield green” we ran a campaign for 2 years and the planning proposal for a supermarket was rejected by a Scottish Office Reporter in 2000. We object to the present planning proposal of a housing development of the showfield for these reasons: 1. This is a valued green field space used by the public for general recreation where people walk their dogs, children play, as well as being the location of the Nairn St Ninian’s Football pitch. It is also in regular use as the location of car boot sales, a vintage car rally, a circus and is crossed by the public at all times. In 2000 it was noted that there was a deficit of 45% of available recreational land in Nairn. Since then the town has grown and so the deficit will now be greater. This space is a vital green lung for Nairn as it expands and a housing development would not only cause loss of this local amenity space, but also change the character of the town. 2. Viscount Finlay of Newton sold the field to the Farming Society in 1928 for £1000 with money paid by the Farming Society and public subscription. There is a restriction in the title that no house building will take place without the consent of Viscount Finlay or his descendants. In 1998 Lady Hays, his grand-daughter, was not willing to grant that consent and we see no reason why this will have changed now. 3. We consider the high density housing development now proposed for the green space is inappropriate and not in accordance with the existing surrounding houses in the area. What would be left of the field would be unsuitable for much of its current use, especially for football. 4. The Draft plan projects approximately 1900 new houses in 20 years. The removal of 30 from this total is not going to significantly affect the plan. 5. Our concerns are also for the detrimental impact such a development will have on the surrounding roads and as a direct result on the safety of pedestrians. The local residential roads - Lodgehill Road, Chattan Drive, Waverley and Westbury Roads are already struggling with the volume of existing traffic. There has been an increase in traffic flow since the relocation of both GP surgeries to the Nairn Hospital, and this, combined with the new Vet’s Surgery on Lodgehill Road and the existing traffic to the 2 local primary schools means that congestion is a problem as well as road safety. The junction of Lodgehill Road and Waverley/Westbury Road is particularly dangerous and of concern, especially for school-aged children. As Lodgehill Road itself ends in a cul-de-sac the quickest access to the A96 will be via Waverley Road. With the proposed development of houses there could potentially be up to 30-60 extra cars using this junction and these local roads, which are totally inadequate to cope. We are aware that the field is owned by the Nairnshire Farming Society, and we have members of the Society on our committee. If the Society should decide to relocate within the town we would be happy to support their relocation proposals, on the basis that the whole field remains green, and its amenity is maintained. This is supported by the Council’s own evidence stated in 2000 which emphasised the showfield’s importance as a structural open space derived from its use, its scale and position and as we have already mentioned, this is also within the terms of the existing legal title granted to the Nairnshire Farming Society in 1928

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

To take away a green space like the playing fields would be a travesty. I walk my dog in the adjacent fields every day and there is always someone else using the playing fields, it is a community space that is used regularly by the community.

Representation

As above, the playing field is used regularly and to change it to houses would be a complete waste of a good green space.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

It would be good if I could view the plan online. All I get is an error message telling me I am not authorized to view the page. So much for local democracy but then the permission for extra, yet unneeded, housing in Munloch is obviously already a "fait accompli" with the developers (no doubt Tullochs).

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change to the Settlement Development Area boundary to include land shown on attached plan.

Representation

As you can see from the attached plans there appears to be adequate room to build a dwelling house on the land and maintain 15m distance from the existing trees. It does appear strange that it should be considered that this site should be proposed for removal from the new Inner Moray Firth Local Plan. It appears to be at odds with several relevant sections of the Scottish Planning Policy document regarding consistency confidence and stability etc for a partially developed currently zoned site. As far as I am aware a significant part of the site is the solum of the old public roadway so the point about it being the "open space" variety of forestry is presumably not relevant.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to change the boundaries of the proposed plan of Culbokie so that the 2 existing houses and the proposed 3rd site East of Woodholme next to the playing fields are included in the new proposed plan. All 3 sites were all already allocated in the previous zoned area. I am amazed and concerned that this has been omitted for no justified reason!

Representation

I wish to record a representation about this proposed local plan with respect to the settlement boundary of Culboke. I have attached a plan showing the area concerned. The village boundary has for some reason been drawn between existing houses built on zoned land and the main road through the village. This seems totally bizarre as the road is well within the existing 30mph speed limit at this point and the two existing houses are located on land already zoned for three dwellings. There are existing pavements and street lighting. This representation is because we own the remaining area of zoned land and we wish to build a home for our family who are presently in rented accommodation. I cannot fathom why the new plan proposes to remove a area of land already zoned for housing on which two existing houses have already been built all within the existing village envelope. As these houses are actually fronting onto the existing main street in the village and within a few metres of both the old and new schools, and also the village hall, it is difficult to imagine how a house could be very much closer to the "centre".This area is the original centre of the village and the expansion to the south and west is all much more recent. This contrasts with the situation at the west end of the village where two recently built houses have been included in the village boundary. There are no pavements or streetlighting at that end of the village.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amendment to the Culbokie Settlement Development Boundary to include land North East of Woodholme Croft.

Representation

Please add these two photographs to my previous representation, one as you can see is my propose site clearly showing the trees in the distant the other picture with the newly developed site next door showing the trees only 5 meters away from the houses. Is there different rules within the village of Culbokie or is it only my site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Architecture needs to be more creative and varied.

Representation

Architecture needs to be more creative and varied because Inverness has become a sprawling mass of similar houses with no character.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01139 Name Erlend Tait Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59

Reference Fortrose and Rosemarkie Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Infrastructure inadequacies must be addressed e.g. roads have deteriorated with the recent increase of traffic on minor roads. Swimming pool for the Black Isle?

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number 01139 Name Erlend Tait Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59

Reference Fortrose and Rosemarkie Type Change

Comment Changes

Wording 'Land is identified which could accommodate over 130 new homes' should be changed.

Representation

'At least 130 homes' is a useless phrase as it could be taken to mean a limitless number.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I purchased 5 clyde street after it was announced that the planning for 12 plots at the yard at clyde street (13/00580/ful) was passed as I recon that it would improve that area and would make my purchase a good investment, work was suppose to start in September but nothing has happened yet. I have now heard a rumour that a deal has been done with the port authorities with the ground along the rail way track (IG5)Can you inform me if this is correct and if so who is paying for the money that has been wasted on that ground to get it through planning also what is the figure that it has cost the council so far to get it through the planning stage?Also why the local people of Invergordon have not been consulted as this area is not appropriate for a car park for workers to use on the other side of a busy road, I also believe that for the sort time that it was used as a car park that the neighbours had nothing but problems from the people using it regarding litter and urinating near there vehicles. If it is not correct then can you inform me when work will start and why it isn't on the proposed development plan for Invergordon

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Don't bother thinking of developing on this ground. Not suitable because of water logging

Representation

This site has already had tests done on it to see if suitable for housing. I believe the results said not suitable because of ground not suitable this area is subject to a lot of water logging and has a considerable dip which ends up like a pool when weather is bad and causes problems. I don't want houses built at the back of my house in case I end up getting flooded. If your proposal goes ahead I would expect some sort of high barrier put up so as I don't have to look at another building or a road. At the moment it's a nice quiet place and houses being built could take price of existing properties.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04420 Name Ewan Macdonald Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Martin Mackay Martin Mackay Solicitors

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CB2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Increased housing density to be proposed for Site CB2

Representation

The Site CB2 which is measured to extend to 9.2 hectares has been deemed appropriate in the draft plan for a proposed housing capacity of 115. This represents a density of approximately 12.5 houses per hectare across the entire site. The site CB2 represents a natural extension of the development currently in the course of development at Site CB5. Site CB5 has already received consent for in excess of 200 homes plus 5 retail units. Within this site CN5 which extends to 15 hectares in total, there is also a football pitch and an attenuation pond and as a consequence of the 15 hectares only 13.24 hectares are given over to residential use. Accordingly the density or the residential development within CB5 exceeds 15 per hectare, significantly higher than that proposed for Site CB2 and it is accordingly submitted that the 9.2 hectares within Site CB2 can easily accommodate a larger number of houses than that proposed and the plan should be adjusted to reflect this and that such an increase in the allocation would be consistent with what is to be developed at CB5. It is also noted that high densities have been consented or allocated on other residential development sites in Ross-shire.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB2 Braes of Conon

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph

Reference Map 3 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

F&C welcomes the fact that Inverness is located at the top of the settlement hierarchy as referred to in this map.

Allocated to Policy 1 Promoting and Protecting City and Town Centres

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph

Reference Policy 1 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

F&C welcomes the inclusion of the statement that residential uses will be encouraged within the upper floors of buildings within all of the centres. This will help to create additional footfall and expenditure within the City Centre, which will in turn improve the vitality and viability.

Allocated to Policy 1 Promoting and Protecting City and Town Centres

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Paragraph 3.3

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

F&C welcomes the proposal to invest in infrastructure to promote growth and improve connectivity. Given the remote nature of Inverness in relation to the other Cities of Scotland, it is important that there is significant investment into the infrastructure to keep the City connected.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

F&C supports the proposal to restrict the floorspace at this location to neighbourhood catchment scale only. However we would suggest including the words 'and type' after 'scale' so that the requirements of the site reads: 'Requirements: Any retail component limited to neighbourhood catchment scale and type' This change is to protect the City Centre from potential out of town expansion for floorspace that should be directed towards the city centre in the first instance.

Representation

F&C supports the proposal to restrict the floorspace at this location to neighbourhood catchment scale only. However we would suggest including the words 'and type' after 'scale' so that the requirements of the site reads: 'Requirements: Any retail component limited to neighbourhood catchment scale and type' This change is to protect the City Centre from potential out of town expansion for floorspace that should be directed towards the city centre in the first instance.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We welcome the restriction to bulky goods identified in the description of this allocation. A recent application submitted to the Highland Council for this site is contrary to this restriction. This application seeks a relaxation to allow a flexible consent for retail uses, which has significant potential to have an adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of the City Centre. Whilst we welcome the restriction identified under the 'Uses' heading, we request that the restriction is reiterated under the 'requirements' heading. After 'transport assessment' please include: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Representation

We welcome the restriction to bulky goods identified in the description of this allocation. A recent application submitted to the Highland Council for this site is contrary to this restriction. This application seeks a relaxation to allow a flexible consent for retail uses, which has significant potential to have an adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of the City Centre. Whilst we welcome the restriction identified under the 'Uses' heading, we request that the restriction is reiterated under the 'requirements' heading. After 'transport assessment' please include: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph

Reference Policy 1 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

F&C welcomes the inclusion of this policy. We are pleased to see that the policy seeking to protect the City and Town Centres of the area is situated as the first policy of the document, emphasising their importance to the Council. Further, our client supports the content of the policy, and the wording used in general.

Allocated to Policy 1 Promoting and Protecting City and Town Centres

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph Paragraph 2.8

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

F&C welcomes the clear statement being made in the header 'Promoting and Protecting City and Town Centres'. F&C supports the 'Town Centres First' principle which the plan proposes to follow. Also in this regard, our client welcomes the recognition that this principle should be in relation to all footfall generating proposals and not only retail and leisure proposals. The Council is under pressure to approve an increasing number of out of town retail developments, and our client welcomes the confirmation through this proposed plan, that the council will continue to protect the City Centre as the priority for footfall generating uses. We welcome the proposal by the Council to establish Inverness City Centre as a 'Priority Action Area', and the proposal to review the City Centre Development Brief. The proposal to invest Council officer time will be an attraction to those developers who are considering investing their money in the City Centre.

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amend text of Policy 1 to read as follows: 'If the Council considers that a proposal may result in an adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of any of these centres then the developer will be required to produce an impact assessment on a sequential basis. If this demonstrates an adverse impact then the development proposal will not be supported'

Representation

Whilst we support the approach taken in the text of Policy 1, we consider that more emphasis should be placed on the need to assess the impact of new proposals outwith the City and Town Centres. Suggested wording would be as follows: 'If the Council considers that a proposal may result in an adverse impact upon the vitality and viability of any of these centres then the developer will be required to produce an impact assessment on a sequential basis. If this demonstrates an adverse impact then the development proposal will not be supported' This amended wording would further protect the City and Town centres.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Typing error identified in the second sentence of paragraph 2.22. It currently reads as follows: 'In the preparation of the Plan the Council has taken a proactive partnership approach has been taken to future transport needs. Action – remove 'has been taken' from the sentence.

Representation

Typing error identified in the second sentence of paragraph 2.22. It currently reads as follows: 'In the preparation of the Plan the Council has taken a proactive partnership approach has been taken to future transport needs. Action – remove 'has been taken' from the sentence.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

F&C supports the methods identified for achieving a consolidated and vibrant City. City Centre regeneration of brownfield land and vacant buildings is of the utmost importance to ensure that the city centre remains vibrant. Our client also welcomes the proposals for the diversification of uses, and the enhancement of civic spaces.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We would also propose introducing wording to further protect the high street. In this regard, the description of the appropriate Retail/Leisure uses should read as follows: *Retail/Leisure uses that are focused on the tourism sector and/or, those uses that gain a competitive advantage from (or are particularly suited to) a waterfront location. For example, a dine-in restaurant would be acceptable, a bulky goods warehouse, large foodstore or high street retailer would not. The changing in wording is to ensure that the City Centre continues to receive the protection it requires.

Representation

We would also propose introducing wording to further protect the high street. In this regard, the description of the appropriate Retail/Leisure uses should read as follows: *Retail/Leisure uses that are focused on the tourism sector and/or, those uses that gain a competitive advantage from (or are particularly suited to) a waterfront location. For example, a dine-in restaurant would be acceptable, a bulky goods warehouse, large foodstore or high street retailer would not. The changing in wording is to ensure that the City Centre continues to receive the protection it requires.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site IN90 South of Inverness Retail and Business P Type Change

Comment Changes

We welcome the restriction identified in the proposed plan for this site. As with the Dell of Inshes site allocation, we request that further text is added to the allocation under the 'Requirements' heading to say the following: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Representation

We welcome the restriction identified in the proposed plan for this site. As with the Dell of Inshes site allocation, we request that further text is added to the allocation under the 'Requirements' heading to say the following: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Allocated to East Inverness IN90 South of Inverness Retail and Business Park

Customer Number 04407 Name F&C REIT Asset Management Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Andrew Woodrow CB Richard Ellis Ltd

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph 2.21

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

F&C welcomes the major projects identified to contribute to a shift towards more sustainable transport in the city. In particular our client supports the inclusion of the following projects: - More frequent and faster railway journeys; - Inverness City Centre to East Inverness walking/cycling route; and - West Link road scheme to relieve congestion in City Centre.

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number 04317 Name Ferdinand Maylin Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Farmers Showfield Nairn

Reference NA1 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would not like to see any house building on the Showfield.

Representation

I reject strongly to the removing of this valuable green centre in the middle of Nairn. Its openness is a source of much use and benifit to the community. The outlet of Lodgehill Road leads onto the two worst cross roads in Nairn. Lodgehill Road/Wellington Road. Cawdor Street/Cawdor Road. Lodgehill Road is swarmed with school children three times a day during the week.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 04012 Name Fiona Barclay Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference MO3 Type Change

Comment Changes

The Corry Road is a single track country road with passing places and unsuitable for any additional traffic. There is no proper drainage in place and the runoff from the fields and surface water causes flooding both on the road and in our garden. In addition the high number of houses planned does not fit in with the layout of the existing houses.

Representation

We are objecting to the housing development proposed at site MO3. The road to be used is inadequate for the current volume of traffic let alone any increase. It is a single track country road with frequent pot holes and no proper drainage system. There has been a warning notice stating "Temporary Road Surface" for at least the last 7 years. The run off water from the road and fields is directed into our garden resulting in flooding and regular destruction of our paths and plants. Currently, the raised area with gorse bushes and trees bordering our garden, is a link route for wildlife between wooded areas. We regularly see deer and their young, pine martins, stoats, red squirrels and foxes. The building of houses and in particular in such huge numbers would endanger this. If houses have to be built in this area then the road needs to be up graded and the problems We've outlined resolved. The development would need to be much smaller (around 20 houses) and sited well away from the wildlife link route which should be protected at all costs.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO3 Ardnagrask, Corrie Road

Customer Number 04234 Name Fiona Getty Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AR8 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like to see this section of the Proposed Plan discarded.

Representation

As Landowner of the land involved in the proposed expansion of the Industrial Estate, I obviously do not want to see good agricultural land being used for this purpose. Is it right to propose a change of use from agriculture to industry without even knowing if there might be a demand for industrial units in future? The farm has been in my family since generations and very well established and to lose such a large area of land would have a severe impact on our activities.

Allocated to Ardersier AR8 Nairn Road Industrial Estate Expansion

Customer Number 04157 Name Fiona Gilmore Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TR1 Tore Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove (assumed) TR1 fromt he IMFLDP

Representation

My husband (Michael John Gilmore) and I should like to make comment/object to the proposed Local Development Plan at Site TR1 by Woodneuk, Tore (14 Houses). As regards our cottage, HC proposed 10+4 houses would mean that there would be 1. Loss of view and sunlight, blocking out daylight 2. Loss of privacy, due to the siting of the proposed buildings. 3. No surface water drainage. 4. Inadequate sewage drainage. No plans for a run off from our septic tank and that of our neighbours. 5. No allowance for extra traffic to and from Tore Primary School. 6. No provision for pedestrian traffic to and from Tore Primary School. 7. Upkeep of the grass hedges. We have maintained ours for the last 21 years. 8. Siting of the proposal buildings too close to our cottage. The impact of said buildings on our cottage. 9. Increase of activity within and around the site will bring more danger to children who may play and cycle around the site. 10. These proposals will result in the value of amenity currently enjoyed by our village being lost or greatly reduced. 11. The elevation-height of the 4 affordable houses are completely out of character with the nature of the surrounding buildings nearby. 12. There are concerns with regard to the dispersion of the run-off from our septic tank that runs toward Woodneuk. I would be grateful if you could note our issues of concern/objection.

Allocated to Tore TR1 By Woodneuk

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 00293 Name Fiona Porter Organisation Invergordon Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.63

Reference IG12 Delny Type Change

Comment Changes

Invergordon Community Council would like this area to zoned for agriculture and NOT industry

Representation

Invergordon CC submitted responses to the main Issue Report in June 2012 where we stated that we did not want industry to be developed at this site. It was known as site 17. We also met with Planning officials in the Social Club Invergordon and discussed this site. The industrial zone appears to go back a long way in history to the 1970's when a petro chemical plant was planned. We were asked that evening if we wished to remove the industrial label. We said yes. We do not think that any more industrial development along the boundary of this part of the A9 is appropriate. This area is very near the notorious Tomich Junction which cannot cope at present with amount of heavy traffic using it. More industry will increase only increase this problem even more and make the junction even more dangerous than it is now. We wish you to reconsider zoning this site as industrial and leave it as agricultural.

Allocated to Invergordon IG12 Delny

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Supported for health centre, pharmacy and dental surgery only. This site looks bigger than 0.2 hectares

Representation

Supported for health centre, pharmacy and dental surgery only. This site looks bigger than 0.2 hectares

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR7 Land south of Medical Practice

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR4 Type Change

Comment Changes

Important flood protection does not add to upstream flood risks (Kilmichael area) and therefore the field needs to accept and store flood waters such that the river does not back up towards Kilmichael.

Representation

Supported with reservations. It is welcomed that the area will provide flood protection to the village green. It is important that this flood protection does not add to upstream flood risks (Kilmichael area) and therefore the field needs to accept and store flood waters such that the river does not back up towards Kilmichael. We support the requirement for high quality architectural design for tourism, business, retail and community use. We note that a suitable junction with the A82 is required as would additional parking to cope with any planned business activity.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR4 Land west of Post Office

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR10 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

we support that this can only be for community use

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR10 North of Shinty Pitch

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR11 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

supported

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR11 West of Shinty Pitch

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR9 Type Change

Comment Changes

We believe this site would be better suited to affordable housing due to access restraints.

Representation

We believe this site would be better suited to affordable housing due to access restraints.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR9 Medical Practice

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR2 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Supported We would seek that the developer restores the drainage from the pond, and out with the 5 houses the remaining area is managed in a manner to support wildlife.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR2 North of Cnocan Burra Burial Ground

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR5 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Noted. The planning requirements are fully supported in particular the phasing conditions.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR5 Drum Farm

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR6 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Noted. The planning requirements are fully supported in particular the phasing conditions.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR6 Land south west of Coiltie Crescent

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR8 Type Change

Comment Changes

We support the redevelopment of the existing Scotmid site; it may be possible to include flats above new shop units. We query that the site extends to 3.1 hectares, more likely 0.3.

Representation

We support the redevelopment of the existing Scotmid site; it may be possible to include flats above new shop units. We query that the site extends to 3.1 hectares, more likely 0.3.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR8 Retail Units on A82/Balmacaan Road

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph 2.7

Reference

Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Proposal to extend the hinterland: we support the proposal to extend the hinterland to encompass all of Bunloit. This is an important part of our community and has been subject to a number of ad-hoc planning applications in recent years. Inclusion in the hinterland will help ensure development is appropriate.

Allocated to Hinterland boundary

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference DR1

Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Supported

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR1 Easter Milton

Customer Number 01641 Name Fiona Urquhart Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference DR3

Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Noted

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR3 Land at West Lewiston

Customer Number 04099 Name Florence Wilkerson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

CB3 should be dropped from the plan.

Representation

CB3 should be dropped from the plan on the grounds that local residents strongly object to propose changes in the use of the land. This will ruin the community recreational area and deprive the church of its much needed car park in the position it is in. Last but not least, the land set out as the car park/ playing field DOES NOT belong to the council. The local community will fight the council every step of the way on this issue.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 04021 Name Forbes Fraser Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN3 Hedgefield Type Change

Comment Changes

I do not wish change to the 40 homes, but I would like to plan to zone where the houses would be, rather than show the whole area as development.

Representation

In a previous version of the Local Plan some of the garden areas were marked as (I think) "presumed against development". I have no objection to 40 homes, but I would ask that the Council protect some of the garden area and woodland area. I have seen development plans for flats before and the woodland beside our house was not built on and a gap of 30 metres was maintained from our boundary. For our amenity it would be good if no houses were located close to our boundary, but the proposed development site just shows the whole area without restrictions.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN3 Hedgefield House

Customer Number 04089 Name Fraser Douglas Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CD9 & CD10 Type Change

Comment Changes

These two areas, CD9 & CD10, should not be considered for development at all.

Representation

How can Highland Council propose to utilize this prime agricultural land for development when it is farmed by a sitting tenant who I believe does not want to relinquish the fields? These areas were previously proposed for similar plans some time ago and were rejected then. Why have they come back? Nothing has changed, except we the objectors convinced the authorities to reduce the speed limit on Newton Road from 60 to 30mph. Newton Road is single track with no designated passing places. The traffic using it just now struggles and varies from articulated lorries, tractors with farm machinery, cars, bikes and pedestrians. There is no way the road could cope with the additional volume of cars all these proposed houses would generate. There are no designated pedestrian pavements either. The present sewerage system will not cope with all the proposed house building. Please refer to your own figures to confirm this. Likewise, the water supply useage would be under extreme pressure. There are no jobs available in this area so what is being proposed is another dormitory township with the soul-less environment these kind of places end up. Any house building should be done in a modest and low density fashion in the area adjacent to the new school where children would not have the dangers of the infamous B9090 imposed on them. The whole idea of expanding the Cawdor village in such a proposed fashion is an absurdity. The castle and village attracts visitors from all over the world and for them to be presented with a housing scheme, would by reputation, affect the turnover of the castle.

Allocated to Cawdor CD9 CD9 Cawdor expansion

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IA1, CS1, MH1, WH1, FE1, FD1, NG1 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

SCDI agrees with the highlighting of the sites listed, as these are key locations in meeting the economic opportunities the region has to offer. The potential that these sites offer businesses based there is key to the success of the region and gives them not only the space they need, but access to the workforce they require.

Allocated to Development Allocations

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN24 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

With regard to the West link, once again SCDI would repeat its support for progress to be made and would hope that the land around this key road can be developed in the near future.

Allocated to West Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Northern part)

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Inverness Type Change

Comment Changes

Identify opportunities for residential properties near the Marina.

Representation

SCDI believes there are opportunities for residential properties near to the Marina and that this should be considered within the development plan. Whilst additional industrial land in Inverness will be needed there may also be opportunities to extend residential development from the city centre towards the harbour in the long term.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN9 Land to South and East of Inverness Harbour Marina

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph 3.3

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We would again highlight the need for clarity on the route of the A96 and our support for a new station at Dalcross.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN22, IN2, IN6 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

SCDI understands that decisions on the relocation of the Council HQ, Porterfield Prison, and the Sheriff Court are required before these sites could be developed, or better utilised, and would support efforts to have decisions reached on new locations for these services.

Allocated to Central Inverness General General

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph 3.1 - 3.20

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Firmer plans for timetable of A96 & rail enhancements. East link between the A9/A96 needs a clear timetable for delivery.

Representation

Inverness to Nairn Growth Area - The A96 corridor offers the greatest opportunity to meet the region's population growth and to provide the space needed to attract new businesses into the area, and provide opportunities for business growth. Upgrading the A96 and enhancing the rail connectivity between Inverness and Aberdeen is key to the success of plans along this route and SCDI would like to see firmer plans for the timetable of these enhancements brought forward to enable developments to run in parallel. SCDI supports plans for Inverness Airport Business Park and a new town at Tornagrain as we believe this area offers a major opportunity to meet population and business growth needs. A new station at Dalcross will offer real integration into the rail network helping to promote modal shift as growth is realised. The Inverness East Link between the A9/A96 needs a clear timetable for delivery to allow the controlled growth of Inverness and to unlock the land around it. SCDI would like to see the Scottish Government push forward with proposals for this. On the West Link SCDI is fully supportive of the plans and believes the completion of the canal and river crossing will unblock the city centre and allow better travel flow around Inverness. We hope that these plans will be delivered as quickly as possible. Ross-Shire Growth Area - The Cromarty Firth continues to flourish and position itself as a key service area for the energy sector. The rebirth of Nigg and the growth experienced by other facilities along the coast shows the scale of opportunity. It is vital that this can be capitalised on and that facilities are in place to support the growing workforce there. SCDI shares the council's desire for this corridor to be an industrial heart of the Highland economy and supports efforts to bring back to use brownfield land into productive use.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TG1 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We would also highlight our support for Tornagrain as a leading model for a sustainable community.

Allocated to Tornagrain TG1 Tornagrain

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN80 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

SCDI continues to be a strong advocate of the Inverness Campus as an important hub for the city but also as a key location to meet the education and business needs of the wider region. We welcome the progress that has been made and believe once completed it will play a major role in the economic wellbeing of the Highlands and Islands.

Allocated to East Inverness IN80 Inverness Campus, Beechwood

Customer Number 04485 Name Fraser Grieve Organisation Scottish Council for Development and Industry

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN21 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

SCDI recognises the opportunities that are presented around the Muirtown Basin and would welcome plans to redevelop buildings around the area and take advantage of this prime location.

Allocated to West Inverness IN30 Carse Industrial Estate

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

SCDI supports the town centres first principle and believes more needs to be done to both encourage and support businesses and public sector agencies to locate in city/town centres. SCDI recognises the challenges faced as a result of both the economic downturn and changing retail habits on our centres and believes much more needs to be done to bring properties back into use and to help our centres attract investment and flourish as the hearts of the community. Housing - SCDI recognises that there will be huge demand for additional housing in the coming years and understand the challenge that will be faced in meeting that need. SCDI believes that sufficient land is allocated to meet that need within the plan but believes there is a real challenge in unlocking the land allocated. Without clarity on routes, and timescales for the delivery of key transport infrastructure improvements, such as the A9/A96 connection and the A96 dualling, then land to the east of Inverness and around Nairn cannot be used. Infrastructure - As the draft Plan rightly highlights in 2.14 the provision of infrastructure is fundamental and in many areas, such as developments along the A96, around Nairn, and around the Inverness West link, it will not be able to progress until the planned road infrastructure is in progress. SCDI believes that a clearer timetable for the delivery of key infrastructure enhancements is needed in order to enable developers to plan and for progress to be made. Transport - The development plan rightly highlights the importance of transport connectivity and the need to enable residents and visitors access to efficient forms of transport. Key projects are highlighted which are not only of great value to the Inner Moray Firth area but vital to the success of the wider region. SCDI recognises the importance of connecting Scotland's cities with transport infrastructure that not only meets current demand but supports economic growth across Scotland.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Lost of amenity to the town if NA1 developed Lodgehill Road heavily used by school pupils and is currently subject to flooding. Waverly Road main route to schools, hospital and doctors. Present housing would prevent alterations to these roads I feel than any future development should be strictly monitored to ensure that adequate provision is made for schooling ,medical services and other community activities

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to see the 87 houses/homes proposed for the IN32 site to be removed from the plan and for the area to be used as either community use from allotments or some kind of community facility. Alternatively just left as wild land.

Representation

There are already plans to build nearly 1000 houses IN31 area according to the master plan, it is ridiculous to consider building further housing that require yet more infrastructure to be built. To say nothing for the massive strain it will put on schools / roads etc. I note that there has already been planning permission put forward for this land to build housing and it was 'withdrawn' with over 50 objections. This land should be retained in its entirety for community use as allotments and / or other community facility such as an all weather sports facility or something similar as there is a lack of sporting facilities on this side of the river. Alternatively what would be so wrong with leaving it as 'wild' land and creating somewhere that people can enjoy rather than further concrete and urban sprawl of housing? I believe that the Scottish Government own this land and rather than being short sighted and try to make a temporary quick buck why not keep the land for people to enjoy for years to come. My house overlooks the field and the quiet rural surroundings is one of the main reasons that I chose to live in this area (otherwise I'd have been as well staying in Glasgow) and that will be ruined as we'll now be 'penned-in' with houses. Nobody I have spoken to in the local area wants this housing development to go ahead.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Please refer to attached letter of representation expressing support for the allocation Proposal BE5. There is a request for clarification about the access requirements associated with this Proposal and how it links with Proposal BE1. Subject to clarification, my client is content to support, however suggestion for an approach to the matter is contained in the letter.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Colliers International has been instructed by G Simpson Builders Ltd to respond to the current consultation about the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) – Proposed Plan, published for comments earlier this month. This representation indicates support for the identification of Proposal BE5 “Wellhouse”. However, the support is subject to clarification of the responsibility for delivery of the proposed loop road between Croyard Road and the High Street, Beaully as this appears to be implicated in the developer requirements for BE5 as well as for Proposal BE1 “Beaully East”. In the event that the proposed strategy suggested below is not acceptable to Highland Council, then my client objects to the phrase contained in the developer requirement for Proposal BE5 stating: “link road connecting to adjacent housing site and A862”. In the Proposed Plan settlement statement for Beaully, at paragraph 4.30 it is stated “...growth is predicated on the continuation of Priory Way link road between the High Street and Croyard Road which will relieve central congestion, and again, further highlighted at paragraph 4.31 where it is explained how “The expansion of Beaully will require upgrades to its road network, in particular the aforementioned loop road between the High Street and Croyard Road”. It is not clear from these statements whether the reference to “link road connecting to adjacent housing site and A862” stated for Proposal BE5 is reliant on the implementation and delivery of Proposal BE1; or that developer’s commitment to formation of part of the link road, in line with the minded to grant planning permission reference 08/00430/FULIN Erection of 37 houses (10 affordable) on Land Adjacent To Fire Station, East End, Beaully. As a minded to grant permission, it is understood the section 75 planning agreement for that proposal has not been concluded and thus the road will not have been constructed. The committee report for planning application 08/00430/FULIN states: “S75 Agreement being concluded prior to release of the permission to cover the number and types of affordable housing units, costs and meeting housing for varying needs standards; the transfer of the solum of the distributor road, at nil cost, to the Council; and the number, type and position of screens to be provided in the burn”. It is apparent that the distributor road referred to has not been implemented. The proposal BE1 for a much larger scale of housing development implies a significant commitment for the developer of BE1 to deliver the road. My client is willing to work with the Council and the landowner of Proposal BE1 in any required masterplanning process in so far as the planning of the link road referred in Proposal BE5 is required. My client is however not willing to contribute to the planning, implementation or delivery of the loop road between the High Street and Croyard Road. To do so may place undue and unreasonable burden on the ability of Proposal BE5 to be delivered in terms of timing and costs associated which may turn the project unviable. My client has undertaken early pre-planning feasibility and design testing of initial proposals for Proposal BE5, which has been influential in efforts to test the property market for suitable future occupants of the allocated uses at Proposal BE5, particularly for a residential institution elderly care home (Class 8) and prospective non-residential institutional use (Class 10) occupiers. On the basis of firm progress being made, my client would resist any requirement to be burdened by the need to contribute to the delivery of the High Street to Croyard road loop. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the link road / access proposal in greater detail at this stage and how my client can make a positive contribution to the process of masterplanning delivery of this important infrastructure for Beaully.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I strongly object to the above proposal for an Industrial site. I was under the impression that when the Black Isle Plan of 2004/5 was passed, no property development would be allowed South of the Coal Yard as this was deemed green belt. I would also like to point out that the road is not suitable for more traffic as the number of lorry's going to the grain dries cannot pass without haking to pull onto the verge and stop. I hope you have considered access off the A9.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Road or footbridge crossing to access A96

Representation

The Highland Council are keen to promote a greener community with less use of cars and re-cycling which I am totally in support of. It has become a major issue now in this area that the only access to the A96 is along Lochloy Road. A footbridge across the railway line would enable many who work or wish to use the facilities in Balmakeith Industrial Estate i.e. Sainsbury. A new road to access the A9 would be a major improvement and would cut down congestion at the Lochloy/A96 I have been told that a foot bridge across the rail line was on previous development plans in this area. I have not seen anything in writing or mapped so I am only going on local comments. I apologise if this is incorrect but would like it to be considered for future developement.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

If there is a need at all for the proposed 67 homes on site AL10, I would rather see them either sited nearer the location of the current Lidl and Morrison supermarkets, or spread out along the edge of the field bordering Obsdale Road, running along towards Milnafua.

Representation

First of all, in general I do not see the need for the amount of houses proposed for Alness in general, and for zone AL10 in particular. I do not think the anticipated 'population explosion' will materialise, as a lot of the workers employed at Nigg and Invergordon are migrant workers, and will not hang around when the work dries up, as it surely will. The boom days of 5,000 workers at Nigg will not come back, and although there is plenty work at the moment, these are only short term contracts, and workers will return home, and come back again when work picks up again, so any occupation of these houses will only be temporary. In the specific case of zone AL10, I have very strong objections to this development. My house runs along the side of Mr. Oag's field, and when we moved in in 1986, we renamed our house 'Ross View' as we had an uninterrupted view across the field to the firth and beyond. The proposal shows several houses immediately in front of my back garden, from where we get our view. At the risk of sounding flippant, I have no wish to rename my house 'No View' or 'Housing Estate View'. If there is a need for houses to go in there at all, they should be sited along the perimeter fence running alongside the road linking Obsdale Road to Milnafua. Sited there, they would block nobody's view, as the houses on the other side of the road (Obsdale Park) are situated at a high enough level for their aspect not to be impeded. Alternatively, they could be sited nearer the Lidl or Morrison's supermarket, bordering the A9. Here they would be well out of the view of other households. Also, Cairn Liath has lain undisturbed for hundreds, if not thousands of years, and is a scheduled ancient monument. In all the years I have lived here, I have never even seen an inquisitive child explore the site. Local people are well aware of the importance of the site, and treat it with the respect it deserves. To site a housing estate bordering such a site is at best ill judged, and at worst, negligent on the part of the council. In no time, the site will become at best a play area for children, climbing the trees and denegrating the environment, and at worst, a drinking den and meeting place for teenagers and other unsavoury characters. I strongly urge the Council to withdraw the plans for this development at zone AL10.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Remain as amenity ground as opposed to housing development as there is already a large area of development spreading out of Alness of the East side - no development westwards. There is very limited infrastrucure with poor coinditon roads, inadequete passing places, no street lighting & no footpaths for children to get to school (safety issue)

Representation

1) There was a previous agreement that I read that a 50m 'buffer' zone would be provided against development between the north eastern section of AL2 and the existing settlement of Mossfield, Alness. However in the proposed plans, page 72 shows a change of use - section AL4 is now zoned for housing growth. Can you explain the reason for the removal of the buffer? Interestinglyt Pat Munro have a public meeting with regard to the development of AL4 - what provision of infrastructure would be required for this? (ie road widening, footpaths, streetlights, utility services) Also see item 7 weith reagrd to the chronilogical order of east ALness being developed. 2) AL3 was also previously deemed at amenity and now changed to housing. Can the change of use be explained? 3) Would the Trunk Road Authority have to give consent to such a large scale development due to the increased use of the Roskeen junction? I recognise they would be consulted, but could their safety concerns be 'over-ruled' by council officials / members? This area has experienced a large number of both non-injury and slight injury accidents and a safety concern would obviously be raised by local users of this area due to the increased use of the traffic from AL2, AL3, AL4 AL6 & AL7 using this existing junction to access the A9 rather than having to drive through the village to access either the Milnafua junction onto the A9 or the Dalmore flyover access onto the A9 ('Morrisons junction') – Surely an increase of traffic use at an existing accident site area, increases the risk of further accidents, with a potential for greater accident severity (slight injury – serious injuries and/or even fatalities)? 4) Where would the separation be between Alness & Invergordon for postcode and telephone STD area codes? Currently all of Mossfield & Achmagarron area is under Invergordon postcode & telephone codes. Since this area is under the umbrella Invergordon 'area', how does the expansion of the Alness area to meet up with Achmagarron, match up with the Alness/Invergordon divide? 5) It has been noted that there is a natural habitat of wildlife in section AL4 of deer – does this has any implication of the change in use from Amenity in the 2012 edition of the Local Plan (section 36) to Housing in the draft? 6) Can you give any further details at this stage what provision of green areas/playpark areas would be provided for the amount of houses being proposed within zones of AL2 (248), AL3 (111) , AL4 (48), AL6 (209, & AL7 (77)? I recognise that section AL11 is itemised as 'Community' but there is no clear definition of this term. Unless space is specifically allocated for play area use (ie play equipment), developers would maximise space for housing development only. 7) Would the proposed development of such be restricted to progressional development? Ie that AL2 is developed 1st in an east to west direction and ONLY once this section along with AL6 is fully developed, AL4 / 3 would be next?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like for the plan to be changed so as not to include any building on this land.

Representation

1. Road Safety - Access to this site via Redwood Crescent and Redwood Avenue will have a detrimental impact to the quiet and safe nature of these roads, which is a key reason why many residents in these areas have chosen to buy houses there. We already feel that there is too much traffic passing our house and with a badly positioned chicane directly opposite our driveway which pushes traffic over to our side of the road without doing anything to actually slow them down, an increase in traffic will make this already dangerous feature more of a hazard. 2. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities - I believe that the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. In particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. The proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider local community love, enjoy and use regularly for walking, cycling, jogging etc. Again another key reason why many residents chose to buy houses in this area. I feel it should be protected for current and future generations. 3. The loss of valuable wildlife habitat, trees and woodland - this area is home to many birds and animals which my family enjoy observing when we walk and cycle through this area. It is important the council protects these areas which are an important factor in why people choose to make Inverness their home. I believe the development will be to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Objection for the plan to erect 6 homes in NA3 - Achareidh.

Representation

This land and trees are a haven of wildlife. Deer, Badgers, Owls, Foxes and most importantly the Red Squirrel. However if the homes were at a suitable distance from the tree line and the tree line remained un-affected I may not have the same concerns. I would also like to notify SNH regarding the protection of the Red Squirrel habitat.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

There is no reason why the site earmarked as TR4 for use as Industry, should be used for that purpose. The road infrastructure doesn't support it and currently struggles with the amount, size and speed of the vehicles which service the grain plant. There are more than enough empty industrial estates in Inverness, Dingwall, Muir of Ord and Beaulieu - there is no valid requirement for one at Tore. This is a quiet, rural residential area and allocating such a large area for industrial purposes would spoil the tranquility and have a detrimental effect on house prices. There is no valid reason why you would want to build an industrial estate so close to houses. The increased traffic, not to mention the attraction for fly tipping, litter, travelling communities and undesirables who are attracted to empty industrial estates would have a terrible effect on the area. The area of woodland is home to various animals and birds and removing the wooded area would have a detrimental impact on that. There can be no justifiable reason.

Representation

There is no reason why the site earmarked as TR4 for use as Industry, should be used for that purpose. The road infrastructure doesn't support it and currently struggles with the amount, size and speed of the vehicles which service the grain plant. There are more than enough empty industrial estates in Inverness, Dingwall, Muir of Ord and Beaulieu - there is no valid requirement for one at Tore. This is a quiet, rural residential area and allocating such a large area for industrial purposes would spoil the tranquility and have a detrimental effect on house prices. There is no valid reason why you would want to build an industrial estate so close to houses. The increased traffic, not to mention the attraction for fly tipping, litter, travelling communities and undesirables who are attracted to empty industrial estates would have a terrible effect on the area. The area of woodland is home to various animals and birds and removing the wooded area would have a detrimental impact on that. There can be no justifiable reason for siting an industrial estate here. Please can you provide details of the types of units and businesses who are seeking to be located in this exact area and justify why you have selected this site for this purpose. The road cannot cope with the current amount of traffic, which is mostly generated from the lorries at the grain plant. They drive dangerously and they should be able to access the A9 directly from the grain plant.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The development of this area IN52 must be accompanied by the safeguarding of all perimeter trees on Drakies Avenue and Culcabock Avenue, to protect the established residential amenity of many properties and to retain the well-established visual amenity of the area.

Representation

The policy makes no reference at all to the beautiful, long-established trees which adjoin housing in Culcabock and Drakies Avenues, and one would be forgiven for thinking the Authority has no objections to tree removal. If access is a critical element worth a mention (which indeed it is) then so is the safeguarding of the trees. It is imperative to set out these strict and vital criteria at the outset and not leave it open to discussion and negotiations later with a developer. Furher, on a matter of no inteerst to me, the notifcvation letter to me may be incorrecta nd others may want to have a good moan.... it erfers to the red area IN41 as "Notfied Propsoed Developemnt Site" when in fact i adjoing IN52, as do my near neighbours. I wonder if there si an erroro here whiochs oemoen may capitalsie on; no need to rsepond on this...I am ahppy wirth he btofictaion to me, for which many thnaks. Much appreciated.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I believe this are is unsuitable for the proposed development. .

Representation

This a quiet peaceful area which abounds in wildlife. It provides residents and visitors with an area to explore and enjoy. Such a development would destroy this unique space and I believe go against government policy which aims to protect and enhance landscapes and wildlife habitats. The damage this development would do to our environment would be disastrous.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04047 Name GEORGE MACLEAN Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

I WOULD LIKE CHANGES TO THE PLAN FOR THE NUMBER OF HOUSES PROPOSED ON THE OLD EVANTON ROAD. THE INFRASTRUCTURE SIMPLY CANNOT HANDLE THE NUMBER OF HOUSES PROPOSED

Representation

THE ROADS, WATER, SEWAGE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE CANNOT ACCOMODATE THE NUMBER OF HOUSES PROPOSED. THESE HOUSES WILL HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT TO HOUSES ALREADY IN THE AREA SUCH AS OLD EVANTON ROAD AND WALLACE COURT, WHERE PROPERTY PRICES WILL DROP DUE TO THE SPOILT VIEWS AND THE NUMBER OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Allocated to Dingwall DW2 Dingwall North

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Objection to development of land at Bogbain Wood for 75 homes & business use. Bogbain Wood already provides a natural boundary for the city and with so many other developments not built out yet, why make the city any bigger by extending the boundary further? I would propose that this area of Bogbain wood be preserved in its current state as the boundary to the south of the city and secured as an amenity area for Milton of Leys and Inverness residence to enjoy on a daily basis.

Representation

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness. I have segmented my concerns into the following - Environmental - this is an area of outstanding natural beauty on the outskirts of our city. Previous developments, including where I now live has pushed wildlife into a smaller space. I see more deer on the roads around Milton of Leys now and on the A9 than ever before so where do they go if this land is developed? I walk in Bogbain Wood daily and there is a multitude of wildlife that would be affected. In the last few months I have viewed pheasants, birds of prey, red squirrels, herons, frogs, newts, I could go on. Have SNH & RSPB been consulted for their views? There is also a lot of young trees planted in this site that would need to be relocated/replaced and where would this go? There are also many paths in this area, not just the main one through the middle but others further up which are well trodden on a daily basis. How are these going to be replaced for the people who use this area daily? Recreational - Milton of Leys lacks any sort of recreational facilities and as such the paths from Bogbain Wood into Daviot Wood are well used by all sorts of people. It is not just the dog walkers (who often travel by car from other parts of Inverness) but the mountain bikers, horse riders and runners who use this space on a daily basis. The footfall in Bogbain Wood is really high and how would this be replaced? We have little space or areas for kids to play/exercise and this is an important part of Milton of Leys that compensates for lack of walks or kids activity areas. Indeed, this area is more important than a play park for kids as it caters for all ages and disabilities. Housing Impacts - there are other areas inside the current city boundaries that should be built in first before expanding Inverness outwards like this. There are many sites in between that should be built out first before creating another building site that will take 10 years to complete! Case in point is how long did the houses in Castleton sit before being brought into Milton of Leys and this could be created again. The area directly behind the housing in Redwood Avenue is prone to flooding. What assurances do we have that developing this land will not make the natural drainage & water table worse, subjecting us to ongoing flooding issues and increased insurance costs. Also, with many houses south facing, what impact would a development of this size have on natural light given any housing/buildings would sit higher than those currently there. With additional housing brings additional roads and with that people using existing built up areas as short cuts to their home/business. There are already examples of speeding in the area and this would only become worse with further development. The Milton of Leys Distributor Road is supposed to be a 30mph zone and a recent speed check survey conducted by Highland Council for the Milton of Leys Parent Council highlighted average speeds in excess of 30mph outside the school and surrounding roads, even during school drop off & pick up times. Some speeds were in excess of 50mph which highlights the dangers of this road. Any development here would require crossing of this busy road that is regularly used as a short cut / rat run to the A9 from housing and businesses to the South West of the city. School/Local Amenities - there would be a significant impact on the school role if further housing was permitted. The ratio is 0.2/0.3 kids per home which is approx 15-20 additional kids which in reality is half to 2/3rds a class. The school cant cope with the existing school roll and with the new developments on the link road also pointing into Milton of Leys Primary instead of Inshes Primary then it will soon not big enough again despite the new classrooms being built this summer. With more housing comes the need for more amenity areas and shops. Whilst Tullochs have been unable to fill the site opposite the school with shops etc this is more by lack of planning support etc rather than lack of demand. This area should be preserved as well for additional shops with and more encouragement or incentives for businesses to consider this area for their business first rather than creating a new area that could become an empty shell like the current Carse Industrial Estate. Residence in Milton of Leys would be encouraged to see more shops in our area but not spread out across two sites but under the one we already have space for. If any land became free then it should be used to provide additional amenity land for Milton of Leys rather than being lost to even more new housing. The school is already the largest Primary in the Highlands and making it bigger is not the answer. We will no doubt see issues like this years P6 class become a regular feature. The size of the school & teacher coverage has been a issue in my eyes over the last 2 years and this would only get worse with a higher school role. When you consider the environmental, wildlife, safety and economic impacts that additional housing in this area would cause then I can only see that any development at Bogbain Wood would have a detrimental impact on Milton of Leys and the city of Inverness as a whole.

Allocated to	South Inverness	IN49	Bogbain (west)	
--------------	-----------------	------	----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The settlement boundary should be extended to include the entire objection site and the CB7 designation should be amended to encompass the objection site. The enlarged site should be identified for mixed use development which could include residential, retail and public house use.

Representation

Objection is taken to the continued failure to identify the remaining land within the ownership of Mr and Mrs Nixon, at the Drouthy Duck (CB7), Conon Bridge for mixed use development, including residential. A plan of the land and buildings, subject of this objection, is attached. The eastern portion of the site comprising the former Drouthy Duck public house, presently closed, is identified for 'Retail Use' but specified as being safeguarded for existing use. The opportunity site and settlement boundary should be extended to encompass all of the land identified on the attached plan, including the Drouthy Duck and Riverbank House, and identified for 'Mixed Use' development. The enlarged site is all under the ownership of Mr and Mrs Nixon and would include the existing public house, Riverbank House and its garden ground as well as the adjoining land lying immediately to the west between Riverbank House and the railway embankment which forms the western boundary. The site would be bound to the north by the flood defences along the banks of the River Conon and the former curling pond which shares an access from the High Street. To the north east the site is bound by the High Street with the Conon Hotel and site CB4 opposite. The south eastern boundaries are formed by detached residential properties accessed off Strathbran Place. The site presently comprises the Drouthy Duck and its associated car parking, Riverbank House and its adjoining garden ground and the vacant land to the west, currently in rough grass and scrub vegetation. The Drouthy Duck is a full 2 storey and attic space in height whilst Riverbank House ranges from 1.5 to 2 storeys in height. An existing access from the High Street serves the Drouthy Duck and Riverbank House. A public footpath abuts the site along the banks of the River Conon, on the north side of the flood defences, and to the north west of the site lies the former curling pond which is now disused. The vacant land lying to the south west of Riverbank House was previously the subject of a planning application for a single house. Permission was refused on grounds of amenity and flood risk. An appeal was subsequently dismissed in January 2009 (P/PPA/270/574). However, in his conclusions the Reporter noted that the amenity value of the site would "...be likely to be enhanced rather than reduced by the proposed development. The proposal is therefore acceptable in this regard". As regards flood risk; the Reporter accepted that works were in hand to reinstate the Conon Bridge flood defences to their original design but without confirmation from the Council that these works had been completed, and in the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment, he applied the precautionary principle and dismissed the appeal. Flood risk is not unique to this site. The adjoining site CB4 on the opposite side of the High Street and nearby site CB3 both sit at a similar elevation and are at the same risk of flooding. Their development, when first identified in the Main Issues Report, was subject to a "flood defences review" and, it was argued, that a similar requirement could be applied to this site. The flood defences review referred to has been completed and the reinstatement works undertaken. This is acknowledged in paragraph 4.130 of the proposed Local Development Plan wherein it advises that "Flood risk has been a constraining factor for development, however, the completion of flood defences on the River Conon offers protection to much of the settlement". It further notes that Flood Risk Assessment will still be required to demonstrate the likelihood and extent of flooding in the area. That requirement applies to both allocated sites CB3 and CB4 and would equally apply to the objection site. Importantly however, given the completion of the flood defences and the previous Reporters comments, it should not be used as justification for not allocating the objection site for mixed use development. The Council themselves acknowledged in their "Additional Site Consultation", carried out in May 2013 that the objection site comprised a brownfield infill site capable of providing choice in the market. They noted the potential flood risk but the same applies to the allocated sites CB3 and CB4 and is fully addressed above. The potential impact on listed buildings was raised as a further issue. However, the listing of the Drouthy Duck as a Category C Listed Building was only imposed in December 2010 following proposals to demolish the building and replace it with a flatted development. Nevertheless the listing need not be an impediment to the conversion of the Drouthy Duck and the development of the wider site. Any development would require to be sympathetic to the listed building and this could be addressed through the layout and design of the proposed development. It is not an obstacle to development. In summary, the proposal site is considered capable of accommodating residential development, with or without the retention of the existing public house. The site benefits from a satisfactory access and its redevelopment would bring an area of vacant brownfield land back into residential use improving the amenity of the area. The site is protected by the same flood defences as sites CB3 and CB4 and flood risk is, therefore, not an impediment to its development. The settlement boundary should be extended to include the entire objection site and the CB7 designation should be amended to encompass the entire objection site. The enlarged site should be identified for mixed use development which could include

residential, retail and public house use.

Allocated to Conon Bridge

CB7

Drouthy Duck

Customer Number 04446 Name George Sutherland Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Lee Murphy Harper Macleod LLP

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.41

Reference NA2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Change sought to Section 4 Development Allocation Removal of the Site NA2 South Kingsteps from the Proposed LDP

Representation

The inclusion of the Site NA2 is premature in the context of the existing infrastructure constraints in the location, particularly vehicular access. Not only is there little, if any, capacity at the Lochloy Road/A96 junction, the section of Lochloy Road between Montgomerie Drive and the Site is currently inadequate and unable to accommodate additional traffic flow. That section of the road would be unsuitable for the provision of emergency access for further development on NA5 Lochloy without significant and costly improvements. The Proposed LDP does not include a commitment or programme of improvements to the local road system, nor does the Transport Appraisal or other related documents provide any degree of certainty that the requisite works will be implemented in the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. The Proposed LDP states that the focus is on "where development should and should not occur in the Inner Moray Firth area over the next 10-20 years." Nonetheless, in terms of Scottish Government policy and guidance the IMF LDP should be in place for a period of 5 years only, although it is required to take a longer term view of potential development. In addition, in terms of the Scottish Government guidance and advice (regarding the allocation of housing sites and the inclusion of such sites in the housing land supply) only those sites which meet the criteria required to render a site as "effective" should be included in the housing land supply. Constraints Road Access - The site is landlocked save for the narrow strip of land extending northwards to the Lochloy Road at the north-eastern extremity of the site. The stretch of Lochloy Road from that point westwards to the junction with Montgomerie Drive is narrow, has a number of tight bends and is without pathway provision. It is currently severely constrained in terms of the road geometry and the topography; consequently current traffic levels give rise to safety concerns. Additional traffic on the stretch of road would exacerbate those road safety concerns for all road users: vehicle drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. The Transport Appraisal for the IMF Proposed LDP acknowledges that the level of cycling in Nairn is well above average (7%). The stretch of Lochloy Road referred to above forms part of National Cycle Route 1 and Eurovelo 1. These factors alone are sufficient to prevent access to the site being taken from Lochloy Road without significant and costly improvements to the stretch of the road referred to above. The proposed LDP refers to a notional capacity of 90 housing units. In the absence of an alternative access, Site NA2 is ineffective and should not be included in the housing allocation as there is no prospect of development within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. Site NA5 Lochloy has potential to provide an alternative access to Site NA2. However there are significant constraints affecting the effectiveness of Site NA5, not least the existing traffic congestion experienced at the Lochloy Road A96 junction. It is considered that it is premature to allocate NA2 until it has been demonstrated that Site NA2 is effective. Flood - There is a history of flooding on the site. No evidence is available to demonstrate that the Site would be capable of development in accordance with both the current Scottish Planning Policy and the emerging Scottish Planning Policy. In the absence of evidence demonstrating that Site NA2 can be made capable of development during the lifetime of the Proposed LDP, all in accordance with current and emerging Scottish Planning Policy on flooding, the Site ought not to be included in the Proposed LDP. Drainage - There is evidence that the existing Treatment Plant is at capacity and will require to be upgraded in advance of further development. Acknowledgement of that status is included in Policy 4 in the Strategy for Growth Areas. This factor, along with the existing constraint on site access, serves to further diminish the prospect that Site NA2 is capable of becoming effective within 5 years. Other Factors Site NA2 is a greenfield site and there is no evidence to demonstrate that the Site can be developed within the required timescale. Accordingly the inclusion of the Site is not in accordance with paragraph 80 of the Scottish Planning Policy. In addition to the specific factors set out above it is considered that in allocating Site NA2 the planning authority has failed to take proper account of the extant policy, guidance and advice. Specific attention is drawn to the following elements and comments stated below as examples. Scottish Planning Policy Paragraph 15 - no likely sequence of development is set out in the Proposed LDP. Paragraph 38 - The decisions on new development are required to take account of a number of factors including the reduction of the need to travel, prioritise sustainable travel opportunities, promotion of sustainable travel opportunities and to prevent further development at risk from flooding. The inclusion of Site NA2 fails to do so. Specific policies on flooding are relevant to the inclusion of the Site in the Proposed LDP but are inadequately addressed in the overall context of Site NA2. Paragraph 77 - There is no context provided for development of Site NA2, particularly taking into account the access constraint and the need for improvement of the road network in the Nairn area generally. Paragraph 79 - In the absence of a satisfactory transport network including footpaths and cycle provision, the allocation of Site NA2 fails to demonstrate compliance with the policy. That failure is of particular significance given the constraints issues referred to above. Paragraph 80 - Site NA2 is a greenfield site and should not be allocated in preference to brownfield or other similar sites. There is no evidence that the Site can be developed within

the required timeframe owing to the current infrastructure constraints. Draft Scottish Planning Policy Principal Policies Paragraph 20 - The Proposed LDP does not provide any evidence to demonstrate that Site NA2 can be developed within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. Building Policy Principles Paragraph 80, 90 and 91 - Maintaining a 5-year Effective Land Supply The Proposed LDP does not demonstrate that Site NA2 will become effective and free from constraints and effective or capable of development within five years of the adoption of the Proposed LDP or the lifetime of that LDP. Paragraph 92 - The Proposed LDP fails to set out the key actions necessary to bring Site NA2 forward for housing development, or to identify the lead partner. Planning Advice Note 2/2010 Paragraph 55 - Site NA2 cannot be considered to be effective in terms of the Advice set out in the Note as a consequence of the existing constraints and the absence of an effective strategy which has the reasonable prospect of removing those constraints within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. The inclusion of Site NA2 does not assist in providing a realistic picture of the available land supply. The Proposed LDP does not include specific commitments to the removal of the physical constraints affecting the Site.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 04106 Name Gillian Cruickshank Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.32

Reference NA1 - Former Showfield East Type Change

Comment Changes

No houses to be built in this area.

Representation

This is a green-space used for feeding by oyster catchers & seagulls. Used by dog walkers and Nairn st Ninian football club. Houses here would ruin the views I have from my flat and be unsightly. They would make this very quiet area too built-up and congested, making it more difficult for me to get to work in the mornings, due to only one main access road to the main road. I feel building here would spoil the overall surrounding area and would make me no longer want to live here since my flat looks directly onto the showfield itself.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Correct the boundary planned for development 2. Clarify what is meant by business/ tourism - factories, hotels, 3. Demonstrate how drainage will be dealt with

Representation

1. Boundary shown on DW6 plan takes in part of our neighbours garden which would seem to be an error. 2. Ferry Road has a large proportion of homes and so certain types of businesses would not be compatible with this. I would hope that the type of businesses that would be allowed could be specified. 3. Of greatest concern is the issue of flooding in the winter. Most of our gardens sit in water during the winter and so any development that was built higher than our gardens would add to our problem. I would hope to see adequate drainage put in and in doing so enable current residents to benefit from this also.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04554 Name Glenn Jones Organisation Combined Power and Heat (Highlands) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Ewan MacLeod Shepherd and Wedderburn LLP

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IG 10

Reference IG 10 Type Change

Comment Changes

Alteration to permitted/supported uses

Representation

Annex B to the Zero Waste Plan is the most recent published expression of Scottish Government Policy on the role of Land use planning in delivering waste infrastructure. Annex B sets out a variety of roles for organisations. Under the Heading "Role of Planning Authority (Development Plan)" Annex B re-iterates the requirement in Scottish Planning Policy that "All development plans must identify appropriate locations for all waste management facilities, allocating where possible specific sites, and providing a policy framework which facilitates the development of these facilities." This point is repeated in paragraph 257 of draft Scottish Planning Policy Paragraph 253 of the same publication states that:- "The planning system should support the provision of a network of infrastructure to allow Scotland's waste and secondary resources to be managed in one of the nearest appropriate installations, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies, in order to protect the environment and public health. While a significant shortfall of waste management infrastructure exists, emphasis should be placed on need over proximity. However, as the national network of installations becomes more fully developed, there will be scope for giving greater weight to proximity in identifying suitable locations for new facilities." Annex B to Scotland's Zero Waste Plan states at paragraph 5.6:- "Development Plans must safeguard all active and consented waste management sites and identify appropriate locations for all waste management facilities, where possible on specific sites or supported by policy framework to facilitate development." The Local Development Plan is not consistent with existing or emerging Scottish Government Policy on waste management. Site IG10 in the proposed Local Development Plan is the Cromarty Firth Industrial Park. Identified uses include industry and business but this does not reflect the fact that there are existing waste management uses on site. As a matter of fact, the policy should be updated to reflect the waste uses which presently exist. Such an approach is required by paragraph 5.6 of Annex B. There is additional land within the Cromarty Firth Industrial Park which is suitable for waste management use. An Application for Planning Permission for a waste to energy combined heat and power plant was submitted to The Highland Council in 2008. In August 2009 the Council's Head of Planning and Building Standards, following a comprehensive assessment of the proposal, recommended that the Council grant Planning Permission for the facility. The Council refused the Application and Combined Power and Heat (Highlands) Limited appealed to Scottish Ministers. An independent Reporter appointed by Scottish Ministers concluded that the proposal at the site was acceptable and granted Planning Permission. That grant of Permission was quashed on a legal technicality in 2011. The matter was considered in significant detail for a second time in 2012 by a further independent Reporter. He too concluded that the proposal on the site was acceptable and granted Planning Permission. That decision is subject to legal challenge at present and the outcome is not yet known. Despite the legal challenges to the Reporters' decisions, the fact remains that two independent Reporters and the Council's own Head of Planning have concluded that an energy from waste facility within the Cromarty Firth Industrial Park would be acceptable. The second Reporter in particular assessed the proposal against all current Development Plan policies and material considerations and found that the proposal complied with all relevant policies. He found that the proposal complied with the criteria set out in paragraph 5.9 of Annex B to the Zero Waste Plan. These are the criteria which the Planning Authority must consider when identifying and assessing sites for waste management facilities to ensure that they support waste infrastructure investment and are in the most appropriate locations. The Council's response to CPH's representation on the Main Issues Report is that it would be inappropriate to change the designation of the site until the outcome of the Court process is known. With respect that is not a valid planning reason for failing to allocate the site for waste management uses. The Council should recognise in its Local Development Plan that Site IG10 is appropriate for waste management uses. Its failure to do so is not consistent with Scottish Government Policy. If the Council does not accept this representation it must set out valid planning reasons for doing so. The conclusion of 2 independent Reporters appointed by Scottish Ministers that the site is suitable for energy from waste use is a significant planning issue that the Council must properly consider and respond to.

Allocated to Invergordon IG10 Cromarty Firth Industrial Park

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The removal of the football pitch, play area and church car park should not be part of the plan.

Representation

Apart from the all weather pith at the primary school, which is not gebnerally open, there are no other green belt areas with such facilities within Conon Bridge. There is much being reported about the health and fitness of our younger generations and the amount of exercise that is taken. Removal of the football pitch and play area will leave local children and families with no such facilities and only add to the problems of lack of exercise. The church car park is being utilised as parking for the railway station in Conon as there is insuficient parking close to the station and the pathway between the church and the station was constructed and lighting provided for that resaon. Losing much of the church car park will reduce the number of individuals that can use the train to travel and ulimately force them back to using their cars. Which again is contrary to policy.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Whole Plan for Dores needs to be challenged & massively reduced on 2 "fronts" :- 1. iconic LochNess, major tourist attraction, will be marginalised by a development on access to the Loch, totally spoil the vista, view & overall atmosphere of this key global tourist area. Risks local jobs loss, eg at the farm; Dores Inn! 2. major accident awaits! Any increase in housing will accelerate the real traffic danger along the B862, Dores - Inverness road. An average of 1.5 cars per home predicted. With cycles, hire cars, caravans, lorries even on existing density, DEATH, will happen. The road has many hidden/blind summits; at the edge of Site D02 is the cycle path for the school,& all other cyclists/walkers. The road is totally unsafe in current state for a lot more local traffic. Council be advised, if this proceeds as planned a death(s) will happen, perhaps even sooner than this unworkable plan is actioned.

Representation

Common sense, respect for LochNess, & the safety of all users of the B862 is paramount!! Without significant investment first, on the dangerous B 862, your propsed plan will, for sure, result in tragedy, traffic accidents, traffic deaths. Council will be negligent & responsible for human misery, unless the B862 is significantly upgraded to a safe road.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03954 Name GRAHAM CALDER Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49-BOGBAIN WEST - Type Change

Comment Changes

I am concerned about your plan for a number of reasons: The area proposed is one of great natural beauty and is used by us and many others for quiet country walks and recreation. We don't want this spoiled. We don't want the wildlife to loose their habitat, we don't want the associated noise and disruption of building works followed by a hotel or similar type of context. The whole nature of the area would be changed. Building 75 more houses in an area which you have failed to provide with facilities and infrastructure over the last 10 years is also irresponsible. Instead you could improve upon this natural area by building some quality footpaths and cycle paths. These could be made to link nicely with the UHI/Culloden areas and money could be spent on a quality cycle path linking the Kessock Bridge to Culloden via the shores of the Moray Firth and then on to link with Ardesier and Moray. Think 'health and quality of life' for existing residents not 'quick profits and more faceless building' for the contractors.

Representation

As per changes representation.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 03642 Name Grainne Lennon Organisation Scottish Government

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Para 4.37

Reference Site NA9 Nairn South Type Change

Comment Changes

Page 64, para 4.37: Amend the text... "Longer term development options at Nairn South are largely dependent on the provision of a vehicular access to the proposed A96 trunk road bypass" to read... "Longer term development options at Nairn South are largely dependent on developers agreeing and delivering suitable improvements to the local road network". Page 67, Site NA9 Nairn South (long term) table, remove the text... '... identifying requirement for linkages to the proposed A96 (T) bypass'

Representation

Previous TS comment: An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites. Additional Comment: The Nairn Bypass options recently presented to the public did not allow for a junction in close proximity to sites identified as NA8 and NA9. Reason - Given the policy position set out in SPP on access to the trunk road network and the alignment options and junction strategy being considered by Transport Scotland for the Nairn Bypass, the developments at Nairn South cannot be dependent upon taking access directly from the new trunk road.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 03642 Name Grainne Lennon Organisation Scottish Government

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site: TM9 Land at former railway station Type Change

Comment Changes

After the sentence... "Land safeguarded to leave open future possibility of rail halt." add the text "An appropriate transport appraisal in accordance with STAG is required. Transport Scotland has no commitment towards funding the delivery of a station at this location."

Representation

Tomatin Previous TS comment: Potential Rail Halt - Until appropriate transport appraisal work has been undertaken for the Tomatin area, which identifies a railway station as a preferred option and where a positive business case is produced then Transport Scotland will not be in position to support this proposal. On this basis, the station should not be shown in the Proposed Plan. Additional notes: Any proposal for a station would have to be shown to be an appropriate transport solution, through the completion of a properly complete STAG appraisal, which would need to consider any station in the context of alternative solutions that may be developed to address recognised transport issues. It would also have to be shown to be a viable financial and technical solution, assessed through the application of the guidance in Network Rail's Guidelines on Investment in Stations. These require the consideration of such factors as the capital costs of building a station and any associated infrastructure, the on-going costs that may be associated with operating subsidies, the potential need for additional rolling stock and the impacts of stations on wider rail timetabling. Funding for new railway stations can be considered under the £30 million Scottish Station Fund which aims to lever in third party funding to provide improved and new stations. The responsibility to demonstrate the need for a new station will continue to lie with the relevant promoter, for example, Local Authorities, Regional Transport Partnerships or developers. More details can be found on the Transport Scotland website: http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/files/documents/rail/rail2014/Scottish_Stations_Fund_Process_0.pdf Reason: To clarify the position and the process and to make clear that the station is an aspiration of the Council which has not been assessed or confirmed as deliverable.

Allocated to Tomatin TM9 Land at former railway station

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site IN49

Representation

We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposal to allocate land at Bogbain West (IN49) for the construction of 75 houses. As an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living and the quality of life of the immediate and wider community. Furthermore, we feel that there has been a lack of opportunity for public participation in the preparation of these plans as this notification letter was the first we heard about it. Our initial objections are as follows: 1. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities We believe that the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. It does not respect local context and would be entirely out of character for the area, to the detriment of the local environment. This proposal would demonstrably harm the amenities enjoyed by local residents, in particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. In addition, the proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community enjoy and use regularly for a range of outdoor activities. 2. The loss of valuable open space One of the council's broad aims is to protect or enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area. Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1, Paragraphs 17 – 19 states that: The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. We believe the proposal contravenes this guidance as it is to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area. It is important that the Council protects and enhances the local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland parks and gardens, urban open space, water resources and the greenbelt. It should also be protected for current and future generations to use and enjoy. This varied and regular use includes walking, cycling, jogging, horse riding, cross country ski-ing as well as school projects. 3. Loss of privacy for the occupants of adjacent residential properties. In line with our right to quiet enjoyment of garden amenities we would urge you to consider the responsibilities under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes home and other land. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. The protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. We believe that the proposed development would not result in a benefit to our area. To the contrary it would lead to the loss of valuable green space and the public's enjoyment of that land. We would be grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this proposal for a developer to build 75 homes on an area of green space that we feel should be left as it is for everyone, as well as future generations, to continue to enjoy and appreciate.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Remove the housing allocation at Greenside Farm or substantially reduce the housing capacity from 50 down to 10-15.

Representation

An allocation of 50 houses at this location is disproportionately high in relation to the size of the village of Rosemarkie. This would overwhelm the village, its traffic and its services. Furthermore, the area indicated on the map does not appear to be sufficiently large to accommodate 50 houses. If 50 houses were to be built here I suspect the footprint would be substantially larger than the area indicated.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reduction in the number of houses planned

Representation

The potential number of 180 new homes in Croy is far too much. It will totally change the character and social dynamics of the village, which will become a sprawling semi-town with no real identity. We have a real concern about the enormous increase in traffic levels in the village and on the B9006 and the impact this will have on travellers and residents as a result of increased noise and pollution levels from a fast and overcrowded road. This will result from the greater majority of people travelling to and from leisure activities, school and work because, as the plan acknowledges, employment opportunities here are very limited. We also have questions about the impact of the planned development on the local primary school and whether this will cope with increased demand for places. Clearly the existing sewage and water treatment facilities will be inadequate and we have concerns over the environmental impact of extending provision on residents here and on the water quality of Loch Flemington should leaching occur. No longer will Croy be a peaceful haven. When we moved here we, as did many other residents, made a lifestyle choice is in danger of being destroyed. The planned changes will do untold damage to a lovely village. A smaller increase in numbers to 40 - 50 homes will be more acceptable and do less harm to the character of our village. We do appreciate that development would be phased over the next 20 years so that we would not get the full impact immediately and that road links to the A96 may be improved.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04246 Name Grigor Hannan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Billy Reynolds William J Reynolds

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.144 future development should be to south.

Reference Previous H1 + H7 rejected sites. Future expansio Type Change

Comment Changes

The site to the southern approach of Culbokie currently zoned for a landscape belt and housing in the local plan and proposed by the owner as ideal for long term future expansion of the village with designed in landscaping to the southern extremity of field H7 should be included within the development plan for mixed housing. The site has existing access from Carn Mor and adjacent public services. Inclusion of this site would allow for long term expansion and concentrate village amenity: play space, shops etc. room to develop at the centre of the village notably CU5, CU6, CU7. Exclusion of this site entirely limits long term housing development and the sustainability of local services: shops, pub, school etc.

Representation

Field to south of Carn Mor, Culbokie Proposed for mixed housing incorporating private plots, affordable plots, sheltered housing area and recreational space. Currently partially included within the local plan. Safe access for vehicles as indicated from Carn Mor. Foul drainage connected to existing sewer system on Carn Mor. Surface water disposed of in SUDS pond on site. Public water supply taken from Carn Mor. The site is not prone to flooding. It is already partially included in the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan and represents a logical extension to the south of the village of Culbokie. Vehicle access, public sewer and water are already available on Carn Mor. The field is currently used for agriculture, but does not represent a significant loss of farmland. There will be no adverse impact on trees or other important landscape features. The additional houses proposed will further reinforce the community of Culbokie and support local amenities such as the school, park and shops. It will furthermore diversify the mix of residents with the inclusion of affordable housing and sheltered housing. The site is adjacent to a bus route and proposes an additional bus stop to the B9169 at the periphery of the site. The site is within walking distance of local amenities. The development of the site is consistent with recent developments to Carn Mor and Balnatua. The proposal creates additional public recreational space within its boundary. There is no reduction in useable public external space. The site arrangement allows for significant screening to minimise the impact of development on the nearest properties to the north. The site is in close proximity to the Culbokie Inn, local shop and post office and adjacent play space. The site includes for the provision of a bus lay-by and multiple paths and walkways. Community Council representation indicates that the preference is for the currently zoned land within the local plan (for housing and landscape screening) should revert to amenity space for the village. This is considered to be highly unsuitable located on the periphery of the village with greater suitability on sites CU 4,5,6,7 do to centrality.

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number 04209 Name Gwen Anton Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59

Reference Site Ref. FR2 Ness Gap Type Change

Comment Changes

Report states that land "could accommodate 130 new homes" yet we are now told that there will be up to 156. The report in 2010 implied 120 would be the maximum. There is also too low a percentage of affordable to private housing. Also concerned that school site may be lost. There is no need for any more retail adding to the traffic problems already experienced in Fortrose. In the 2010 report it was stated that Tulloch would provide an extra classroom for Fortrose Academy. We now hear that 1st year pupils will be bussed to Alness - is this because the Academy is too small? Yet we are to have more housing and therefore presumably more pupils.

Representation

See above, but reason for change is to reduce the impact - visual, etc of so many houses in such a small area, in a village whose character is going to be lost. Chances are that services will be overloaded leading to frustration and dissatisfaction among existing residents

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR2 Ness Gap

Customer Number 01888 Name Gwyn Phillips Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59

Reference FR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Density of Housing on Greenside Farm

Representation

In the last local plan, 35 house were to be allowed on this site but this is now increased to 50. The housing density is unacceptable and out of keeping with the area and of this conservation village.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

No retail or commercial use for the primary school site. Total number of houses in the Ness Gap to be the same as in the last local plan.

Representation

The area proposed for a new primary school should never be considered for retail or commercial use. Such use is against the primary policy of protecting town centres. If it not required for a school there are many other more suitable uses for this site, such as more 1 bedroom social or affordable housing, a daycare facility for senior citizens or a medical facility. Nowhere in the plan have the wishes of the local populace, for this site, been considered. There is an increase in the total number of houses to be built in the Ness Gap from 120, in the last LDP, to over 150 now proposed. The housing density is out of keeping with the area. The developer has been building out the site so that these extra units could be accommodated and therefore appears to expect such approval to be forthcoming.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Review boundary of Nigg masterplan

Representation

Ref. dwellings Broomhill, Broomhill Cottage, St Kilda, Balnabruaich, Nigg. IV19 1 QU - The boundary drawn and published in the Nigg Master Plan is not clear when matched with areas on the ground. The Title to the land is held by the owners. The hamlet of 3 dwellings and private land at Balnabruaich between the protected woodland and B9175 has been reincluded as Industrial land. It had this designation removed around 10 years ago, allowing the easing of planning restrictions for the houses, some of which have been there for 200 years, and the new build of St Kilda. The present owners of Nigg Yard indicated that they had no need of this small corner, and indeed have fenced it off themselves along the boundary of St Kilda, earlier this year. Two of the owners of the private dwellings are 5th generation crofters of the original plots, and remained outwith the earlier development of Nigg by their firm refusal to sell their croft right. As this land is surplus to industrial requirements, present and future, could it please be returned to residential use to enable the owners to enjoy their Properties free of planning restrictions caused by inclusion within the Nigg Yard Boundary.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04347 Name Halde Pottinger Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.96

Reference CD3,5,6,7,9,10 Type Change

Comment Changes

The overall scale of development is not commensurate with conserving the existing settlement. The number of proposed houses should be reduced by a factor of 10 i.e. a maximum of 30 houses.

Representation

The effect of this proposal would be to destroy the existing settlement. It would constitute a complete disregard for any kind of conservation. The uniqueness of this village would be lost in the face of such a massive development. The proposal represents a whole new settlement. It must be scaled down so that it is in keeping with what is here just now.

Allocated to Cawdor General General

Customer Number 04347 Name Halde Pottinger Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.96

Reference CD4 Type Change

Comment Changes

That this space is essentially retained as farmland with a small area that relates to the rear of the existing West End cottages having the potential for a small number of houses .

Representation

This land is good quality farmland and should be preserved as such. Any building on this land would be visible from the Western approaches. The hidden nature of the village would be lost. The number of houses in this area alone would dwarf the existing village. A development here , on its own , is entirely out of keeping with the unique village that exists.

Allocated to Cawdor CD4 CD4 Cawdor expansion

Customer Number 04347 Name Halde Pottinger Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.96

Reference CD1 and CD2 Type Change

Comment Changes

CD1 and CD2 should be removed from the development plan and preserved as green space upon which development is not permitted. CD1 should be become the village green.

Representation

Both of these sites represent an integral part of the green space that that is historic to , and interwoven with, the structure of the village. CD1 (the old school playground) is the space to which the other houses relate to .It has always been accessible and open. It is the only such green space within the existing village. It must be preserved as such.This is the space around which the village was constructed or has developed.This space should be developed as a village green in such a way that people can use and enjoy it. CD2 is the space that links the village to the Big Wood. The slope of the field leads right into the wood. It is historic rough grazing and borders close to the castle. The elevation would mean any development looked down on the village. It has important conservation value (e.g. barn owls feed here) and it has unique amenity value. Both of these open spaces provide the context within which the village sits. The village is a compact settlement but it is also a ribbon development i.e. houses are built along the single street which winds around the playground and beside the field that CD2 is. If you remove these spaces the whole nature of the village is lost. Cawdor Village is hidden until you find it but then , because of the spaces it opens up. These green spaces are essential to preserve the uniqueness of this village.

Allocated to Cawdor General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

NAIRN – DEVELOPMENT SITE NA2 – SOUTH KINGSTEPS Your Ref – IMFLDP/PP/NN Proposed Access The junction where the Lochloy Road meets the A96 can be very congested at peak times with tailbacks going as far back as Bona Vista Road. There should be a direct access route from the existing development (NA-5) over the railway line to meet with the A96 before consent is given for any more housing development in this area. The proposed access onto the Lochloy Road at the East end of Kingsteps is unsuitable for a development of this size, the road is a single track country road as is evident by the use of driveways for passing places. The Lochloy Road is part of the National Cycle Network and as such is regularly used by cyclists Horse Riders frequently use the route through Kingsteps from the nearby stables and paddocks for access to the beach Lorries and tractors frequently use this route to service the agricultural and forestry industries in the area. School bus route with a 48 seat bus taking pupils to school. The only sensible access to this site would be through the existing development at NA-5. Over development of the area The proposed site adjoins the existing rural housing forming Kingsteps (22 houses), consequently this should reflect the rural nature of the existing housing. Most of the houses in Kingsteps sit on at least 0.5 acre plots, some quite a bit more. Any development of the site should reflect the nature of the neighbouring properties in line with the Scottish Governments Planning Policy and advice. Noise pollution, traffic problems and over-development in the countryside are all arguments which the landowner of the proposed site has used to object to far smaller developments in this area, it would be somewhat ironic if these issues were overlooked when considering this application, which is totally out of character and unsuitable for Kingsteps.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04361 Name Hamish J Mackenzie Organisation Tain & Easter Ross Civic Trust

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph 2.3

Reference Special Landscape Areas Type Change

Comment Changes

Tarbat Ness is a site of national importance. There are threats of unacceptable visual impacts from development, particularly of wind turbines. We therefore believe that Tarbat Ness and as much as possible of the surrounding area should be designated as an SLA.

Representation

2. Special Landscape Areas and Tarbat Ness 2.1 We note with concern that the present draft of the IMFLDP follows the Highland Structural Plan (2001) in omitting Tarbat Ness from the list of SLAs. We are firmly of the opinion that Tarbat Ness should be judged to be at least regionally, if not nationally, important when judged against the criteria set out in the background paper "The Assessment of Highland Special Landscape Areas" and used to evaluate areas as potential SLAs. 2.2 Specifically in relation to the criteria:- •The combinations of land character types at Tarbat Ness provide unusual and attractive scenery. At the headland "there is here", in the words of Hugh Miller, "a wide expanse of ocean encircling a narrow headland - brown, sterile, edged with rock, and studded with fragments of stone". •This panorama of almost 360 degrees gives land forms and scenery that are rare, perhaps unique, in the Highland context. •Its landscapes and coastlines are dramatic and striking. To quote Hugh Miller again "on the one hand the mountains of Sutherland are seen rising out of the sea like a volume of blue clouds; on the other, at a still greater distance, the hills of Moray stretch along the horizon in a long undulating strip, so faintly defined in the outline that they seem almost to mingle with the firmament". •Both the Sutherland and the Moray views exhibit rugged mountain cores and dominant mountain massifs, including the Cairngorms. •Finally there is a juxtaposition of these mountain views with moorland on the headland itself (which is a first landing for many species of migrating birds), and they set each other off to striking visual effect - not least when the heather is purple and wild flowers are in bloom. 2.3 Tarbat Ness and the long low, flat peninsula past Portmahomack and as far west as Inver is a popular tourist area and a significant part of the part of the Highland heritage. We believe that it should be should be designated as an SLA and should thus enjoy the protection from development which covers unacceptable impacts on the amenity and heritage resource. 2.4 In a windy area such as that near Tarbat Ness there is a very real danger that planning applications will be made for wind turbines and wind turbines. We believe that such developments would be out of character and would result in significant and unacceptable visual impacts to the detriment of the amenity and the heritage of this unique area. Designation as an SLA would provide appropriate protection.

Allocated to Special Landscape Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Expansion of boundary to enclose whole of Ester Ross peninsula at least the Tain to Portmahomack coastal area.

Representation

1.2 The eastern part of the Easter Ross peninsula is, however, not included in the Hinterland and thus does not enjoy this protection. As a result planning permission is being granted time after time for developments in the open countryside, particularly close to the B 9174 and B9165 between Tain and portmahomack (many of them above Inver), between Portmahomack and Rockfield, and between Portmahomack and Tarbat Ness. We consider that many of these developments are inappropriate, except where they complement existing clusters (as for example at Rockfield Mills). We note in particular that • These planning permissions are leading to ribbon development, particularly between Tain and Portmahomack, which at the present rate of approvals could in a few years join Tain and Portmahomack. • The resultant houses are obscuring the views, particularly those of of the Domoch Firth and the Sutherland mountains, which are such a striking feature of the landscape in an area which is highly dependant on tourism. • These developments are encouraging an elongated spread of single dwellings with no community cohesion. • By allowing people who would otherwise live in the various settlements in the area to build these isolated developments the policy is harming the character and social balance of those settlements. 1.3 Much of the peninsula is already an area of countryside with a very significant demand for commuter housing. We feel that the whole of the peninsula east of Tain- or as an absolute minimum that part of the peninsula lying between Tain and Portmahomack among the north coast and the line of the B9174/B9165- should therefore qualify for inclusion in the Hinterland and thus have a presumption against development. 1.4 We further note, with approval, that the IMFDP proposes a Ross-shire Growth Area which takes in a great swathe of Easter Ross, including Tain and Nigg, with industrial/commercial development sites at Fearn Aerodrome and the F endom as well as Nigg Yard itself. The obvious consequence of such growth will be a very substantial increase from people commuting to those sites in the already strong demand for housing in the countryside. We submit that some joined up thinking is required and that the Ross-shire Growth Area should be accompanied by a Hinterland that covers those parts of the Easter Ross countryside most at risk. 1.5 We note that the whole of the Black Isle is included in the Hinterland, obviously because of the demands for commuter based housing from the growth of Inverness. We are firmly of the opinion that similar pressures already exist in Easter Ross and that they will be exacerbated by growth within the northern part of the Ross-shire Growth Area. We believe that the Hinterland should be extended preferably to cover the whole of the Easter Ross peninsula east of Tain, but with an absolute minimum of the area described in 1.3 above (Tain to Portmahomack), where the pressures are already very considerable and leading to ribbon development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Tain is an important historic town and we believe that the IMFLDP should recognise it as such. It should have a Pattern Book to support any future housing and commercial development within the settlement boundary. This should be drawn up with the Highland Council conservation team. To encourage new development to be of the highest standard the Pattern Book should lay out house types, a palette of materials, street widths etc. Without this there is a danger that future plans for housing such as those around the ASDA site will be disconnected from the historic core of the town and be low density cui de sac executive type development which is not appropriate for Tain.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

2. Special Landscape Areas and Tarbat Ness 2.1 We note with concern that the present draft of the IMFLDP follows the Highland Structural Plan (2001) in omitting Tarbat Ness from the list of SLAs. We are firmly of the opinion that Tarbat Ness should be judged to be at least regionally, if not nationally, important when judged against the criteria set out in the background paper "The Assessment of Highland Special Landscape Areas" and used to evaluate areas as potential SLAs. 2.2 Specifically in relation to the criteria:- • The combinations of land character types at Tarbat Ness provide unusual and attractive scenery. At the headland "there is here", in the words of Hugh Miller, "a wide expanse of ocean encircling a narrow headland - brown, sterile, edged with rock, and studded with fragments of stone". • This panorama of almost 360 degrees gives land forms and scenery that are rare, perhaps unique, in the Highland context. • Its landscapes and coastlines are dramatic and striking. To quote Hugh Miller again "on the one hand the mountains of Sutherland are seen rising out of the sea like a volume of blue clouds; on the other, at a still greater distance, the hills of Moray stretch along the horizon in a long undulating strip, so faintly defined in the outline that they seem almost to mingle with the firmament". • Both the Sutherland and the Moray views exhibit rugged mountain cores and dominant mountain massifs, including the Caimgorms. • Finally there is a juxtaposition of these mountain views with moorland on the headland itself (which is a first landing for many species of migrating birds), and they set each other off to striking visual effect - not least when the heather is purple and wild flowers are in bloom. 2.3 Tarbat Ness and the long low, flat peninsula past Portmahomack and as far west as Inver is a popular tourist area and a significant part of the part of the Highland heritage. We believe that it should be should be designated as an SLA and should thus enjoy the protection from development which covers unacceptable impacts on the amenity and heritage resource. 2.4 In a windy area such as that near Tarbat Ness there is a very real danger that planning applications will be made for wind turbines and wind turbines. We believe that such developments would be out of character and would result in significant and unacceptable visual impacts to the detriment of the amenity and the heritage of this unique area. Designation as an SLA would provide appropriate protection.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

We are highly concerned that the proposed plan does not recognise the pressures on the countryside in Easter Ross, particularly on the road between Tain and Portmahomack and those between Portmahomack and Rockfield and between Portmahomack and Tarbat Ness - pressures caused by this having become a commuter area. These pressures are bound to increase with the proposed Ross-shire Growth Area. We therefore urge that the whole Easter Ross peninsula east of Tain, or at least the area between B9174/B9165 and the northern coast of the peninsula, should be given the protection afforded by being included in the Hinterland.

Representation

1.1 The Highland Council quite properly offers greater protection to those areas of the countryside where the demand for commuter based housing is greatest. Policy 35 of the Highland Wide Local Development Plan thus lays down that the Council will presume against development (with certain specified exceptions) in the open countryside in defined areas. Para 2.7 and Map 3 of the proposed IMFLDP refer to and show the extent of the Hinterland. 1.2 The eastern part of the Easter Ross peninsula is, however, not included in the Hinterland and thus does not enjoy this protection. As a result planning permission is being granted time after time for developments in the open countryside, particularly close to the B 9174 and B9165 between Tain and Portmahomack (many of them above Inver), between Portmahomack and Rockfield, and between Portmahomack and Tarbat Ness. We consider that many of these developments are inappropriate, except where they complement existing clusters (as for example at Rockfield Mills). We note in particular that •These planning permissions are leading to ribbon development, particularly between Tain and Portmahomack, which at the present rate of approvals could in a few years join Tain and Portmahomack. •The resultant houses are obscuring the views, particularly those of the Dornoch Firth and the Sutherland mountains, which are such a striking feature of the landscape in an area which is highly dependant on tourism. •These developments are encouraging an elongated spread of single dwellings with no community cohesion. •By allowing people who would otherwise live in the various settlements in the area to build these isolated developments the policy is harming the character and social balance of those settlements. 1.3 Much of the peninsula is already an area of countryside with a very significant demand for commuter housing. We feel that the whole of the peninsula east of Tain - or as an absolute minimum that part of the peninsula lying between Tain and Portmahomack among the north coast and the line of the B9174/B9165 - should therefore qualify for inclusion in the Hinterland and thus have a presumption against development. 1.4 We further note, with approval, that the IMFDP proposes a Ross-shire Growth Area which takes in a great swathe of Easter Ross, including Tain and Nigg, with industrial/commercial development sites at Fearn Aerodrome and the Fendom as well as Nigg Yard itself. The obvious consequence of such growth will be a very substantial increase from people commuting to those sites in the already strong demand for housing in the countryside. We submit that some joined up thinking is required and that the Ross-shire Growth Area should be accompanied by a Hinterland that covers those parts of the Easter Ross countryside most at risk. 1.5 We note that the whole of the Black Isle is included in the Hinterland, obviously because of the demands for commuter based housing from the growth of Inverness. We are firmly of the opinion that similar pressures already exist in Easter Ross and that they will be exacerbated by growth within the northern part of the Ross-shire Growth Area. We believe that the Hinterland should be extended preferably to cover the whole of the Easter Ross peninsula east of Tain, but with an absolute minimum of the area described in 1.3 above (Tain to Portmahomack), where the pressures are already very considerable and leading to ribbon development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Pormahomack: we are highly concerned that the proposed plan, unlike earlier ones, no longer shows a defined settlement area. Nigg: we suggest that consideration should be given to a new planned village for workers at Nigg Yard. Tain : should be recognised as an important historic town and should have a Pattern Book to guide future development.

Representation

3. Settlement Areas in Easter Ross 3.1 We have looked at the plans and maps in the draft IMFLDP for Fearn Aerodrome, the Fendom, and the Seaboard Villages and are happy with the proposals. We do , however, have comments on the omission of Portmahomack, and on Nigg and Tain. 3.2 We note that there is no plan or map for Portmahomack, despite the fact that Portmahomack was included both in the call for sites stage and in the initial consultations. We think that it is important that there should be a clearly defined settlement area, since •The lack of a defined settlement makes planning decisions, particularly those relating to the fringe of the village, largely dependant on the judgement of the particular planning officers who may be involved rather than on policies which have been democratically and transparently adopted. •Without a defined settlement there is bound to be uncertainty as to what is and what is not within the settlement and thereby an exacerbation of the ribbon development between Tain and Portmahomack alluded to in our comment at 1 above. •The ad hoc development between the village of Portmahomack and Rockfield around the farm of Seafield is an example of what will happen if an a clear plan is not in place. 3.3 Nigg We suggest that the possibility of a new settlement at Nigg, for workers at the Nigg Yard should be examined. This could be a new planned village, looking out over Cromarty. 3.4 Tain - suggested Pattern Book [Development Guide] Tain is an important historic town and we believe that the IMFLDP should recognise it as such. It should have a Pattern Book to support any future housing and commercial development within the settlement boundary. This should be drawn up with the Highland Council conservation team. To encourage new development to be of the highest standard the Pattern Book should lay out house types, a pal ette of materials, street widths etc. Without this there is a danger that future plans for housing such as those around the ASDA site will be disconnected from the historic core of the town and be low density cul de sac executive type development which is not appropriate for Tain.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reintroduction of village section. Cleardevelopment envelope defined.

Representation

3.2 We note that there is no plan or map for Portmahomack, despite the fact that Portmahomack was included both in the call for sites stage and in the initial consultations. We think that it is important that there should be a clearly defined settlement area, since • The lack of a defined settlement makes planning decisions, particularly those relating to the fringe of the village, largely dependant on the judgement of the particular planning officers who may be involved rather than on policies which have been democratically and transparently adopted. • Without a defmed settlement there is bound to be uncertainty as to what is and what is not within the settlement and thereby an exacerbation of the ribbon development between Tain and Portmahomack alluded to in 1 above. • The ad hoc development between the village of Portmahomack and Rockfield around the farm of Seafield is an example of what will happen if an a clear plan is not in place.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Area as highlihgted on the attached plan (Area 6) to be included in the development plan for housing

Representation

Area 6 (North of Obsdale Road) – Triangle to the North of AL10. It is noted that the area is not highlighted as an area for expansion of housing to the town. This area has been highlighted as being ideal for this type of development and we are currently negotiating a contract with the Highland Council and Albyn to provide 12No affordable units to the plot of land. In doing so we will create affordable homes to the town which have been under provided for a number of years and would request that this area be included in the IMFLDP.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04278 Name Hamish Little Organisation Pat Munro (Alness) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas

Paragraph Page 71 Alness Developemnt Allocations

Reference Area to the North of AL14

Type Change

Comment Changes

The area as highlighted on the attached plan, area 3 to be included in the plan for tourism and business.

Representation

Area 3 to the north/east of AL14 (South of the A9 at the junction to Teaninich Avenue). We would request that this area be expanded for tourism and business. The proposal is to locate a restaurant/country shop and garden centre. The expansion and development for this area will provide additional employment to the area and provide tourist the opportunity to sample local produce and engage with the historic background of the area. The inclusion of a gardening centre would also provide Alness and the surrounding area a much needed facility which would be easily assessed from the A9. We would request that the area be included in the proposed development plan.

Allocated to Alness General General

Customer Number 04278 Name Hamish Little Organisation Pat Munro (Alness) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph Page 73 Paragraph 2

Reference Policy Reference AL6 Milnafua

Type Change

Comment Changes

The narrative within this section highlights that a master plan/development breif to be agreed. Part of this are comes under a 1973 planning permission which was enacted and therefore, the narrative should read to be developed in accordance with planning permission V/6770/B/3607/1.

Representation

The highland council have agreed that as the permission was enacted the planning permission remains live and therefore the area concerned should not be subject to a masterplan application.

Allocated to Alness AL6 Milnafua Farm

Customer Number 04278 Name Hamish Little Organisation Pat Munro (Alness) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph Page 72 Paragraph 4

Reference Ploicy Reference AL2 Whitehills

Type Change

Comment Changes

The narrative within this section highlights that a master plan/Development brief to be agreed. Part of this area comes under a 1973 planning permission that was enacted and therefore the narrative should read to be developed in accordance with planning permission V/6770/B/3607/1.

Representation

The highland council have already aged that as the permission was enacted the planning permission remains live and therefore the area concerned should not be subject to a master plan application.

Allocated to Alness AL2 Whitehills

Customer Number 04278 Name Hamish Little Organisation Pat Munro (Alness) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas

Paragraph Page 71 Alness Development Allocations

Reference Area between AL12 and AL18

Type Change

Comment Changes

We would propose to include the are highlihgted on the attached plan (area 1) for Business and Industry Expansion.

Representation

Area 1 to the south of AL12 and to the west of AL18 (West of Teaninich Avenue). Area to be included within the development plan for Business and Industry Expansion. In introducing this area AL 12 will no longer be isolated, the inclusion of the area will make the development a more viable business proposition, increase employment opportunities for the area and create an area for increased business and industry expansion. We would request that the area be included in the proposed development plan.

Allocated to Alness General General

Customer Number 04278 Name Hamish Little Organisation Pat Munro (Aness) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Page 71 Aness Development Allocations

Reference Area to the South West of AL6 Type Change

Comment Changes

Area as marked on the attached plan (Area 5) to be included in the development plan as housing.

Representation

Area 5 (North East of Obsdale Park, Aness) - Triangle to the south west of AL16 to be included for housing. As there is a high demand for housing in the area, we propose that this area is included for expansion to meet the demands highlighted in the development Plan and the economic growth of the area.

Allocated to Aness AL6 Milnafua Farm

Customer Number 04278 Name Hamish Little Organisation Pat Munro (Aness) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Area to the North of AL16 and AL2

Reference Page 71 Aness Development Allocations Type Change

Comment Changes

The area above AL16 and AL2, as marked up as area 4 on the attached plan, to be maintained as previous designation.

Representation

Area 4 to the North of Aness (North of Old Milnafua Road) was previously identified in the Spring 2012 Inner Moray Firth Local Plan as being permitted for Industry. The area highlighted has been removed from the latest issue of the IMFDP with no designation allocated. As part of the consultation we would request that the area be re-included in the proposed development plan. Although the area in general will be returned to farmland in the future, its current use will be maintained for industry.

Allocated to Aness General General

Customer Number 04278 Name Hamish Little Organisation Pat Munro (Alness) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Page 71 Alness Development Allocations

Reference Area to the east of AL13 and South of AL15 Type Change

Comment Changes

We propose to include the area highlihgted on the attached plan (area 2) for Tourism.

Representation

Area 2 to the east of AL13 (East of Teaninich Avenue) – Proposal to include this for tourism at the request of the Alness Community. It is our proposal to introduce a caravan park to this area which we consider being the ideal location. There are existing footpath links to the town centre and the wider countryside, which will allow tourists and visitors to explore the vibrant town centre and the historic and costal links. The inclusion of a caravan park in this area would provide additional employment to the area and increase the numbers of visitors and tourists to the area. We would request that the area be included in the proposed development plan.

Allocated to Alness General General

Customer Number 04495 Name Hamish Robertson Organisation Conon Bridge Petition

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per Petition Response.

Representation

Circa 664 co-signatories. The Proposed Local Development Plan published by The Highland Council in November 2013 designates the land in the centre of Conon Bridge (CB3 in plan) for the building of new housing. I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to build houses in the above area of Conon Bridge. This land includes the present playing field which we understand is owned by the Amenities Association :-The playing field and the area of the present car park was gifted to the village in the 1950s. It is important that the playing field remains in the hands of the village, and also that sufficient off-street parking is retained In this central position beside the church. I further ask that you amend the above plan to show this entire area (CB3) as a green space dedicated to the provision of outdoor recreation for all ages in the village. There is a great need to develop further amenities in Conon Bridge to keep pace with the rapid development currently taking place round the village, and surely this is an opportunity for the Highland Council to work with the community in Conon Bridge for the benefit of all.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

No further housing development in the. If development is approved it should only be after extensive investigation and major engineering works regarding flood risks and drainage systems.

Representation

[redacted] Having been served notice regarding the above, I wish to object to the above. Following are my grounds for objection:- My main area of concern is the risk of future flooding. Many objections were raised regarding the housing behind the Fire Station as detailed in the 2003 Plan. I was at the time concerned that Councillors and Planners did not give proper consideration to my concerns about potential flooding arising from the proposed development. I feel that events in the intervening years have shown my fears to be well founded. There is a history of flooding in the area and there are photographs attached evidencing some of the incidents, which have occurred over the years. Drainage in the Croyard Road/Croyard Drive area is not good and I am concerned this would be exacerbated by further development in adjacent fields. The problem would appear to have been accepted by Highland Council as it is stated in Para 4.31 of the proposed plan that "Beauly has a history of flooding and drainage issues, as such many development proposals will required to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment and/or drainage impact assessment the outcome of which may affect the development options of sites and require complex mitigation measures". In view of this statement by the Council we feel that a development of 238 houses in site reference BE1 would appear unwise, even reckless. Beauly sits on a floodplain and there is a substantial watercourse runs past part of Croyard Drive, existing allotments and enters a twenty-four inch culvert to the north of Shrewsbury House. The design capacity of this culvert is totally inadequate to cope with the existing upstream volume of the watercourse. This watercourse has been the source of numerous flooding incidents since the Croyard Drive houses were established in 1991. I could not have confidence in remedial work being carried out to this culvert providing a long term solution. I believe that no further housing development should take place in the village. If however development is approved I believe that a prerequisite should be the diversion of the existing watercourse to another outlet, for example in open ground between Beauly and Muir of Ord. During consultations regarding the 2003 Plan it was repeatedly stated that one of their main concerns was that the character of the village should be retained. Since that time there have been in excess of one hundred housing units built in Beauly and plans have been passed for a further thirty-seven behind the Fire Station. Now we are talking about a further two hundred units. It would be nonsensical to now suggest that the character of the village would be retained. When the 2003 local plan was adopted The Reporter recommended "that future development should be well-designed, landscaped, drawn up with consideration for its surroundings, the amenity of neighbouring residents, and not be intrusive or impact adversely on individual or community residential amenity. The reporter also stated that the local infrastructure of the village should be improved before further large-scale development takes place". I don't believe that developments since the adoption of that Plan have taken account of the Reporter's recommendation regarding neighbouring residents or improvement to the infrastructure. The maintenance of the rural nature of our village has already become unbalanced since the implementation of the current Local Plan and generally existing residents are fearful for the manner in which our village is being developed and expanded. I notice now that the 2013 Plan now refers to Beauly as a town rather than a village. The re-opening of the railway was good for the village but with such a large scale development at the opposite end of the village it is obvious that the station car park, even after the recent extension, will not be able to cope. This will lead inevitably lead to an increase in road traffic to and from Inverness – completely contrary to the thinking behind the re-opening of the station. Parking and traffic flows are major problems in the village at the moment. It would seem obvious that such large scale development can only make matters much worse. There will simply be huge under provision of parking spaces. The proposed loop road is unlikely to alleviate the problem of the huge increase in the number of cars trying to move around in the village. In conclusion I would say that I object very strongly to the proposals in the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan and would not wish to see any further housing development in the village until the foregoing concerns are adequately addressed. At the very least I think the matter merits a Public Enquiry. Yours faithfully Harry Black 12/12/13

Allocated to

Customer Number 04206 Name Harry Black Organisation BEI ADJOINING RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.26

Reference BE1 Type Change

Comment Changes

We do not wish to see any further housing development in the village. If development is approved it should only be after extensive investigation and major engineering works in respect of flooding risk and drainage.

Representation

[redacted] Having been served notice regarding the above, we the undersigned wish to object to the Plan. Our main area of concern is the risk of future flooding. We may also write to you individually regarding this particular item and any other items we feel affect us arriving out of the proposals. Many objections were raised regarding the housing behind the Fire Station as detailed in the 2003 Plan. We were at the time concerned that Councillors and Planners did not give proper consideration to our concerns about potential flooding arising from the proposed development. We feel that events in the intervening years have shown our fears to be well founded. There is a history of flooding in the area and there are photographs attached evidencing some of the incidents, which have occurred over the years. Drainage in the Croyard Road/Croyard Drive area is not good and we are concerned this would be exacerbated by further development in adjacent fields. The problem would appear to have been accepted by Highland Council as it is stated in Para 4.31 of the proposed plan that "Beauly has a history of flooding and drainage issues, as such many development proposals will required to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment and/or drainage impact assessment the outcome of which may affect the development options of sites and require complex mitigation measures". In view of this statement by the Council we feel that a development of 238 houses in site reference BE1 would appear unwise, even reckless. Beauly sits on a floodplain and there is a substantial watercourse runs past part of Croyard Drive, existing allotments and enters a twenty-four inch culvert to the north of Shrewsbury House. The design capacity of this culvert is totally inadequate to cope with the existing upstream volume of the watercourse. This watercourse has been the source of numerous flooding incidents since the Croyard Drive houses were established in 1991. All of the foregoing leads us to conclude that this watercourse must be redesigned to current engineering regulations to effectively eliminate flooding incidents in future. We believe this to be a prerequisite to any further development. BE1 Adjoining Tenants Association.

Allocated to Beauly BE1 Beauly East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We do not want any further housing development within the village. If development is approved it should only be after extensive investigation and major engineering works to minimise flood risk and resolve drainage issues.

Representation

[redacted] Having been served notice regarding the above, we the undersigned wish to object to the Plan. Our main area of concern is the risk of future flooding. We may also write to you individually regarding this particular item and any other items we feel affect us arriving out of the proposals. Many objections were raised regarding the housing behind the Fire Station as detailed in the 2003 Plan. We were at the time concerned that Councillors and Planners did not give proper consideration to our concerns about potential flooding arising from the proposed development. We feel that events in the intervening years have shown our fears to be well founded. There is a history of flooding in the area and there are photographs attached evidencing some of the incidents, which have occurred over the years. Drainage in the Croyard Road/Croyard Drive area is not good and we are concerned this would be exacerbated by further development in adjacent fields. The problem would appear to have been accepted by Highland Council as it is stated in Para 4.31 of the proposed plan that "Beauly has a history of flooding and drainage issues, as such many development proposals will required to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment and/or drainage impact assessment the outcome of which may affect the development options of sites and require complex mitigation measures". In view of this statement by the Council we feel that a development of 238 houses in site reference BE1 would appear unwise, even reckless. Beauly sits on a floodplain and there is a substantial watercourse runs past part of Croyard Drive, existing allotments and enters a twenty-four inch culvert to the north of Shrewsbury House. The design capacity of this culvert is totally inadequate to cope with the existing upstream volume of the watercourse. This watercourse has been the source of numerous flooding incidents since the Croyard Drive houses were established in 1991. All of the foregoing leads us to conclude that this watercourse must be redesigned to current engineering regulations to effectively eliminate flooding incidents in future. We believe this to be a prerequisite to any further development. BE1 Adjoining Tenants Association.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

In response to Neighbour notification October 2013 Acknowledgement by Barchester Healthcare Ltd (adjoining property to development) that they have no objections to proposed development. Proposal in line with Local Plan provision. Harry H Kelly Head of Development Planning Barchester Healthcare Ltd.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04007 Name Hazel Leith Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.87 ? Ardersier.

Reference AR6 (Area to north of Ardersier for proposed Cara Type Change

Comment Changes

Could a house be added to this proposed develoment ? Maybe with a shop and Reception area as well. A small coffee shop would also be very convenient for tourists and caravaners alike since we don't have this sort of facility anywhere locally.

Representation

I'm wanting not so much to change the proposed plan but to add things that I thought were mentioned in the original call for sites application. Not much point in having a caravan park if it is restricted to caravans and changing block only. The facilities I mention above would obviously enhance the proposal. Perhaps it was just an oversight in the final wording ?

Allocated to Ardersier AR6 North of village

Customer Number 04314 Name Hazel Morrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA2 South Kingsteps Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan Site: NA2 – South Kingsteps I write with reference to the above site proposed for inclusion in the IMFLDP. Whilst not completely opposed to some degree of housing development, I would like the following points to be considered and implemented if the site is to be adopted in the IMFLDP. Kingsteps is a historic rural settlement in it's own rights and any development adjacent to this area needs to be sympathetic to ensure Kingsteps retains it's individual identity. Accordingly; a. In it's current format Lochloy Road is incapable of serving a development of an additional 90 houses and any attempt to improve/widen to achieve an access at the Eastern end of Kingsteps would completely disrupt the harmony of the historic Kingsteps hamlet. Lochloy Road is already running at capacity (or above it) and an additional 90 houses each with a minimum of 2 cars per household would render it unsafe. If any development whatsoever is granted for site NA2 then access should be taken via the current Springfield development and not from Lochloy Road. b. The implied housing density of 6+ houses per acre is not appropriate for site NA2's semi-rural location. Housing densities should be consistent with the rural Kingsteps area where all properties are built on 0.5+ acre plots. Therefore housing density on the proposed site NA2 should be restricted to 2 houses per acre. c. No house building whatsoever should be permitted north of the Kingsteps burn which dissects the site. I would insist this is a condition of any future Planning consent to create a divide between any new housing and Kingsteps and to ensure Kingsteps retains it's identity as a settlement in it's own right. A landscaping proposal should also be agreed and implemented prior to any house construction commencing. It should incorporate a 20 – 25 metre wide dense planted zone along the northern boundary of site NA2 bordering Kingsteps to ensure Kingsteps retains it's own separate identity.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 00428 Name Hazel Sears Organisation Halliday Fraser Munro

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph 2.12

Reference Site capacities Type Change

Comment Changes

Change: 3rd sentence However a different capacity than that specified 'will' be acceptable

Representation

The Plan states that Indicative housing capacities are shown for each site and that planning applications are expected to be generally consistent with these. However it is important that the Plan is flexible. The site capacities identified have not in the main been assessed with the detailed technical knowledge required to establish number deliverability. It is critical therefore to acknowledge that these capacities are indicative, not only dependent on detailed design studies, but they also have to take account of market conditions which can have an impact on mix and tenure and resultant densities. If the Plan is to endure for at least 10 if not 20 years it must be accepted that a current indicative density is likely to change. The Plan must not be too prescriptive in terms of densities and capacities.

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number 00428 Name Hazel Sears Organisation Halliday Fraser Munro

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Mixed use

Reference IN24 Torvean and Ness-side (Southern part) Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Torvean and Ness-side (Southern part) forms a critical part of the city's housing land supply and was allocated for residential use in the extant Inverness Local Plan 2006. The site is also allocated for development purposes in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, Policy 8. The site is located in a thoroughly sustainable location and if developed in accordance with the approved Torvean and Ness-side Development Broef will facilitate the delivery of the Western Link Road, a crucial road link to enable cross river/ canal crossing in the western side of the city.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I was at a meeting of about forty Nairn folk who, as well as I object to building on The Farmer's Field.Surely this greenfield site is protected in law from loss to developements like housing. also, what about the traffic problems that exist already in the area.These would be exacerbated to a totally unacceptable level.From what I have seen at the meeting, a very great deal of people are most alarmed at the prospect of the said development.I was at The Save Our Showfield campaign when some years ago developers wanted to build a supermarket on the green space described here.Also St Ninians football team trains there, and they value the space as you can imagine.The farmers who own the site can gain renting the space out to a large range of differing entertainment groups, circuses, car rallies, sports, historic displays etc.Please see reason in my argument, I remember being in the Steering Committee last time they tried to take away this dear green space.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I find this form quite unsuitable for a response. It does, however, illustrate how disinterested THC are in any opinions on development of the 'Inner Moray Firth' other than their own. President Putin would probably be very glad to engage the services of THC in his government. The objections that were put forward at the previous attempt to desecrate the Common Good Lands of Sandown still stand. If you have conveniently forgotton what they were, then perhaps you should read the file. 350 houses: too too many. Land could be used for long term employment uses, not speculative building which caused the current economic crisis. Whatever happened to the proposed wetlands project? Has it been quietly shelved?

Representation

The proposed plan is flawed from it's very inception. 2000 words are not sufficient to mount a proper response. Nairn requires sustainable solutions, there are NONE in this plan, short terminism rules. The jargon contained in this proposal only serves to disguise the lack of imagination, innovation, and leadership of THC

Allocated to

Customer Number 04187 Name Hector MacDonald Organisation Resolis and Urquhart Church of Scotland

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.146

Reference CU7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Change the allocation.

Representation

We believe that this area should be used for community use or sheltered housing. however the proposed housing density is yoo high and out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Allocated to Culbokie CU7 East of Old Primary School

Customer Number 04269 Name Helen & Michael Duffy Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59-4.62

Reference FR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Either withdrawal of or substantial reduction in size of proposed development in rosemarkie

Representation

Section 4.59 of The inner moray firth local development plan states that all development must be within the scale and character of conservation area. While the site at Greenside is technically outside the central conservation area of Rosemarkie, the scale of the development is completely out of proportion to Rosemarkie and 50 new dwellings will impact substantially upon the character of the village, and community. The potential increase in traffic (both in Rosemarkie and passing through Avoch and Fortrose) from a further 50 dwellings is likely to be substantial. Rosemarkie already struggles to accommodate he current traffic throughput, with congestion caused by buses or deliveries, and lack of pavement due to historic nature of the High Street meaning that pedestrian safety is compromised. Increase volume of traffic on these small A roads is likely to result in increased risk to pedestrians. With the secondary school in fortrose, there are a large number of children walking to and from school both within the villages and across the Ness Gap, and further development within Fortrose and Rosemarkie will potentially increase traffic beyond capacity of the high streets and put children at risk. as most commuter traffic will be to the A9 and beyond, there will be similar impact on road safety in Avoch, with its primary school. It is for these reasons that we object to the proposed development FR1, and suggest it should be withdrawn or substantially smaller.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The IMFLDP makes no reference to any proposed carriageway improvements on the B9009/B9091/B9006 to meet the possible additional fifteen hundred daily vehicle movements arising from proposed developments at Cawdor and Croy. Does the Council consider that these carriageways are capable of carrying the possible additional traffic volumes that these developments may attract? At times of peak traffic flows Inshes roundabout is unable to cope with existing traffic. At such times drivers currently attempt to alleviate delays by travelling up the Old Drumossie Brae and dropping back in to Inverness via Milton of Leys and various exits from the SDR. The opening of the University will increase pressure on Inshes roundabout as anyone travelling westwards on the B9006 wishing to access the University will have to go around the roundabout. The possible addition of a possible fifteen hundred daily vehicle movements in this area from the proposed Cawdor and Croy developments (and this figure ignores any possible traffic from Nairn, ribbon developments along the routes and possible further developments at Sunnyside and to the south of the B9006 at Westhill) under existing traffic arrangements is unthinkable. The existing traffic arrangements at the Inshes roundabout need to be improved now to meet current demand. Any such improvement should be such that it can accommodate any proposed IMFLDP developments affecting the roundabout. What are the proposals for connecting the A9/A96 to the SDR? The existing A9-SDR connection contributes to peak time traffic congestion at the Inshes roundabout, with traffic backed up along the B9006 to Cradlehall and on occasion to Westhill. If the SDR is to be used as the proposed east/west trunk road link such proposal can only add to the existing congestion at Inshes roundabout, and if this link is seen as the trunk road cross town link why is it not funded and constructed by Transport Scotland? The IMFLDP is vague on proposals to make Inverness a user friendly centre with adequate and reasonably priced accessible vehicle parking facilities. Public transport and/or park-and-ride facilities are alternatives to use of personal transport but require to be suitable, adequate and cost effective to be attractive. While walking or cycling are suitable alternatives for shorter journeys I invite any seventy-something to cycle from Inverness to Croy or Cawdor with their weekly grocery shopping. Consideration has to be given to the infirm having access to competitively priced goods and foodstuffs by easy access to these through suitable transport or reduced business rates to providers of these services based in the smaller and remote communities.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

The IMFLDP indicates proposed significant development along the southern Moray Firth coastal plain. At a time when as a nation we are importing over 50% of our foodstuffs and unspecified quantities of non-food goods, when the demand is for a reduction of food miles (and by implication, a reduction in non-food goods miles), when fossil fuels are being seriously depleted and expensive (and should be reserved for use as chemical feedstocks), when alternative energy supplies are uncertain, when we are encouraged to reduce the use of personal transport this is serious vandalism of valuable agricultural land. While the development proposals for the Inverness - Nairn Corridor do not contravene current legislation the loss of agricultural land to building and an increased reliance on imported goods and foodstuffs which could be produced on the home front seems particularly shortsighted. We should be planning for and creating sustainable communities to meet local needs, looking wherever possible to produce locally for local consumption, exporting surpluses to the nearest centre of demand, importing only what can not be produced locally and reducing wherever possible long distance road and rail haulage of goods and foodstuffs. To this end we should not build, except in exceptional circumstances, on land suitable for agricultural purposes, building instead on marginal land. Exceptional circumstances are easily explained, e.g. any sensible alignment of the Nairn by-pass can only be over good agricultural land; the dualling of the A96 Inverness to Nairn will require a lesser land take if it incorporates the existing A96 in its construction. Where is the evidence of demand for additional jobs, people and facilities along the Inverness - Nairn Corridor? While not precluding light industrial engineering development in the Inverness and Nairn areas, in the absence of any firm commitment of heavy industrial development at Whiteness any future heavy industrial development should be in the Invergordon/Nigg area. Invergordon has a deep water port capable of both expansion and handling larger ships and has much of the necessary infrastructure in place. The present Inverness harbour has limited room for expansion and is limited in the size of ships it can handle unless it is moved to the east of the Kessock Bridge. Such a move would be expensive both to construct and to maintain. But we should look at the wider future transport potentials. Marine containerised shipping of goods is the most cost effective manner of distribution, reducing road and rail distribution from long distance haulage to a requirement for only local transportation. There has been a steady decline in the smaller ships available, and while this can be overcome it becomes a trade-off between smaller ships which are more costly to run but with lesser local distribution costs (smaller ships in to a number of smaller ports with local distribution from these ports) versus larger ships which are less costly to run but with greater local distribution costs (larger vessels in to one port with a wider distribution network). There is, of course, an alternative to this - undo the Beeching decimation of the rail network!

Allocated to

Customer Number 04410 Name IABP Ltd Organisation IABP Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) S White urnberry Consulting Ltd

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas

Paragraph 3.7 & Map 5

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Amend the final sentence of paragraph 3.7 as follows: "A new rail halt at Dalcross will serve Tornagrain, the Airport and adjacent Business Park." Amend Map 5 to indicate the permitted Park & Ride at Dalcross.

Representation

The LDP should plan positively for the delivery of the infrastructure required to support development. The Dalcross rail halt is a vital element of the infrastructure provision required in the Inverness-Nairn corridor. The rail halt and park & ride already have planning permission and the plan should therefore recognise this status and reinforce the commitment to their delivery within the identified timeframe of 2014-2019.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 04410 Name IABP Ltd Organisation IABP Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) S White urnberry Consulting Ltd

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas

Paragraph

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Add 2 bullet points to Section 3.5 as follows: •Prioritise and support the delivery of IABP as the key employment allocation within the Inverness-Nairn growth area. •New office, industry and warehousing development should be located in the designated employment areas, unless it can be demonstrated that insufficient employment land is available.

Representation

Long identified in The Highland Council's planning policies as a strategic employment site, Inverness Airport Business Park (IABP) is widely recognised as one of the key drivers for the A96 Growth Corridor. It is set to make a major contribution to attracting inward investment to the region, promoting business expansion in the A96 Corridor, to the benefit of the economic prosperity of existing and future generations in Inverness and the Highlands. It has been subject to a comprehensive masterplanning approach, leading to the formulation of a sustainable masterplan framework of the highest design quality which will optimise integration with nearby developments including expansion of the Airport and the proposed new town of Tornagrain. The Masterplan takes a holistic approach to the IABP development site and its surroundings to ensure a coherent and dynamic scheme which is strongly integrated with its context, both physically and functionally. It also provides an opportunity to create a multi-mode transport gateway to the Highland region, combining road, rail and air. For these reasons, IABP is an important catalyst for growth at the airport, as well as the wider region. However, the significance of IABP in helping to deliver the Council's vision for the corridor is not fully reflected in the Proposed Plan. The Plan should therefore be amended to emphasise IABP as is the premier business/employment location in the Inner Moray Firth.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 04410 Name IABP Ltd Organisation IABP Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) S White urnberry Consulting Ltd

Section 1.Introduction

Paragraph Settlements- Map 1

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

The map should indicate the proposed rail halt at Dalcross.

Representation

The creation of a new rail halt at Dalcross is a key infrastructure upgrade that will support planned growth in the Inverness-Nairn corridor. Like road and other rail improvements, it should be indicated on the spatial strategy plan.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 03367 Name Iain Cameron Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.102

Reference D01 South of Village Hall

Type Change

Comment Changes

Extend the area D01 to cover the whole block (now a coniferous plantation), up to the B862.

Representation

As the landowner, I have been involved in the only tentative proposal for developing this area, which involved financing the infrastructure for affordable housing by selling free market plots higher up the hill. If this policy is to be adopted it would be sensible to allocate for housing the whole of the area at present under coniferous woodland. I do not suggest that this whole area is filled with houses, just that, given the steep terrain, maximum flexibility would be required to position plots higher up, nearer the B862, as the topographical studies done so far do not identify where these sites might be possible.

Allocated to Dores DO1 Land South of Dores Hall

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Please refer to attached representation. This expresses support for the Council's preference to allocate Proposal MO5 for mixed use development. The representation explains how a Planning Permission in Principle (PPP) application has recently been submitted for Proposal MO5. Reference 13/01775/PREAPP and 13/03032/PAN. It expresses the steps taken by the applicant in line with officer advice relating to timing and content of a PPP application in light of the LDP process. It also explains and justifies the applicant's approach to site layout and design in so far as compatible uses; which includes the provision of the developer requirements listed in Proposal MO5. Further details are found within the attached representation along with an attachment showing the Planning Processing Agreement between Highland Council and the applicant which sets out the timings and commitments taken by both parties - draw reference to timing of submission of a planning application.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF IAIN ELLIOT LIMITED LAND 150M WEST OF WYNDHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, GREAT NORTH ROAD, MUIR OF ORD IV6 7UA Colliers International has been instructed by Iain Elliot Limited to respond to the current consultation about the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) – Proposed Plan, published for comments earlier this month. This representation indicates support for the identification of Proposal MO5 “Land to South of The Cairns”. The support is subject to a minor modification of the site boundary of Proposal MO5. Please refer to attached updated red line boundary which more accurately represents the site boundary on the south and south east. This accounts for a detailed review of land titles of the landowners Iain Elliot Limited, and presents the most accurate extent of land in their control. The allocation is supported on the basis that it has the continued support of the Council, as the proposal was identified as a preferred option in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan Main Issues Report when published in April 2012. Since that time, Iain Elliot Limited has undertaken further feasibility on advancing proposals for the site in order to demonstrate its feasibility and deliverability. Once initial feasibility had been considered, Iain Elliot Limited has been working collaboratively with Highland Council officers and other stakeholders, along with the local Muir of Ord community to develop its plans for delivery of Proposal MO5. This consultative process is outlined below. Iain Elliot Limited chose to access the Council’s Pre Application for Major Developments advice service in June 2013 on the basis of the earlier identification of the site in the Main Issues Report. At that time, it took advice from council officers about the form, content and timing of presenting a planning application for Proposal MO5. Officers advised that a planning application pre-dating the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan Proposed Plan consultation may be premature. However the officers also advised that weight can be attached to a Proposed Plan in the decision making process for planning applications, reference 13/01775/PREAPP. The submission of any planning application for the site could thus be supported by the Council prior to adoption of the IMFLDP (it follows, any determination by the Council would be made and judged on the applications’ own merits). As a major development project, Iain Elliot Limited undertook wide ranging community consultation about the developing proposals, once a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN) was lodged and agreed with Highland Council in August 2013 (reference 13/03032/PAN). The consultation took the form of formal press notices, public meetings with Muir of Ord Community Council and a 2-day public drop in session on the 3rd and 4th September 2013. A further public meeting took place with Muir of Ord Community Council on 12th November 2013 to provide an update on progress and to take further comments. The local press also ran news articles during September 2013. Iain Elliot Limited has signed a Planning Processing Agreement with Highland Council which restricts the presentation of a planning application until 29th November 2013 or later. This was agreed in order to meet the consultation timing of this IMF LDP Proposed Plan stage; to allow any comments to be made to the proposed allocation MO5 and enable the determination of a planning permission in principle (PPP) application when lodged. The planning application was lodged on 29th November 2013. With regard to the previous comments made in the IMF LDP consultations, matters relating to: avoidance of coalescence with Windhill; preservation in situ of the Windhill Standing Stone scheduled monument; retail development outwith the settlement centre; impact on protected species and designated sites; the consideration of an off-road footpath/cycle way for safe route to school and to access village services; the provision of affordable housing; enhancement of the village boundary / gateway - these have all been addressed in the process of pre-application masterplanning and the close consultations. The consultations have included exchanges with Historic Scotland, SEPA, Scottish Natural Heritage and council departments. These have added great value to the pre-planning and masterplanning process, along with subsequent opportunities for refinement of proposals displayed at the community consultation events. The matters expressed in the Main Issues Report responses have been addressed in the PPP planning application that will be lodged on or after 29th November 2013. Other matters expressed and advised by Highland Council and other agencies in the pre application pack (13/01775/PREAPP) have been addressed through the appointment of expert consultants to study and recommend appropriate mitigation on matters relating to: ecology (and presence of protected species); archaeology (and the treatment and possible promotion of the scheduled monument); noise assessment (for consideration of local amenity to existing and proposed properties); traffic impact assessment and transportation (for the consideration of impact on the road network and the accessibility of the site for walking, cycling and public transport); drainage and flood risk assessment (for the examination of site constraints and public safety); commercial property advice (for the consideration of the current vitality and viability of Muir of Ord High Street) and design/sustainability and place making advice to prepare a holistic masterplan for the Proposal MO5. A copy of the plan is enclosed with this representation. Indicative Proposals for MO5 The planning permission in principle (PPP) application does not require applicants to submit detailed designs, elevations of buildings or samples of colours or finishes. However, the masterplanning process and public consultation

stages have allowed a much broader and very open expression of the indicative proposals for the site. In addition to supporting studies, a reasonably detailed concept masterplan has been refined and submitted showing the approach to siting, arrangement and layout of the key uses and how they fit into the identified constraints and opportunities of the site. The proposals all meet the requirement of the Proposed Plan allocation MO5 in that the proposal is for: Uses: 2.7Ha Business (Class 4); 1.2Ha Commercial (Class 1 food and non-food) and 60 homes (including affordable). Requirements: Safe route to school; Safeguard around the Windhill standing stone; Extension of the 30 mph speed limit; Formation of a suitable access from the A862; Development in separate phases not exceeding 20 houses in any one calendar year (if the 20 units are not built in the calendar year, the balance may be carried over to the subsequent phase). Please refer to attached concept masterplan and the red line boundary defining the site boundary in greater accuracy. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the proposal in greater detail at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO5 Land to South of The Cairns

Customer Number 04052 Name Iain Maclean Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG5 Railway Sidings Type Change

Comment Changes

Use the sidings as parking for the workers on the CFP A site

Representation

This site is about fifty meters in front of the Phase 2 development of the CFP A, which is a glorified industrial scrap yard, and an eyesore. Any idea that the sidings could become a "gateway site" is illusory, short of adult tree plantation, or similar measures of screening out the dock area. The sidings have a busy road in front, plus the dock area, and a railway line behind, so it seems an unpleasant place to live, but it would be possible to build some houses. It is suggested that, if built, the buildings should be one storey high, out of respect to the inhabitants of Cromlet. A more logical use of the sidings, and one of more service to the long-suffering population of Invergordon, would be to use the Sidings as a parking for the workers on the CFP A site. At present the people living in the lower town, find that every parking space is filled by worker's cars. Shoppers can no longer take their cars, because it is impossible to find a parking.

Allocated to Invergordon IG5 Former Railway Sidings

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Comments on the Local Plan from Monique and Iain Riddle in support of the inclusion of Bunloit into the Hinterland We support the inclusion of Bunloit into the Hinterland for the following reasons: 1.Landscape Value Despite some recent and inappropriate housing developments in the Bunloit area (which is located within a Special Landscape Area), the locality has managed to retain its wild upland moorland and crafting character with expansive views North Ben Wyvis, East to the Great Glen and South to Ben Nevis. Any more development will overwhelm the unique landscape setting of this area. Adventure tourism (walking, mountain biking, horse riding, etc) is expanding at a fast rate. Areas such as Bunloit, and its hub Drumnadrochit are very well placed to take advantage of this trend – as long as the area does not lose its unique landscape character. 2.Access The single track tarred road to Bunloit is currently inadequate for the existing intensity of use. The road is notorious for being steep with few passing places and numerous “blind spots”. In winter the road can be very hazardous indeed. This narrow road is shared by vehicles, walkers undertaking the Great Glen Way hiking trail, as well as horse riders from the local stables. Any further increase in usage as a result of inappropriate development will result in an unacceptable level of risk for users of the road. 3.Water Bunloit is situated on a relatively small fault bounded outcrop of Old Red Sandstone. This rock provides the aquifer supplying water to existing homes in the area. This type of “older cover” rock has relatively low porosity and permeability, and therefore the impact on the aquifer of increased extraction – as a result of future development – could have a major impact on the water supplies to existing homes. In addition the increase in septic tank soakaways linked to new development carries an increased risk of contaminating the existing aquifer. 4.Wildlife Increased development in the area will have an adverse impact on the flora and fauna which includes otter, pine marten, badger, black grouse, red squirrels and Greater Crested Newts.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04369 Name Iain Sime Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59 & following

Reference FR1 & FR2 Type Change

Comment Changes

FR2 requirements. FR1 - traffic management

Representation

FR2 area includes current planning permission for a swimming pool. This is absent from the proposed plan and should be included as such a local facility is lacking in the local area. FR2 should include greater commitment to primary school, as well as capacity for further development of Fortrose Academy. I do not think the proposed retail use on this site is appropriate. Such facilities are currently concentrated on the high st where there are vacant facilities and therefore scope for further retail development /re-use within the community. I also think concentrating retail usage on the high street will best help maintain the local character of Fortrose and the Conservation Area. To accommodate the existing planning permission for the swimming pool and leave room for school(s), there would seem to be a need to reduce the housing allocation at this location, and remove the proposed retail use. FR1 - proposed plan is for possible "road closure of Courthill Road". Ongoing access is vital for current residents and, for safety of access, suggest maintaining current one way access down hill below Courthill House is maintained (or reversed so access is only uphill). Otherwise, I support FR1 as being the most appropriate site for allowing expansion of Rosemarkie if needed.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number 04369 Name Iain Sime Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.60

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

I warmly endorse the proposal to maintain the 'gap' between Rosemarkie and Fortrose and thereby maintain the separate character of the two settlements. The proposed plan does this by maintaining the gap by correctly seeking to prevent development to the south and north of the main road between the two settlements.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number 04369 Name Iain Sime Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.15-4.17

Reference IN90 Type Change

Comment Changes

IN90 - change from retail

Representation

I am concerned that further expansion of the already considerable retail park east of Inverness will lead to further, reduced demand for retail facilities in Inverness town centre and further erosion of the vibrancy and sustainability of the retail sector in central Inverness, by encouraging further use of the retail park.

Allocated to East Inverness IN90 South of Inverness Retail and Business Park

Customer Number 03938 Name Iain Watt Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN46 - Balvonie, Milton of Leys Type Change

Comment Changes

Changes should be made to omit the planted hill from any housing development

Representation

This land is essential for the community with regards to green space for people to walk on and exercise the dogs. When houses were purchased in the area this area was clearly marked as being green space. The development of this section would also invade the privacy of occupant of Braes of Balonie, overlooking houses with large windows. It would also overlook the houses of Pinewood Drive, obscuring views and having a detrimental effect on the occupiers' privacy. Any construction work would be dangerous in an area where many young children frequently play on the streets, as well as causing noise pollution and damaging the quality of life of residents. The erection of 45 extra houses is ridiculous considering the local primary school is already over subscribed and has recently sought permission to expand in order to deal with this problem. The plans provided to householders in the area also seems incorrect as large swathes of land are shown as being undeveloped when over the past few years several houses have been built to the North of Ashwood - in fact the planted hill is the only section that has not been overrun by housing development!

Allocated to South Inverness IN46 Balvonie, Milton of Leys

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I would like to support the plan to increase the Hinterland to the south of Kiltarlity. As the plans show the increased housing demand expected around the Firth over the coming years it is essential that new developments are appropriate and given the full scrutiny that this extra protection affords. Developments that bring benefits to the local communities should obviously be supported, but thankfully with this extra layer of planning protection, schemes that do little other than provide easy cash for unscrupulous developers will thankfully be given the examination they deserve. One off high value properties will do little to ease the housing demand over the coming years and are not for the greater good of the community, especially as the area has already suffered the blight of the Beaulay- Denny line and wind farm development pressure. Thankfully the Hinterland expansion will now help protect this beautiful area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Agree but would appreciate further information on the text that says "The council intend to ... draft a Conservation Area Management Plan". What exactly does this mean? As a resident I am acting on behalf of my sister who is the owner of the plot to the west of the village (reference 57 35'20 to 23 N and 4 32'30 to 38 W) and would like to build her retirement home there. She retires in two years. It is understood that for that purpose there is a need for this land to be incorporated into the urban area of the village and to comply with a series of planning norms. For the latter that is understood and accepted for the former what are the steps required to reassign the land? We both believe that it is a natural part of the urban area, not being large enough to serve an agricultural purpose. With your instructions on how to proceed she would be willing to provide you you with all the required information.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Currently the land at Holm between Dores Rd and the river Ness is farmland or wild land. This land has been used by the residents of Holm and the surrounding suburbs for recreation including cycling walking, dog exercise, and wild life exploration (Badgers, deer, foxes etc) for the past (at least) forty years. The plan as envisaged anticipates urbanising this whole area, with the necessary loss of this wild amenity close to urban settlements. It is entirely unacceptable to envision this as there is an obvious planned loss of wild green space and amenity. This would be correctly challenged and defeated at Planning on these grounds. The Park land to the west of the river is no substitute as it requires a drive to get there. An acceptable solution would be to incorporate several hectares of wild land into the Ness-side plan now in a band from Dores Rd to the river possibly to coincide with the power lines. This band should be at least 200m wide in order to retain its wild character.

Representation

Justification for the change is to avoid angst and costly Planning delays when the plan as presented goes to formal planning and is defeated ultimately on ground of loss of green space and loss of amenity.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Land should be retained as agricultural land or natural green belt

Representation

To build more house in the KNocknagael farm land is an absolute crime, this is prime agricultural farmland which we should be using for this purpose, it is also home to badgers, bats, deer, foxes, owls to name but a few of the wildlife that I have see on a regular basis in this area. The burn offers a fantastic environment for the wildlife to live, building more houses in this are will destroy the environment for ever. I appreciate that areas for future housing are required but eleven there are far more suitable areas that can developed long before loosing this area of Inverness. I also believe that the local infrastructure and primary schools do not have capacity for additional children which further development will create. I would propose this area to be retained as community green belt with the creation of nature walks to which could follow the flood Chanel from doers road up holm burn across seasick road and right up to the top of fairways or onto Milton of leys this would be a fantastic nature trail to be enjoyed by everybody. The rest of the lower field could be allocated for allotments with in a natural wilderness. There could also be an area for a community based hans on learning project for the local schools to educate children on farming and how our food is grown with produce being grown and sold in a community cooperative to fund the project

Allocated to

Customer Number 04164 Name Ian Fraser Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.133 and 4.157

Reference Maryburgh & Conon Bridge Type Change

Comment Changes

All new residential development in the catchment of Ben Wyvis Primary School will be required to make a contribution to the provision of community facilities within both Maryburgh and Conon Bridge and the future expansions of Ben Wyvis Primary School.

Representation

The existing statements in both 4.133 and 4.157 are confusing and badly worded as they suggests that new residential development will be required to make a contribution to the provision of the Leanaig Centre community facilities at Ben Wyvis Primary School. Maryburgh has provided community facilities since the 1980s, long before the Leanaig Centre was built and the Maryburgh Amenities Company through the Futures Group hopes to extend these community facilities and provide complementary facilities to those being provided by the Leanaig Centre. The proposed community facilities at Maryburgh will be inclusive of the wider community including Maryburgh, Conon Bridge and Dingwall. Therefore any future residential development will need to make a contribution to all the community facilities within the area.

Allocated to Conon Bridge General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1) IN49 - delete "75 homes" and replace with "housing." Business use should be flexible but compatible with housing and should include tourism related uses and leisure. This site has the capability to deliver a quality mixed use development with housing numbers in excess of the 75 suggested. The master planning process will provide clarity on the numbers achievable and a ceiling should not be put in place at this stage. 2) IN67 is shown split up into three areas on the Proposals Map, with all three areas being allocated for Business. To allow flexibility and encourage development to the area the following changes should be made to the Proposed Plan: • The use of the eastern area and the use of part of the north western area should be re-defined as being suitable for business, tourist related development, and commercial leisure. • The remainder of the north western area and the whole of the southern area should be allocated for residential development.

Representation

IN49 Bogbain (west) , IN67 Bogbain (east) We write on behalf of our client Tulloch Homes Ltd (THL) who has landholdings at Milton of Leys, Inverness and has been lead developer in the area to date. THL welcome the inclusion of sites IN49 and IN67 within the proposed plan, these sites already forming part of an allocation for business and commercial uses within The Inverness Local Plan 2006 as continued in force April 2012. Whilst the remainder of the Milton of Leys development has progressed over the last decade the sites under consideration have not moved forward principally due to lack of demand for the allocated uses however these sites now benefit from infrastructure at boundary and can play an important role in completing the overall development of the area and providing additional community benefits. THL support inclusion of 75 homes within site IN49 as part of the mixed use opportunity however a greater scope of housing is possible than 75 on IN49 without compromising its mixed use allocation and indeed increased housing numbers spread over both sites IN49 & IN67 would help to encourage and sustain local services in the area (see paragraph on IN72 below) and make better and more sustainable use of the major roads and service infrastructure which is now in place. Milton of Leys is at the latter stages of development with the majority of housing phases complete or nearing completion but with the neighbourhood centre and commercial uses yet to come forward. Efforts with the commercial centre at Milton of Leys (IN72) have been extensive with difficulties in securing initial operators, however THL are now on course for early delivery of the first phase of the retail element although this is very limited compared to the extent that IN72 allows. In order to encourage further commercial, community and retail use to the area along with business uses and to help sustain the services about to come on stream it is clear from our discussions with operators and agents that further residential use as part of IN49 & IN67 would be a positive driver in facilitating the delivery of what is envisaged for Milton of Leys as a whole. In terms of effectiveness and deliverability, all major elements of servicing and infrastructure including road connectivity are now in place at Milton of Leys and no technical nor landownership constraints exist, thus any further development including residential will be capable of early release being readily effective and deliverable whilst making better and more sustainable use of the newly completed roads and services infrastructure. This puts the area at considerable advantage compared with many other sites that require major infrastructure upgrades to enable delivery. With regards ecological issues on IN49, THL have examined the area with consultants and can confirm that the majority of the site is developable with the incorporation of some standoff areas including the pond on IN49. It is also proposed to incorporate a green corridor between site IN49 and the existing housing to the north whilst allowing for well planned connectivity to and from the area and indeed an important part of the overall design will be to incorporate green networks and paths throughout the site enhancing the overall connectivity and permeability. Finally THL would confirm they are committed to delivering a Masterplan for completion of Milton of Leys with the emphasis on high quality design and taking into consideration all relevant factors.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The site should be removed altogether from the proposed plan. It is perplexing that it was ever considered suitable for housing in the first place. It surely cannot be classed "edge of settlement" being clearly in farmland in the countryside. Your own literature suggests settlement expansion in Muir of Ord. may lead to potential conflict with policy GSP7. This is because previous development has been disproportionately high and promised infrastructure improvements have failed to materialise. Accepting that some development may be desirable, there are better sites available elsewhere in the town. Kindly advise by what process the number of houses earmarked for Ardnagrask has risen from capacity 22 ("long term, low density subject to access and master plan") to 51 today, no strings attached.

Representation

I am a part owner with my extended family of two houses on Corrie Road. I am also a longstanding member of the golf club. In both capacities I have strong grounds for objection to the proposal. These include loss of amenity, flooding , increased accident risk on an already dangerous single track road, addition traffic to add to bottleneck at the bridge. Essentially though it is about allowing our precious countryside, truly green belt, to be eaten up so rapaciously. The golf club is likely to lose its 11th hole because of inevitable health and safety complaints from the houses adjacent. There is no other land available to build a replacement because it is already hemmed in by houses that have been allowed to proliferate on all sides. It is already in precarious financial condition....loss of members could lead to insolvency eventually with disastrous consequences for employment, tourism and a social scene integral to the life of the village I will be writing separately to cover my objections in detail.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The proposed site in Cawdor Village at location CD2 is not appropriate for infill housing development. The Proposed Plan should be changed so that the focus of any housing development for Cawdor is on new building being undertaken on the outskirts/outer fringes of the village, not in the core historical/conservation centre of the village.

Representation

It is not appropriate to permit infill housing development at location CD2 in Cawdor for the following reasons: 1. Main Street in Cawdor, the access road to the proposed CD2 site is a single carriageway road, bordered on one side by existing period housing and on the other by an ancient dry stone wall and meadow. It could not be adapted to provide safe and functional access to CD2 without considerable physical damage to Main Street and significant detrimental impact to the very nature of that part of Cawdor as a conservation village. 2. Main Street in Cawdor, and the network of single carriage roads in the heart of Cawdor village, could not support high traffic volumes which would be the inevitable result of infill housing development in the village. 3. Site CD2 is raised slightly above the rest of the Cawdor Village, with the impact that any housing would be above the sight lines of the rest of the village and completely out of keeping with the village as a conservation area. 4. There is no supporting explanation or evidence in the Proposed Plan on why specifically site CD2 is in anyway appropriate for infill housing development. It would also block current public access to the Cawdor Woods. 5. There is no supporting explanation or evidence in the Proposed Plan on why CD2 should or could support 10 homes, as is suggested in the Plan. This volume of housing in only 0.44 ha is completely out of keeping with the volume of housing and also how Cawdor village houses are located, in relation to each other close to the site, and throughout the rest of the village. 6. Proposing high density infill housing in a conservation area/village like Cawdor does not take account of the opportunity to have housing development on the outskirts of the village which would not damage the historical heart of the village. If there is to be development, infill should be strongly avoided. 7. CD2 is close to the borders of both the Cawdor Castle grounds and also the Cawdor Woods SAC. As sensitive environmental sites, it is thoroughly inappropriate to insert 10 homes so close to these locations. The land on which CD2 is proposed is a valuable green space in the village, and should be valued and protected as the 'lungs' of the village. 8. It is presumed that The Cawdor Estate are the principal financial beneficiaries of having site CD2 being sold for housing development. However, there is no benefit to the existing village inhabitants. To villagers, it would represent the loss of valuable green space, lack of access to Cawdor Woods, increased traffic in the core conservation heart of the village, devastating damage and loss of original stone walls and other period features along the throughfares in and around Main Street.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Access from Nairn South into the town to be radically improved ALONG with access into and protection from the town's largest employers, the John Gordon Timber Mill

Representation

1) Granted that Government requires more houses, planners should specify the number of dwellings they wish for Nairn South - not leave this to builders 2) The route of the A96 south (or Nairn by-pass) to be first formalised before any further discussions are held with would-be builders 3)Only then should discussions recommence 4) At this stage builders must produce costed proposals for satisfactory access INTO the town PLUS essential earthworks to protect new residents from the multi-generation old timber business (unless they are prepared to fund this to change to an agreed new location) 5)Three options for satisfactory access into town stand out. Arguably not one is perfect. Maybe a combination of two will be necessary with other options welcome. a) widen the railway bridge on the Cawdor Road b) widen the railway bridge form Mill Lane into Church Street (not preferred as this will lead to block-backs in Leopold Street) c) Establish a route over the former level crossing west of town leading to Moss-side N.B. If no improvement is made to the access via the Cawdor Road block-backs are certain to threaten access to the Nairn & County Hospital thereby causing pandemonium Conclusion: Until the A96 route is determined irrevocably and unless builders are prepared to pursue Items 4 & 5, all talks with them should be discontinued and the whole concept of development on Nairn South shelved.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We write in support of the proposed development. Our company, Robert Weir and Son own the land proposed to be developed and we can confirm the following in relation to the proposed development: 1. We own/ control the two proposed access routes, as shown on the attached plan. (attachment 1) 2.1 The Principle Access off Newton Park is shown on attachment 2 - the area coloured pink was secured by us to ensure access to the site. 2.2 The Secondary Access is via the existing Tulloch Homes development (Groam Farm West) which was previously in our ownership and over which we retained access rights to facilitate this access. 2. We are very happy to prepare a Masterplan/ Development Brief for agreement with the Council and would welcome this being adopted as Supplementary Guidance for the Development. We will engage with suitably qualified Professional Consultants to address integration of built form, circulation, green space and landscaping as well as Transport Assessment and travel routes to the primary school, community facilities and village centre. 3. We are supportive of the provision of small scale retail and/or business use and would like to work alongside the community to try and achieve their asperations.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

IN67 (Bogbain East) is shown split up into three areas on the Proposals Map, with all three areas being allocated for Business. Inverness Estates wishes to see the following changes made to the Proposed Plan: The use of the eastern area and the use of part of the north western area should be re-defined as being suitable for business, tourist related development, and commercial leisure. The remainder of the north western area and the whole of the southern area should be allocated for residential development.

Representation

The relevant land is allocated in the adopted local plan for business and commercial use. The original justification for designating such a huge amount of land, at this location, for business and commercial use is now unclear. It is possible to understand why it may have been seen as a suitable location for some exceptional uses (such as a film studio) but in terms of general business development it is a poor location with more locational disadvantages than advantages. During the past decade, the owners of the site have tried, without success, to market the site for business/commercial development. These attempts to attract development have involved both local and national agents, as well as the services of Scotland Development International and Highlands & Islands Enterprise. In support of this representation we attach a letter from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1). This represents an independent assessment of why there has been no interest in business development at Milton of Leys, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. A copy of the marketing details prepared in 2011 by SDI and HIE is also attached, for information (Doc 2). There has been not market interest. The owners of the land therefore require to consider alternative development options for the land in question. Having reviewed the options, the changes set out in Section 4 are requested. An indicative development framework, previously submitted at the Main Issues Report and Call for Sites stages is attached (Doc 3). This shows the way in which the changes sought in Section 4 above might be implemented.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site IN85 (West of Eastfield Way) should be allocated for mixed-use commercial development, supportive of the function of Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park as a whole. The allocation should indicate that such development should include business accommodation, commercial leisure facilities, restaurants, drive-through restaurants and ancillary commercial activities. For the avoidance of doubt, retail use is not sought.

Representation

The site was created as part of the original development proposals for Inverness Retail and Business Park. The site was allocated for a hotel complex, and this use was confirmed within the 1994 Inverness and Ardersier Local Plan. In the subsequent Inverness Local Plan, the site was allocated for business development. For over 17 years, the site has been marketed as a development opportunity, so far unsuccessfully. The site owner has had every incentive to attract development to the site. Without development the asset cannot deliver a return on the investment. However, there has been no market interest for business development on the site, either in the form of small pavilions or in the form of headquarters buildings (such as when the site was promoted as a potential location for the new headquarters of Scottish Natural Heritage). Therefore, although the site is set in a prominent location at the entrance to Inverness Retail and Business Park, it does not contribute positively to the setting or function of IRBLP in terms of economic activity, employment generation, or infrastructure support. However, there is currently significant market interest on the part of restaurant and drive-through operators. The only realistic prospect of beneficial economic development taking place on the site will be if a more flexible approach to planning policy is adopted. In support of this representation we attach letters from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1) and Montagu Evans (Doc 2). These represent independent assessments, from both local and national agents, of why there has been no interest in business development on the site in question, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. Also in support of this representation we attach a copy of the Supporting Statement (Docs 3, 4 & 5) which was part of the information submitted with a recent planning application for the site in question (12/04555/PIP). That application was recommended for approval by officers but was refused by committee. Particular attention is drawn to Appendix 1 of that document, where the planning and infrastructure benefits of the proposed land-use and development is clearly set out. Particular attention is drawn to the infrastructure benefits which will be delivered for the Beechwood Campus.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

“Retail (bulky goods only)” should be deleted from the range of uses considered suitable for this site.

Representation

The site in question was previously promoted (just over 10 years ago) by the Kilmartin Property Group as being suitable for development, in particular for a bulky goods retail development. In 2004, the site was carefully considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry, Janet McNair. The Reporter rejected the site, saying it was not suitable for major development. At Paragraph 8.193 of her report, she commented as follows: “Notwithstanding the development that has already taken place and is planned in this area, the objection site would remain part of a swathe of largely undeveloped land along the west side of the A9. This land is clearly visible for a considerable distance on the descent in the City from the south, from where its tapering dimensions northwards draw the eye to this location. The retail park is set back from the road, beyond mature trees. While it is difficult to reconcile the permissions that have been granted for individual new houses with the unequivocal opposition to the development in Policy 2.41, these are at least domestic in scale. I conclude that, although detached from the extensive area of open land to the east of the A9, the land immediately to the east of the retail park makes a valuable contribution to the landscape setting of this main approach to the city. I conclude that it merits safeguarding from significant built development, such as the type of large-scale buildings likely to result from a retail warehousing allocation.” It is submitted that circumstances have not changed. This is not a site which should be developed for large-scale buildings and the comments of the Reporter, published in her Report in 2005, remain relevant and valid. In addition it is submitted that there is no requirement for the allocation of additional floorspace for bulky goods retailing at this stage. The Highland Council has previously indicated that it is minded to approve the proposed bulky goods retail park at Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park. The implementation of that development has been delayed due to current economic circumstances. However, once the bulky goods retail market returns to health, the IRBLP bulky goods floorspace will be able to respond to the demand. No other bulky goods retail park requires to be designated at this stage.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00944 Name Inverness Estates Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Brian Muir Muir Smith Evans

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN55 Type Change

Comment Changes

“Retail (bulky goods only)” should be deleted from the range of uses considered suitable for this site.

Representation

The site in question was previously promoted (just over 10 years ago) by the Kilmartin Property Group as being suitable for development, in particular for a bulky goods retail development. In 2004, the site was carefully considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry, Janet McNair. The Reporter rejected the site, saying it was not suitable for major development. At Paragraph 8.193 of her report, she commented as follows: “Notwithstanding the development that has already taken place and is planned in this area, the objection site would remain part of a swathe of largely undeveloped land along the west side of the A9. This land is clearly visible for a considerable distance on the decent in the City from the south, from where its tapering dimensions northwards draw the eye to this location. The retail park is set back from the road, beyond mature trees. While it is difficult to reconcile the permissions that have been granted for individual new houses with the unequivocal opposition to the development in Policy 2.41, these are at least domestic in scale. I conclude that, although detached from the extensive area of open land to the east of the A9, the land immediately to the east of the retail park makes a valuable contribution to the landscape setting of this main approach to the city. I conclude that it merits safeguarding from significant built development, such as the type of large-scale buildings likely to result from a retail warehousing allocation.” It is submitted that circumstances have not changed. This is not a site which should be developed for large-scale buildings and the comments of the Reporter, published in her Report in 2005, remain relevant and valid. In addition it is submitted that there is no requirement for the allocation of additional floorspace for bulky goods retailing at this stage. The Highland Council has previously indicated that it is minded to approve the proposed bulky goods retail park at Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park. The implementation of that development has been delayed due to current economic circumstances. However, once the bulky goods retail market returns to health, the IRBLP bulky goods floorspace will be able to respond to the demand. No other bulky goods retail park requires to be designated at this stage.

Allocated to South Inverness IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

IN67 (Bogbain East) is shown split up into three areas on the Proposals Map, with all three areas being allocated for Business. Inverness Estates wishes to see the following changes made to the Proposed Plan: The use of the eastern area and the use of part of the north western area should be re-defined as being suitable for business, tourist related development, and commercial leisure. The remainder of the north western area and the whole of the southern area should be allocated for residential development.

Representation

The relevant land is allocated in the adopted local plan for business and commercial use. The original justification for designating such a huge amount of land, at this location, for business and commercial use is now unclear. It is possible to understand why it may have been seen as a suitable location for some exceptional uses (such as a film studio) but in terms of general business development it is a poor location with more locational disadvantages than advantages. During the past decade, the owners of the site have tried, without success, to market the site for business/commercial development. These attempts to attract development have involved both local and national agents, as well as the services of Scotland Development International and Highlands & Islands Enterprise. In support of this representation we attach a letter from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1). This represents an independent assessment of why there has been no interest in business development at Milton of Leys, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. A copy of the marketing details prepared in 2011 by SDI and HIE is also attached, for information (Doc 2). There has been not market interest. The owners of the land therefore require to consider alternative development options for the land in question. Having reviewed the options, the changes set out in Section 4 are requested. An indicative development framework, previously submitted at the Main Issues Report and Call for Sites stages is attached (Doc 3). This shows the way in which the changes sought in Section 4 above might be implemented.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site IN85 (West of Eastfield Way) should be allocated for mixed-use commercial development, supportive of the function of Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park as a whole. The allocation should indicate that such development should include business accommodation, commercial leisure facilities, restaurants, drive-through restaurants and ancillary commercial activities. For the avoidance of doubt, retail use is not sought.

Representation

The site was created as part of the original development proposals for Inverness Retail and Business Park. The site was allocated for a hotel complex, and this use was confirmed within the 1994 Inverness and Ardersier Local Plan. In the subsequent Inverness Local Plan, the site was allocated for business development. For over 17 years, the site has been marketed as a development opportunity, so far unsuccessfully. The site owner has had every incentive to attract development to the site. Without development the asset cannot deliver a return on the investment. However, there has been no market interest for business development on the site, either in the form of small pavilions or in the form of headquarters buildings (such as when the site was promoted as a potential location for the new headquarters of Scottish Natural Heritage). Therefore, although the site is set in a prominent location at the entrance to Inverness Retail and Business Park, it does not contribute positively to the setting or function of IRBLP in terms of economic activity, employment generation, or infrastructure support. However, there is currently significant market interest on the part of restaurant and drive-through operators. The only realistic prospect of beneficial economic development taking place on the site will be if a more flexible approach to planning policy is adopted. In support of this representation we attach letters from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1) and Montagu Evans (Doc 2). These represent independent assessments, from both local and national agents, of why there has been no interest in business development on the site in question, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. Also in support of this representation we attach a copy of the Supporting Statement (Docs 3, 4 & 5) which was part of the information submitted with a recent planning application for the site in question (12/04555/PIP). That application was recommended for approval by officers but was refused by committee. Particular attention is drawn to Appendix 1 of that document, where the planning and infrastructure benefits of the proposed land-use and development is clearly set out. Particular attention is drawn to the infrastructure benefits which will be delivered for the Beechwood Campus.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site: IN9 "Land at Inverness Waterfront; Area (ha): 29.0; Uses: tourism, retail, leisure, business, residential and harbour uses Requirements: scale, composition and extent of development to be determined by a masterplan to be informed by appropriate engineering, conservation, environmental and market evidence as required to satisfy statutory requirements". The Proposals Map should be adjusted accordingly as attached. Corresponding changes to the Inverness to Nairn Growth Area "vision" and "strategy", viz. at para. 3.1 (second bullet) add "Inverness waterfront"; and at para. 3.5 (a third bullet) add "allocations of land for new jobs and houses, including by transforming Inverness waterfront into a vibrant mixed-use urban quarter as a new place for living, work and leisure able to deliver strategic economic development".

Representation

DOCUMENTS Inner Moray Firth Major Ports & Sites Strategy 2006 extract Inverness Culloden and Ardersier Local Plan 1991 extract Letter dated 9th December 2013 from A F Cruden Associates Representation on behalf of G H Johnston Building Consultants Ltd to Main Issues Report dated 5th July 2012 on behalf of INVERNESS HARBOUR TRUST 1.The MIR identifies part of the Trust estate as industry (preferred) and the substantive part as non-preferred. The following representations seek a significant reappraisal of the potential of the 38 ha. development opportunity on the lines presented on behalf of the Harbour Trust at the Call for Sites stage. All of the Harbour Trust assets should be allocated mixed use and preferred and a comprehensive development proposal promoted as part of a masterplan within the Proposed Plan. 2.The MIR has failed to reflect the sense and objectives of the Inverness Harbour Trust (Call for Sites) representations. It is inappropriate that the MIR continues to see the future of the harbour as a conventional industrial port; whereas the Harbour Trust had promoted a much wider development and a broader range of mixed uses much more akin to the substantial waterfront schemes that have sustained regeneration in many UK cities over the past decade and more. 3.The MIR is therefore extremely restrictive in its reference to industry and the preference/non-preference it promotes; it is partial and selective in the uses and extent of development it would enable; and it is unnecessarily presumptuous about phasing and the impacts of development. Neither land reclamation or development is discouraged in principle by the proximity of the firths; both have been achieved within the past 5 years as the most recent significant phase of the harbour development. Development would be outwith the HSE buffers. 4.In respect of all of these factors, the MIR does not sit easily with the Highland-wide Local Development Plan either in its appreciation of the potential contribution of the Harbour Trust estate to strategic regeneration objectives (in particular its juxtaposition with the declared priorities at South Kessock, Longman core and Longman seaboard), the essential tourism and business streams it seeks to accommodate, or its operational policies and the evidence base that underpins them. 5.It is particularly disappointing that the MIR appears not to have taken account of the conclusion of the Inner Moray Firth Major Ports and Sites Strategy (2006) which invited a wider waterfront real estate development package. As a result the MIR provisions are significantly understated and a major missed opportunity for a city - renowned for turning away from its waterfront - and the regional economy. The purpose is to ensure the leisure sectors identified in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan) are achieved through a viable market opportunity able to maximise the benefits to Inverness and the region. A creative approach is essential to transforming an industrial landscape to an attractive, appealing place. 6.The lead policy in the Inner Moray Firth Major Ports and Sites Strategy (2006) acknowledges "pressures to develop other sectors of the large Inverness Waterfront for housing, leisure and commercial uses are expected to gather pace over the next decade ... market pressures and rising land values will eventually promote intensive property schemes". That provides the framework on which to promote the future of the harbour. 7. The vision is to create a vibrant quayside waterfront quarter, a new place for living, working and leisure based on a composition of high density development, transforming the city's waterfront, its profile and image. Mixed housing, offices, hotels and conference facilities; a leisure hub of national visitor centre, tourist shops, entertainments, bars, eating places at quayside level around the centre-piece: an expanded marina and canal. Streets and spaces, a park and promenade; iconic architecture and engineering: a pedestrian bridge of the Ness ... essential waterfront development, of its place, connecting the outstanding marine heritage ... a natural gateway. 8.The concept promoted on behalf of the Harbour Trust is founded on all of the following inter-related principles: •high intensity mixed uses and critical urban mass to create "place" - a new gateway to Inverness and a leisure/business hub to embrace the Trusts subjects initially between Carnach Point and the Kessock Bridge. It is the ability - recognised in policy - to create place, that will secure investment and property development at such time as the market determines. Residential is vital to the viability of that mix; •a composition of development essential to the location, reflecting the uniqueness of Inverness harbour in the north-east of Scotland, its development prospects and the value of the port to regional transport, infrastructure and tourism. In that regard the value of the Trusts assets lies in the principle that these are promoted as a comprehensive package: the corollary - to fragment

them - would significantly undermine its potential; • a scale of development able to secure viability and to support/collaborate with the strategic regeneration objectives which adjoin the Trusts subjects in three directions. In that respect the Trust estate presents a vital contribution to the City strategy; and that scale of development would contribute to integrated facilities and infrastructure upgrades; • potential for development east of the Kessock Bridge (whether in the leisure or cargo-trans-shipment sectors) which - in view of market prospects, opportunities in the cruise-ship sector, logistical restrictions on shipping, and an appropriate long term perspective for the harbour - needs to be taken into account and planned for now; • sustaining the harbour as a regional transport hub, its existing functions and upgraded infrastructure to meet identified business streams in the next 15 years (eg. including options relating to transportation/renewables) which are vital to the Trust, Inverness and the regional economy.

9. The Proposed Plan must therefore be based on an outcome that: (i) restores a wholly mixed use allocation (for all of the uses promoted in the Call for Sites) such that it allows maximum flexibility, a diverse waterfront and a composition of development that would evolve as part of a comprehensive masterplan approach. These uses include: commercial, office, retail, residential, tourist and leisure. (ii) recognises that the opportunity at Inverness harbour derives from the extent of the Trusts ownership and that the viability of development and the business streams promoted in policy require a comprehensive (not selective) approach and thus an appropriate allocation of all of the Trusts interests; and (iii) avoids premature judgements about the extent of land reclamation or its impacts when policy invites such issues to be determined by evidence; or that there is any predetermined view that development opportunities can be taken forward on a piecemeal basis.

10. In 2008 the Harbour Trust presented plans of a hotel adjacent to the marina as a pre-application engagement with A+DS. The A+DS response is attached. A+DS applauded “the inspiration to create a special place”; that the project had “considerable potential” and encouraged a “response to the unique characteristics and challenges” the location presented. It saw the site as “visually important” and in “an exciting landscape”: “a spectacular setting” able to redefine “Inverness’s northern edge”; “an opportunity to “raise the quality and appearance of what is presently a semi-industrial area to a very special place”.

11. A+DS suggested a “wider masterplan or design framework to set the proposal in a broader context”; examining “integration with adjacent sites (some of which are in the clients ownership) including those on the opposite bank of the Firth”, and identifying “how the port and its associated development connects to the city centre”.

12. In relation to viability A+DS “support the intention to create a high quality destination with a variety of uses to encourage life and vitality”; that care was needed “that the long term vision will be delivered; a revision to the aesthetic norm of industrial/retail sheds should be resisted”; and that there are opportunities to “investigate new live/work typologies that would introduce a mix of uses to help activate the area at different times of the day”.

13. A+DS believe there is “potential for this to become an exemplar project”. “The importance of design goes beyond its immediate boundaries, as it will influence the formation of an urban quarter” ... it encourages a “visionary and creative approach”.

14. A+DS is a significant influence in place-making, one of the core objectives of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. Its view fully embraces the concept the Harbour Trust wishes to promote at this time.

15. This requires a commitment to change an industrial landscape, connect the waterfront, revitalise an economic gateway, and recast the profile of Inverness: that can be brought about by a commitment to the market package and mixed uses proposed. That is not the view of the Harbour Trust alone; it is the view of those that formulated the Inner Moray Firth Ports and Sites Strategy and subsequently A+DS; it was the view of the Council’s own first Vision for Inverness (1997). The vision has somehow become blurred: the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan is the opportunity to restore it and begin to transform the City waterfront as a strategic priority.

16. The Trust propose to work closely with the community at South-Kessock/Merkinch and have made initial contact with community council interests in that regard. The Trust recognises sensitivities at Carnach Point - relating particularly to nature conservation and local amenities - and that the role of its interests at that location and any contribution it might make to the strategic regeneration objectives of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan should evolve in collaboration with local people. Further to the above representation and to ensure that objective is able to be fully explored, it is essential that the preferred mixed use status is applied to the Trust interest at Carnach Point. Further discussion on these matters as the Proposed Plan progresses would be welcomed by the Trust.

Allocated to	Central Inverness	IN9	Land to South and East of Inverness Harbour Marina	
--------------	-------------------	-----	--	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site: IN9 "Land at Inverness Waterfront; Area (ha): 29.0; Uses: tourism, retail, leisure, business, residential and harbour uses Requirements: scale, composition and extent of development to be determined by a masterplan to be informed by appropriate engineering, conservation, environmental and market evidence as required to satisfy statutory requirements". The Proposals Map should be adjusted accordingly as attached. Corresponding changes to the Inverness to Nairn Growth Area "vision" and "strategy", viz. at para. 3.1 (second bullet) add "Inverness waterfront"; and at para. 3.5 (a third bullet) add "allocations of land for new jobs and houses, including by transforming Inverness waterfront into a vibrant mixed-use urban quarter as a new place for living, work and leisure able to deliver strategic economic development".

Representation

Grounds of Objection 1.The proposal for a mixed use waterfront development embraces the long term planning aspirations of IHT. The Trust wishes to investigate the market potential that will underpin future expansion - to do so now - and to address comprehensively and on an integrated basis, the potential for future development of: •port operations that would embrace a regional transport gateway, efficient harbour expansion/reconfiguration and market potential in the cruise-ship sector (partly located seaward of the Kessock Bridge) and enabled by a Harbour Revision Order; and the •tourism - hotel/marina-visitor based - business sector supported by urban scale, mixed use development and a vibrant waterfront quarter that would create "place" and thus give impetus to property investment and delivery of those leisure streams recognized in the HWLDP. 2.These proposals are unique to a waterfront position, almost 2km of land and foreshore; 29.0 ha., 1km from the city centre. This is not the view of IHT, but of the Council itself and its economic agency partners in the approved Inner Moray Firth Major Ports & Sites Strategy (IMFMP&SS) in 2006, viz. "Pressures to develop other sectors of the large Inverness Waterfront for housing, leisure and commercial uses are expected to gather pace over the next decade. The city has a variety of ...locations where market pressures and rising land values will eventually promote intensive property schemes...". It is incumbent on the development plan seek to harness that potential and begin to facilitate full and proper investigation of it. 3.IHT seek the allocation of its estate (east of the River Ness) with appropriate policy securing its objectives for urban development and harbour expansion and which begins to deliver the IMFMPSS and implicit in the vision of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. 4.The Reporter(s) are invited to read this objection with - and in light of - the undernoted documents including the full MIR representation as set out below. This objection also focuses on the Schedule 4 response. Proposal 5.The PLDP restricts development to less than half of the IHT estate, restricts the uses and thus the viability of a proposal, is presumptuous of the environmental effects and of a process that requires demonstration of acceptable impacts. It ignores the benefits to the regional economy, the city's capacity for business and tourism and the mixed-use principles sustaining waterfront development elsewhere. 6.IHT has long held plans to expand its leisure/tourism assets - hotel, business, marina, heritage centre and supporting facilities. However, significant investment is discouraged by the industrial setting; and viability is dependent on creating "place". That can happen if there is confidence that Inverness waterfront is to be transformed; is to contain the right mix of uses and is to achieve the right scale of development. There is potential to create a spectacular cityscape, unique to the Highland capital, its outstanding location and international appeal. 8."The vision is to create a vibrant quayside waterfront quarter, a new place for living, working and leisure based on a composition of high density development, transforming the city's waterfront, its profile and image. Mixed housing, offices, hotels and conference facilities; a leisure hub of national visitor centre, tourist shops, entertainments, bars, eating places at quayside level around the centre-piece: an expanded marina and canal. Streets and spaces, a park and promenade; iconic architecture and engineering: a pedestrian bridge of the Ness ... essential waterfront development, of its place, connecting the outstanding marine heritage ... a natural gateway". 9.There appears to be no record that this vision and concept has been considered by the PED Committee or reported in the Summary of Comments Received. This is a strategic development proposal and the planning authority is obliged to have given it consideration. 10.The proposal amalgamates the statutory functions of IHT and its responsibilities for harbour development for which it would obtain a Harbour Revision Order; and the land use planning purpose of the development plan. These would fuse together harbour and urban development; co-dependent on land engineering/reclamation, compatible uses and activities, and facilitated through comprehensive planning of the IHT estate. 11.However, neither, the evidence base, the masterplanning, the market appraisal nor the structural works can proceed piecemeal, because these are fundamental to the extent of development, the layout of activities, feasibility and costs. Development will be phased as the market responds; but the core planning implications must be addressed comprehensively. 12.That would be the purpose of the "whole" allocation the IHT seeks. The PLDP cannot afford to regard the proposal in 5-year chunks or as a development that will occur short term and in isolation of wider changes around and about. The role of the development plan is to begin to enable the

proposal to be fully investigated for its environmental effects, development potential and viability. The development plan needs to respond accordingly. Strategy 13. Further to the IMFMP&SS (2006), the IMFLDP should be facilitating and implementing that strategy. The proposal would bring a new dimension to the regional economy, re-profile Inverness waterfront and regenerate the City. The waterfront is pivotal to three identified regeneration sites (Longman, Longman-College and Merkinch and therefore serves the declared regeneration strategy for the City. Principles 15. The PLDP does not reflect an understanding of the engineering feasibility, market viability or planning design protocol that are the physical and commercial underpinnings of the proposal; or the statutory prerequisites that would inform it. The IMFLDP must recognise that all of the IHT estate could have development potential and the more that is maximized, the greater the prospects of a mixed-use waterfront proposal being viable. 16. Notwithstanding, that potential must be proven; for it to be proven it must be fully investigated; and for it to be fully investigated, the IMFLDP must give certainty that if it is proven but only if it is proven, it would be consistent with the development plan, and development could then, subject to planning permission, proceed. It is the evidence that will determine the scale, composition and mix of uses that is sufficiently attractive to the market for development to go ahead. 17. The PLDP is presumptuous and premature in the allocation it makes; the planning authority does not have the evidence base on which to make the judgment it has. The effect of the PLDP is to curtail waterfront development; and make it less likely to happen. In responding that "...Future development plans will consider favourably further allocations if this initial phase is seen as a success in regenerating the waterfront..." it accepts the principle of a more expansive development, but its approach stymies that prospect. Status and Jurisdiction 18. The IHT is entitled to apply for a Harbour Revision Order in relation to the subjects it owns. The development plan ought to recognize that as development potential. The Inverness Culloden and Ardersier Local Plan (1997) did, safeguarding land and foreshore akin to the subject of this objection for the long term. The IHT was granted a Harbour Revision Order for reclamation of back-up land, new quayside and a marina, completed in 2009. That was reflected in the Inverness Local Plan. The same fundamental proposition arises for the IMFLDP ie. harbour expansion and mixed uses, except this proposal concerns more land, a longer timescale and an optimum view of the IHT estate. That approach to planning should be commended and facilitated. 19. The IHT is not bound by any prescribed restrictions on the scale or composition of development. The commercial operation of the harbour - its development potential - would span a wide range and mix of potential uses. Any competent Harbour Trust would be looking long term at its assets and to move forward with the development plan. Environmental Effects 20. It is not possible by law to undermine or circumvent the statutory provisions that govern environmental safeguards; whether these relate to flooding/flood risk or nature conservation or other compatibility issues. Full and proper consideration of all environmental impacts will be a prerequisite and a secure foundation for any proposal; and amongst the core masterplanning inputs. 21. The requirement to satisfy European and UK law is absolute; any development proposal must demonstrate that; and planning permission or any other consent would not be forthcoming without it. The PLDP does not offer any greater security against risk of the environmental effects of development than would be the case had it allocated the full extent of the IHT estate; but having not allocated the estate in full, that does diminish the prospects of development proceeding. 22. The planning authority has no evidence on which to base its judgment about acceptable level of risk; but it has taken an uninformed view about the extent of IN9. This was specifically raised in MIR representations (see below). The objection would pre-empt or prejudice no outcome. It is precisely what the policy 57 etc. of the HWLDP prescribes. The planning authority must apply the same principles to the development plan. The planning authority's view that "there are too many environmental risks in writing a blank cheque for foreshore development in this area..." is indicative of a proposal and a process, completely misunderstood. Engineering Feasibility 23. The planning authority states "...Future development plans will consider favourably further allocations if this initial phase is seen as a success in regenerating the waterfront"... It is not viable to add-on a later seaward phase of development because a second (duplicated) sea-wall or similar perimeter defense is a completely impractical proposition in engineering and cost terms (see A F Cruden Associates below). Residential 24. As a core property component, residential development is essential to achieving a critical mass of buildings and people at a scale needed to "make a place", and thus present an attractive investment proposition and enhance the prospects of delivering the "leisure and tourist uses of high quality architectural design etc. that gains a competitive advantage from a waterfront location" that are appropriate. As it stands the PLDP is not sufficiently ambitious or accommodating. It must foster the same mix of uses that have sustained urban waterfront regeneration across the UK and world-wide over the last twenty-five years. That scenario underpinned the view of A+DS (below). 25. The planning system does not regulate residential development by age of occupancy; but the massing of development needed to "create the place", would demand higher density building - stacked flats - rather than conventional family homes; which are amply provided for on expansion sites throughout the PLDP. The mix of development envisioned for the waterfront is unique to its purpose and location. 26. Enhanced pedestrian/cyclist corridors, links to facilities and a promenade into the city centre would attach to a major waterfront development, facilitated in large part by IHT itself. It owns 50% of the intervening waterfront to the edge of the city centre and the rest could readily provide for continuity of routes as redevelopment proceeds. The waterfront is no further from its schools than the resident urban catchment population; children would not reasonably make such a journey unaccompanied; safer routes and "green transport" would be included and a pedestrian crossing of the Ness would improve proximity to Merkinch primary school. Facilities 27. Development could support community facilities - a hall or similar accommodation; a neighbourhood shop and public transport services. The planning authority could seek to condition such provisions. The viability of facilities is assisted by neighbouring large scale employment; and established facilities primary school, health facilities are within 1.5 km. 28. The waterfront proposals are being fitted into the structure of the city driven by the opportunity for economic regeneration, regional strategy and the advantage that derives from a gateway position, critical mass, proximity to the city centre and the waterfront. Those are invariably the factors that deliver the mix of uses needed to transform Inverness Waterfront. The proposal fits the PDL objective (para. 3.1) "a consolidated city acting as the larger and more efficient engine to drive forward the wider Highland economy. Recommendation as above

Allocated to Central Inverness IN9 Land to South and East of Inverness Harbour Marina

Customer Number 03989 Name Irene Fox Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN74 Type Change

Comment Changes

Planning application ref 06/00494/FULIN 23/05/06 was granted for the erection of 5 bungalows (reduced to 3) outline approval was granted on the meeting dated 30th January 2007. Agenda item 2.12 Report no PL12/07 it states "6. POLICY 6.1 The Inverness Local Plan identifies this site as being within an amenity area which the Council will safeguard against development not associated with its purpose and function. The development of the site for 3 housing plots is therefore not in accordance with the provisions of the Local Plan." Can you please explain the circumstances that have arisen to increase the number of houses to 8.

Representation

I would like this to be reverted back to the original outline planning permission for 3 houses.

Allocated to East Inverness IN74 Caulfield Road

Customer Number 04080 Name Irene Munro Organisation N/A

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph leave the area the way it is

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

the changes are that the playing fields area of Conon Bridge and the car park are not used for housing.

Representation

there is very little green space for residents in Conon Bridge to keep fit, play football or enjoy exercise. The area is boggy in parts and liable to flooding. The access to the area is the car park which not only serves the church and related activities but also commuters leave their cars there to go to the railway station

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Recently the Highland council voted against building 300 plus homes on part of this site due to the lack of infrastructure and the already overcrowded roads in Nairn. Traffic under the railway bridge at Nairn is constantly backed up already and if this plan should be approved there will be a permanent trafficjam in this area, in fact traffic will come to a complete standstill. Nairn is a small town, which is already overcrowded. Shops are closing down in the town as people travel to Inverness for their shopping needs and homes are becoming more difficult to sell in the area. Surely it would make more sense to expand in Inverness closer to the A96. There is a proposal already in the works to build a new town at Tornagrain of over 1000 homes and this makes far more sense than building in a small country town which doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with over 521 homes. I don't understand how you can turn down a proposal to build 300 homes then immediately propose that over 500 homes should be built in the same area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I refer to your letter of October 2013 in connection with the above, with particular reference to site CB5. I fail to understand the significance of sending this letter when work on site CB5 is well under way and the first dozen homes are already occupied. However the map on the reverse of the letter showing the Conon-Bridge development plan is interesting. Site CB3 proposes 39 homes and community etc., but the owner of the nearby site of the old filling station is having to "jump through hoops" in an attempt nto obtain planning permission for development from you. There is intense local opposition to your proposals for site CB3, & not without reason. The playing field belongs to the community under trustees (2 remaining). Accept that you have made a mistake in this instance and leave the playing field well alone. Re-think your proposals for CB3 if you consider it essential to have development in this area, although it is arguable that the other marked sites provide plenty of scope.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We are strongly against the re-opening of the railway + steam train in Strathpeffer.

Representation

Our house is situated just 30 meters from the proposed track and we are concerned about potentially substantial noise and pollution. With all the soot and dust created by the steam, we would no longer be able to spend time in the garden, put our washing out to dry or even open the windows of our house. Something that will certainly increase the pollution is the fact that the village is situated in a valley and already fog is lingering around often. As we understand there is renewed interest from the council (and many locals in our village!) to establish a footpath / cycleway over the old track bed to link Strathpeffer with Dingwall. This would be a priority to us, as it would allow people – of whom many children / youngsters and tourists alike – to make a safe journey from A to B. However, the plans for a steam train would contradict this. We often use the back of our garden to access our house, which would not be possible if the old rail track is being taken back into use for a steam train. While it is difficult to look in the future (and we certainly are not able to look in the wallet of the steam train group) we think that such a bold plan will be hard to get off the ground and more importantly to maintain in the long run (look at the difficult situation at Strathspey). The financial and human resources are in our opinion very limited.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the land to be left as it is now.

Representation

The area is used by walkers, joggers and dog walkers who also come from outwith our area in order to do tthis. The land is inhabited by numerous species of wildlife, particularly around the pond area. Our property backs directly onto the proposed building area and we have had problems in the past with flooding, due to the boggy nature of the ground. A ditch was dug behind our house to keep the water flowing away from our property which, so far, seems to have made a difference. We are now concerned that any disturbance of the ground will risk more flooding in the future. It is a shame that every bit of green space has to be earmarked for yet more housing, instead of being left for recreational use. We have lived here for ten years and it is only now that we are finally getting a small shop. We do now have a primary school which, I don't imagine, would be able to cope with the extra children that would result from 75 more houses. Of course, we would not appreciate having houses built right behind our back garden fence. My husband is confined to a wheelchair and enjoys having the privacy to sit outside and appreciate the peace and the sound of the wildlife without an audience. I really feel that this would have quite an impact on his quality of life.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

If additional housing over the previous plan is approved, all or at least a large proportion of the houses should be affordable.

Representation

A reason given by Highland Council for approving the original development was to increase the provision of affordable housing in the area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The Master plan for this development should clearly indicate the provision for, location and extent of land set aside for a swimming pool.

Representation

This was one of the conditions for granting permission for this development. It is essential that this land be retained, near to the existing Community Center. it is important that the development has more than just houses built to try to sustain the wellbeing of the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04249 Name James Alexander Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IN 6

Reference The Town House Type Change

Comment Changes

Clarification of inclusion of the Town House building within IN6

Representation

My reason is that the area may have been included erroneously

Allocated to Central Inverness IN6 Bridge St

Customer Number 04249 Name James Alexander Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Site(s) IN2 Porterfield Prison

Reference Criteria on which a capacity of 30 is based? Type Change

Comment Changes

Present suggestion constitutes overdevelopment, resulting in pressure on access, utilities and general amenity of immediate surroundings and residents. Development of the prison site should be an opportunity to create a low density mixed but mainly residential city square which would enhance the Crown district in terms of townscape and quality of life. Well-designed open space in an urban context is lacking throughout the city of Inverness. The well-being (amenity, health and enjoyment) of all ages should be regarded as the priority.

Representation

The visual dereliction of Viewhill House and the crude alterations to the Masonic building nearby, signal the need to arrest the creeping urban detritous which is in danger of spreading in the event of unsympathetic development of the prison site. This part of Inverness is a Conservation Area and demands a sensitive approach to scale and proportion in the type of development which would replace the prison. For that reason development of the prison site should not be considered in isolation but as part of a masterplan for the surrounding area to include the aforementioned Viewhill House and the Masonic Club and car parks.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN2 Porterfield Prison

Customer Number 04083 Name James Attwood Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.128

Reference CB6 Type Change

Comment Changes

A landscaped buffer zone should be added between the end of Brahan View and any new development. Access to any new development should only be from the A862 and NOT through Brahan View.

Representation

Changes to the Proposed Plan are essential for road safety reasons, particularly as the proposed development will be a mix of residential and business units.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB6 Riverford

Customer Number 04083 Name James Attwood Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.128 to 4.134

Reference Site CB3 Land to South West of High Street Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like this section of the Proposed Plan to be completely deleted.

Representation

Having recently attended a Community meeting regarding this section of the Proposed Plan it is my understanding that while the Council has owned the land since 1972 that is now the car park, the playing field is owned through a Trust Deed by the village Amenities Committee. Also the former allotments that border the playing field are owned by the residents of Bank Street and not by the Council. This is the last piece of green open-space within the village and must not be sacrificed for further over-development of the village

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

That the proposals within the Plan relating to Area CB3 in Conon Bridge be deleted.

Representation

I object to the proposals for the Area CB3 on the following grounds: 1 The football field is an integral part of the village centre. and is a green area that will be unnecessarily lost if these proposals go ahead. 2 The football field is used by children and by informal football and hockey teams for practice. The population is urged by Government and Health authorities to take more exercise and this field supplies the means to fulfill this need. 3 The field was gifted to the village by a local landowner and is held in trust by the village. There can be no justification to usurp the wishes of the benefactor. 4 The children's playground area at the lower end of the field was gifted to the village by householders on sites adjacent to the play area. There can be no justification to usurp the wishes of those residents. 5 The car park adjacent to the church and the playing field is well used and is a feature of the village centre. Vehicles are parked there for church services, for funerals and weddings, for activities within the Church Hall and for access to the local shops and businesses. As an example I have noted that on Sunday 1 December for the morning church service more than 30 cars were parked there and on Sunday 8 December a total of 45 cars were parked in the car park and on the nearby disused area that was formerly a garage. This area is due for private development and with this facility lost to the village, the need to retain a large car park in its present location becomes even more important and necessary. For weddings and funerals the overflow from the car park often extends into adjacent streets and this condition will worsen if the car park is removed or reduced in size. A new parking area within the CB3 development will inevitably be further from the village centre and, more than likely, smaller in size. A number of local clubs and organisations use the church hall for their activities and the car park is a well used and conveniently placed facility to accommodate users who often are not residents of the village. 6 The field is used for local annual village fetes, activities and galas and there are no other locations suitable for events of this type within the village boundaries. 7 Housing developments are necessary to accommodate population growth for whatever reason. However such developments should never be allowed to detract from the integrity and character of a long established village. There is sufficient suitable land outside of the current village boundaries to accommodate increased housing. There is, therefore, no need to build on green spaces inside the village. For these reasons I must object in the strongest possible terms to the developments proposed in CB3

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I am a householder adjoining the Nairn Showfield. I have several objections to the proposed changes as outlined in the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local development Plan. From personal observation I can say this area is used considerably by the Nairn area population. It is a popular summer destination for families and groups of children of all ages. These groups use the field for ball games, kite flying, informal football and other children's games. Many local people use the field for dog walking from early morning to late at night and to deprive the dog owners of this space would be unwelcome by many people. In the summer Sunday School trips and other outings from towns outwith Nairn use the field for their picnics and other activities. School children from the school use Lodgehill road to go to and from school and at lunchtime to go to the town and the increase in traffic must pose a danger to them In the past year it was the venue for a circus and also a visiting car/van attraction. These events are well patronised by the people of Nairn and earn revenue. The rescue helicopter has also, on occasion, used the Showfield. This attractive local open space will be badly missed if planning permission was given for housebuilding and I strongly urge the Council to reject this proposal [redacted]

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

STOP IT

Representation

It has taken over 10 years for Milton of Leys to gain a shop. This is still the only facility. Another 75 houses will mean a further 150 children. Where will they be educated as the new school is at capacity. Access north on to the A9 is dangerous, especially at this time of year with the low sun. Adding this extra traffic can only exacerbate the problem. To lose even more green open space can only be detrimental to us the residents.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

My wife and I are delighted to see provision being made for Allotments in Balloch. The nearest existing allotments are on the outskirts of Nairn with, we understand, a substantial waiting list. We are equally delighted that this "green corridor" that effectively separates Balloch and Culloden is not being promoted for housing. This is an important factor in maintaining the individual identities of Culloden and Balloch and avoiding a merger of the two.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Allocation of site H4 in the plan

Representation

Thank you for providing me with this information regarding my property on Wardlaw Road, Kirkhill. I have read the report and would like to respond with my comments and concerns regarding the decision not to include it within the development plan. This may not be the correct formal in which to express my displeasure but if possible I would like to appeal against the decision taken by the Highland Council. It was reported that my land referred to as H4 was somehow out with the village boundary. This is simply not the case, it is merely a short walk from all amenities and much closer than Achnagairn which the council seem to be recommending for development. Moreover, previous planning application were granted on Wardlaw Road which has been developed into an inclusive part of the village. It was never my intention to fully develop this whole area, this was perhaps the view of the council but certainly wasn't mine. I fully appreciate that a major development on this land whilst providing excellent and well needed housing could be constraint due to access. I would ask that this decision be review with perhaps a measured judgment taken on a reduced number of houses. This would have minimal impact on access and retain the majority of the land. I have made some comments below relating to an extract from the report and I would appreciate an opportunity to discuss this matter further with a member of the planning team H4- Preferred in MIR Site H41ies within a north western area of Kirkhill on the north side of Wardlaw Road. Following further, more detailed consideration of this site in response to objections to its allocation, it is no longer recommended for inclusion in the plan. The objections given were from local resident who clearly do not want to see housing on land close to their houses. This was always going to be the case and I do not believe that their objection had any basis or were indeed accurate. This land has been in my family's tenancy & ownership for several generations and to say that it is subject to flooding is simply untrue. It is understood that access was intended to be taken via a new housing development as a continuation of its access road 'Mansfield Park'. However no details of this potential access were provided by the landowner. I was never asked to provide plans to access my property from Mansfield Road. Access via Mansfield Road was intimated by HC and it was clearly their intention to utilise this access and the developer on Mansefield Road was instructed to leave a hammerhead on the road for exactly this purpose There appears to be a number of difficulties in taking access via Mansfield Park, in particular the loss of attractive mature trees, crossing of a narrow burn and it is likely that a proportion of garden ground would need to be purchased from nearby properties at Heatherlie and Sunnyside to allow for the creation of an access. In the absence of any information to demonstrate these issues can be 1 overcome there is no certainly that the site can be delivered. Access would necessitate the removal of 2 trees which is regrettable but not a reason to reject access, the narrow burn could be crossed with ease and should not pose any problem. The matter of loss of garden space at Heatherlie and Sunny Side is questionable and I would ask that you re-examine the actual land boundaries to determine true ownership. Garden boundaries have a tendency to conveniently "expand" over the passing of time ! !The Council's Road Officer's have confirmed that access from Wardlaw Road would not be supported due to its narrow width and limited opportunities for upgrade to a suitable width including a segregated footway for pedestrians. Wardlaw Road would be required to be stopped up should development on H4 be supported. I would concur that the lower part of Wardlaw Road may be too narrow to facilitate a major building development but I would ask that this be re-assessed with a view of a much more modest build. Other concerns raised in representations are noted. It is agreed that other sites within the village and the wider Inverness Housing Market Area are less constrained and therefore have a greater likelihood of being developed within the plan period. Furthermore adequate land is supported for housing elsewhere that will meet the housing land requirement in the Inverness Housing Market Area. With regard to flood risk, whilst no part of the site is identified as being at risk of flooding on the SEPA Indicative Coastal and River Flood Map it is understood lower parts of the site are often affected by pluvial flooding. The site is also prime quality agricultural land and is understood be croft land. This is a small piece of privately owned land, it does not constitute a farm nor does it form part of any larger farm. Its loss of agricultural land would have little or no impact on the farming community in this area. I would be most gratefully if you would review my thought an advise me of the next step as I clearly and I most sincerely disagree with the current situation.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04058 Name JAMES MACKAY Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG11 Type Change

Comment Changes

COMPLAINT REGARDING DEVELOPMENT AT IG11 - SPECIFICALLY OBJECTING TO A FENCE BEING PUT UP ON THE SHORE ROAD OPPOSITE OAKES COURT WHERE VISITORS PARK THEIR CARS TO VIEW THE LINERS THAT COME INTO PORT OF INVERGORDON AS THERE NOWHERE ELSE THEY CAN USE AS A VANTAGE POINT AS THE WHOLE AREA IS A NO PARKING ZONE.

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to Invergordon IG11 Cromarty Firth Port Authority

Customer Number 04491 Name James Robertson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TM9 Type Change

Comment Changes

Highland Council to under take temporary reparis and/or find the owners of it or compulsory purchase of the road.

Representation

TM9 - Uses Rail Halt -Requirements -Upgrading of road to adoptive standards; land safeguard to leave open the future possibility of a rail halt. Seeking to change Highland Council to Undertake Temporary Repairs and/or find the owners of it. Or Compulsory Purchase of the road. Representation We the residents ofTomatin would welcome a rail halt and station square to be returned to it's former self or as near as possible. But the main concern is the reinstatement of Station Road because of the additional damage caused by the recent Timber Operations in TM5. Adjacent to the road. There is also the problem that nobody seems to know just who owns the road. There is also an underpass with an over bridge, who would be responsible for this should it be damaged. Yet again little attention is paid to the Topography of the Area There is also the question of Public Liability.

Allocated to Tomatin TM9 Land at former railway station

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Council to remove TM5 from plan, and enter into further discussions with future Developer/Landowner as to what they now propose. Representation I no longer believe that the plan represents a true picture of the location due to the recent Tree Felling and Stacking Operations in this location and does not now meet many of the requirements as stated in this document. The retention area of trees within TM5 Adjacent to Station Road have now been felled and is now used as a Stacking and Extraction point for the Timber, which are loaded from Station Road This in itself is causing problems. With both local residents being unable to access their homes by the Articulated Timber Vehicles obstructing Station Road and also obstructing the old A9 with one Parking while another is Loading. This road is also Used by Pedestrians who access it to work at the Distillery, and is also used by School Children to access the foot bridge to the Bus Stop. Little attention has been paid to the safety of road users both Pedestrians and cyclists also motorists. Station Road is a Public right of way and has been for Generations. I have lived in this area for forty years and have never known Station Road to be closed, other than by snow. Please note Timber Transfer point as indicated on the enclosed plan, this point was in fact the proposed line of the new road into the wood for the proposed development see attached Plan with indicative line of road. Yet again no attention was paid to the Topography of the area It is also noted that when Tomatin Estate was granted a Felling application. Little or no Attention was paid to the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan as you will see from the enclosed plans . End Maps are for Reference.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Replace requirements with Additional planting and improvements of the bonded warehouses and/or tourism related uses.

Representation

Proposals for development at the following Location; Sites TM13- TM 12 TM8 Descriptions of the proposal. For TM13 (I believe this to be misleading) Site TM13 Tomatin Distillery. Requirements: Only for expansion /reconfiguration of distillery or related operations; I believe this will leave it yet again open to its interpretation and we may again be confronted by an application for a Transport Depot in the location of TM13 As occurred in the last Deposit Draft local Plan Sep 2002 and the way it was phrased, was misinterpreted by both the planning officer and the applicant/agent. Remove Reconfiguration of Distillery or related operations. Suggestion; Replace with Additional planting and improvements of the Bonded Warehouses and /or Tourism, Related Uses. Representation Any further increase in heavy goods vehicles on this part of the old A9 will be in direct contradiction of government policy to reduce the impact of heavy road use through Scotland. Suggestions have been made that reinvestment in the local rail connections both North and South of Tomatin would not only avoid further stress on the local road infrastructure but would also benefit the local community. This also appears to be recognised under the present Local Draft Site TM9. Little attention has been paid to the Topography of the Area, and is the Gateway into Tomatin from the junction of the A9 onto the Old A9, as this is a dangerous access and there have been a large number of accidents there over the years. It is also part of the National Cycle Network-A9 Millennium Route, and would have an impact of safety of both cyclists and road users and for Pedestrians who at times have to walk on the road because of the poor condition of the foot bridge and the overgrown vegetation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Objection to any housing being built on former showfield east which is a cherished green area and used by any public and school children for recreation – no evidence to show any of the Council’s safeguarding of green areas here – it would be a great mistake to build (30) houses on this amenity space. The people in Nairn do not want to put houses in field.

Representation

MY MAIN OBJECTIONS AS FOLLOWS:- The Road (ie Lodgehill Rd) is not wide enough for more traffic and is inadequate for your purposes. The crossroads at junction of Lodgehill and Wester Road is already dangerous - it is an accident area. Ambulances already flash up and down Waverley Road on route to Nairn Hospital – also extra vehicle at new vet surgery. The health and safety issue has been ignored – 3 schools use Lodgehill Road regularly going to school. At lunchtime and again in the afternoon going home. It would interfere with infrastructure – inadequate drainage already exists. There are many other suitable sites for housing available in and around Nairn. I repeat again the people in Nairn want the site to stay green.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I support the inclusion of Bunloit into the hinterland for the following reasons: Bunloit Road: • Even with current levels of traffic, the Bunloit road is hazardous and of poor construction. • The road is narrow and the construction of it unsuitable for increased use for access by ordinary vehicles, let alone by heavy vehicles, such as construction lorries. It rises approx 1,000 feet up a steep hill with 9 sharp bends and poor visibility, few passing places and recurrent problems with drainage, flooding, snow and icing. It is particularly hazardous in winter. • At the top of the hill, sight lines are poor in many places, the running surface is narrow, the verges are very soft, there are few passing places and repeated problems with ditching and drainage. Further traffic generated by increased housing will inevitably impact on the safety of this road. • Some of the access roads for recent developments and the associated drainage works, culverts etc. have been poorly constructed, leading to flooding of neighbouring properties and the Bunloit road. Safe bell mouth construction, new passing places and clearing for safe visibility along the road have not always been undertaken. Further, similar, poorly executed construction work would exacerbate the problems of safe use of the Bunloit road. • The Bunloit road is shared along much of its length with the Great Glen Way walking and cycle tracks (approx 12,500 walkers alone use this section of the GGW annually.); horse riders from Borlum Farm and elsewhere also use this road frequently. There are already safety issues relating to traffic and further development and associated increases in vehicles using the road will exacerbate them. • The safety of the employees and dogs accommodated at Drumnadrochit Kennels would be adversely affected by further increases in traffic, as would safe movement of livestock along the road around neighbouring farms. Landscape and Character: • Further inappropriate development along the Bunloit Road, which is in a Special Landscape Area, will adversely affect the character and public views over the surrounding countryside and Loch Ness, including the experience of those using the Great Glen Way. Potential Impact on Neighbouring Tourist Businesses • Further inappropriate development of commuter housing in this area will adversely affect the popularity of Bunloit as a tourist destination and potentially the employment related to it. There are currently at least 5 separate businesses of varying sizes offering different types of tourist accommodation. Their attraction depends on the unspoilt location, views and access to rural activities, including bird watching, walking, horse riding etc.; these are all dependent on a peaceful environment. Water and Drainage • Bunloit has always experienced problems with water shortages. Following repeated and worsening summer droughts within the last decade and intermittent supply failures, most properties have been forced to sink boreholes because surface supplies and springs proved inadequate as the number of houses and demand for water have increased. Further increases in housing will exacerbate these problems with inevitable impact on aquifers. • Deteriorating water supplies, due to excessive extraction from aquifers by increased numbers of houses will also adversely affect the safe watering of grazing livestock from natural surface sources and springs. • Drainage arrangements for some new developments, including their access roads and culverts have been poorly planned and have led to problems with flooding of neighbouring properties and the Bunloit road. There is a risk that further development would exacerbate these problems. • The septic tank soakaways from some new developments have been poorly planned so there is a potential risk of pollution of adjacent burns and lochans. There are now fewer sites appropriate for new soakaways if pollution is to be avoided. Natural Environment and Habitat: • Bunloit is part of a Special Landscape Area, well known to host a number of species of birds, mammals and amphibia which are rare and protected at a National and European level. Recent development has already harmed the habitats of, and led to a decline in Slavonian Grebe, Black Grouse, Great Crested Newts, Badgers and Pine Martens etc. Further construction in the Bunloit area, the associated disturbance, problems with drainage and possible pollution of nesting sites and predation by household pets would increase the pressure on these species.

Allocated to Hinterland boundary

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

What happened to the 30 year plan that was produced a couple of years ago? Thousands of pounds was spent on this proposal with no mention of developing the land in DR3, and now it has all changed. The massive swing in strategy is quite alarming as the site DR3 in Drumnadrochit has always been allocated as green belt to maintain the long standing division between Lewiston and Drumnadrochit. This land must not be considered for development.

Representation

This change has obviously been considered due to a land owners enquiry. Does this mean your 'strategy' is being driven by land owners? I am very disappointed in the lack of direction of our area and am very concerned about its planning management. In times of austerity surely local government should be looking to minimise outgoings and not squander it on inadequate, thoughtless and speculative proposals every couple of years. Balmacaan Road is already a very busy road with many young families residing here. There are no facilities for off road parking for residents towards the lower end of the road, so cars are parked on the road. The primary and high school is also accessed from this road, by the children living in Lewiston and Balmacaan. The increase in traffic will cause an even greater hazard to school children on their journey to and from school in quite often bad weather conditions and inadequate visibility. We've had accidents in this area already and many near misses. This proposal will increase this risk. It is not appropriate to build on every pocket of green land without thought. I am all for further development and can appreciate the advantages it will bring in many ways, but feel that this proposal is being driven by an inadequate management strategy and needs more input than just 10 minutes in front of a localised map. There are larger areas in the village that would benefit from development without the loss of character to the area and without changing long standing by-laws and these developments will not compromise the safety of its more venerable residents, if planned carefully. Will we look forward to a change in strategy in another couple of years?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

removal of allocation NA1 - 30 homes

Representation

I am against the building of up to 30 homes on the former showfield east. I feel this is a high density of homes within the allocated area & not in keeping with the surrounding streets. There is enough new houses being built within the Nairn area, whilst there are new & old houses for sale, some have been for sale for years. As Nairn is a country town, the public, tourists & visitors should enjoy & benefit from the green spaces in the town.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04023 Name Jane Reid Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.36

Reference NA8, NA9 Type Change

Comment Changes

Removal of NA8 and NA9 areas from the proposed plan, Nairn South as it is called.

Representation

Nairn South is not needed, and should the planners pay any attention to the local people, businesses etc. not wanted. It can not be sustained by the local community, by transport links, or any part of the local infrastructure. To keep waving it around as though it were of merit is a flagrant disregard for the wishes of those who will have to live with it.

Allocated to Nairn NA8 Nairn South

Customer Number 04023 Name Jane Reid Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.36

Reference NA6, NA4 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Nairn West provides better access to Inverness, surely the only source of employment for the potential home owners. there is no impact upon industry; no bottlenecks with the railway bridge, no additional traffic congestion twice a day through the town. There is also room for infrastructure improvements in that direction - shops and a new primary school which will surely be needed. it also does not require the by pass to be constructed befor eit becomes feasible.

Allocated to Nairn NA6 Delnies

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We would like to see the proposed changes to the car park in Conon Bridge and also to the Football Field abandoned. The football field does not belong to Highland Council but to the community of Conon Bridge

Representation

1. The Football Field was a gift to the children and people of Conon Bridge. You cannot in all justice and morality use another's gift for your own use or change it. The field has been used by countless people from the community and also visitors our own children and grandchildren and is still used to day and should be avaiile to future generations. 2. Children and adults need somewhere to exercise, play football etc. We have very little green fields available in the village 3. Since the railway halt was opened commuters have been encouraged to leave their cars in the car park and use the train. Now you intend to take the car park away forcing people back on to the road.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site for housing development

Representation

I am writing to comment upon the above. This is a green lung for the town of Nairn, it stands between the old and the new parts of the town so is convenient for all areas, and it is used also as a pathway from one side to the other. I go past it every day and there is alwsys somebody using it, for golf, football, and just exercise for both dogs and people. It is used by the Nairn St Ninian football club and there are frequent matches there, and at night there are floodlights so that this can happen when it is dark. Many children walk to and from school across this field with a degree of safety and enjoyment which would not be there if there were houses. It is very obvious that they benefit from the freedom of the green space after a day in school. The other thing which concerns me is that it is local knowledge that the Title to this field contains a condition that no buildings must be built on it except a grandstand. I very much hope that the Nairnshire Farming Society who own this field, are able to be provided with another field for their Show which now needs something larger, and that this green space can continue to do service to the town in a way that is appreciated by so many of the citizens of the town, every day of the week.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site CB3 from the plan.

Representation

I write on behalf of the Congregation of Ferintosh Parish Church, in Conon Bridge, to lodge our objection to a proposal to use the playing field, adjacent to our church, for a housing development. The field in question is currently not owned by the Local Council but was gifted to the village over 60 years ago for community use. Any housing on this site would mean building works carried out on a flood plain. There would be a loss of well used local sports amenity, which is open to public use without cost. At a time when we are encouraged to be more active and keep fit and when there is already a lack of outdoor facilities, it would be disappointing to lose any existing facilities. Any access to this field would mean a reduction in car park spaces. Considering that the local railway station has just been re-opened and people have been encouraged to use this car park to leave their vehicles, this seems to be a contradiction in terms. The local council has also made a footpath from the car park to the railway station for this reason. There does not appear to be any provision for replacement parking in the proposed development plan. Having recently attended a local meeting about this issue, there appears to be considerable opposition to this development. The Congregational Board has fully discussed this aspect of the development plan and request that you take these comments into consideration when discussing this matter.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Caledonian Canal from Muirtown Basin to the Sea Locks at Clachnaharry should be given special heritage status. No new build should be allowed apart from a tastefully built heritage/tearoom/conference centre on the right bank (i.e. the Carse side) overlooking the basin & nicely landscaped into site. A joint project – Council & Waterways? I refer you to the Falkirk Wheel where the Forth & Clyde Canal meets with the Union Canal & the Water Park. No shops, please, save town centre shops instead. Re-develop B&Q site.

Representation

Muirtown Basin – the nicest part of “our” section of the canal should remain with uninterrupted views over it from the main road. The beauty of the area and Telford’s magnificent achievement is the “jewel in the crown” of our area. Nothing should be added but I think museum/heritage about the building of the canal would be a great asset if done tastefully. The walks round there are gorgeous. I think the land around there would have to be subject to flood risk assessment. Would homes/businesses get insurance? 30 homes would put immense pressure on Muirtown School

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Historic conservation area of Clachnaharry should never have had a 3 storey block of flats overlooking it in 2013 and does not tally with your stated aims of preserving character, considering appropriate scale or use of tradition materials. No new builds or developments in our historic areas please unless they can be built to fit in with the surroundings.

Representation

The historic "Olde Worlde" charm and character of Clachnaharry village has been totally ruined by the building of "Alcatrove" some 35 metres from the conservation area. The "Alcatraz effect" is made much worse by the fact that the site which it stands on is elevated in relation to the conserved mid street and low street. It's a disgrace and it makes a travesty of the conservation status. Whilst I am greatly in favour of the stated aims in 4.3 Planning have to actually practice what they preach. Please no more new build or out of scale build in Clachnaharry. Please preserve conservation status rigidly and the 3 category "B" listings & 1 "C" listing on High Street. No new build in the Old Quarry.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

No new build. Site should be retained for a naturalistically landscaped green space for the use of wildlife, local community and visitors. I suggest a memorial space/garden dedicated to the memory of the great engineer of the Caledonian Canal – Thomas Telford.

Representation

There should be no new build as there are 3 "B" Grade listed buildings close by i.e. two Thomas Telford cottages and Dunhollie House. No matter where you put the entrance/exits there is not enough visibility for seeing traffic coming from the right i.e. from town. I propose that the rear part of the quarry i.e. woodlands & grazing grass be fenced off with deer fence to contain the roe deer. The middle section be planted with native hazel & rowan trees to support the local red squirrel population, some Scots pines & heather could be added. The front section currently level with the road could be very naturalistically planted again with heather (page 5 provision & geological survey.) and grasses and seating & perhaps a statue or plaque with information about Thomas Telford and the building of the canal. I am not aware of such a formal memorial existing in this area and I think that this would be a great opportunity to use this space to honour the great man. New build flats are architecturally inappropriate to this end of Clachnaharry High Street as 3 Category "B" listed buildings are in close proximity. They would not be in keeping with the surrounding area. With only one school in the area at Muirtown I question whether it could support further new build. With this site being a former quarry, I would expect there to be sufficient geological assessment to ensure that the site is stable – the rear part is boggy. Convert Clachnaharry House into flats.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I refer to the above planning application for the building of 51 houses below Ardnagrask in Muir of Ord, and would like to register my objection to this plan. My objection is not based on the principle of NIMBY as I am aware that people have to live somewhere or we would all still be living in caves. My objection is based on the following points: 1. It would result in an unacceptable density of housing in a quiet rural area. 2. Recent developments higher up Cony Road have already resulted in flooding lower down the hill, and it is quite obvious to me as a layman that the planned drainage from these houses was either inadequate from the beginning or the original plans if they were adequate were not adhered to. I have little faith in any other development such as is proposed doing anything other than exacerbating the present problems. 3. My last objection is probably the most important of all; there is at approximately 52.06W and 49.07N on OS sheet 26 a knoll of Pinus Sylvestris, our native pine tree where a pair of Buzzards have raised at least one chick each year since we came here 9 years ago, and the parent birds use the surrounding fields for finding a food source. In addition, Red Kite patrol the area almost every day seeking food sources. Any development such as is suggested would drive these birds away, thereby restricting their ability to survive. This would be contrary to the policy of our present government. I trust that the planning authority will pay due cognizance to the above points.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

ML1 – Residential, 7 houses. Change: I would like the boundary to be moved, to reduce the potential of the development to overlook my property and impinge on privacy and light. According to the plan there is potential space at the far end of the development to move the development closer to Cameron Crescent, to create a suitable barrier space. The alternative means of achieving this is to reduce the development to six houses. ML5 – Business development, North of the A832
Change: I would like this particular development to be reduced in size and moved to a less prominent site or taken out of the IMF development plan completely.

Representation

I am seeking change to development proposals ML1 and ML5 Both developments will directly impact my property, ML1 (residential-seven houses) to my side elevation and ML5 (business / commercial development) to my rear elevation. These developments but especially ML5, are going to have significant impact on the rural and open character of the eastern end of the village. My comments are based on the following criteria: • Appropriateness of the development - location and size • road layout and the road safety situation • utility infrastructure • impact on the local environment, drainage and pollution issues • long-term sustainability. ML5 – Business development, North of the A832
Change: I would like this particular development to be reduced in size and moved to a less prominent site or taken out of the IMF development plan completely.
My concerns centre around the size and appropriateness of expanded development of the site identified as ML5. • The proposed footprint of this development is of excessive scale and size when compared with size of the village. • The footprint and description of ML5 appears to suggest that the development will essentially be a large industrial estate, which would be incompatible with the rural aspect and character of the village. • The location of the development is inappropriate being at the eastern gateway to the village, and along the main tourist route into the Black Isle. • It will be sited opposite one of the most exceptional views on the Black Isle. Munloch Bay, is an area of outstanding natural beauty and a designated SSSI. The surrounding landscape is a fundamental part of this ecosystem and sustains an important and varied wildlife community and has immense value for public / environmental amenity. • The Village, the Bay and the surrounding landscapes provide a significant contribution to the tourism economy of the Black Isle, this development would substantially detract from the character and perception of the area for both locals and visitors. • The site currently contains Frasers Garage and its associated bus park. The garage while being a locally valued facility, does from a residential point of view generate noise from mechanical works often late at night and considerable light pollution. • This comparatively large scale commercial development would increase the traffic load significantly leading to increased traffic noise, disruption and traffic pollution. The junction between the A832, B9161 is a well-known accident black spot, creating additional traffic will make a bad situation much worse, the combination of single track roads, the fast A832 and the residential access to Millbank road is not compatible with a development of this type. • Commercial expansion of this site would create on-going disruption, noise and potentially an increased risk of crime, and as such would not be appropriate on this site, with its close proximity to residential property. • The question about long-term sustainability is key – there are so many small industrial estates that are under occupied and under used, there is already over capacity in the inverness area for these types of developments. Building yet another commercial development that may well go the same way and end up being a blot on the landscape is not sensible planning or use of public money. ML1 – Residential, 7 houses. Change: I would like the boundary to be moved, to reduce the potential of the development to overlook my property and impinge on privacy and light. According to the plan there is potential space at the far end of the development to move the development closer to Cameron Crescent, to create a suitable barrier space. The alternative means of achieving this is to reduce the development to six houses. As drawn, this residential development is abutted right up against my boundary fence, which presents issues of privacy : • The land surrounding my property forms a raised plateau, this includes the land to the side where the development ML1 is planned. The land is raised by approximately 1 metre above the ground level on which my property and the other affected properties along Millbank Road are built. • There is a real possibility of being significantly over looked, by some of these new properties. Obviously being over-looked will affect privacy, and the ability to enjoy the use and amenity of home and garden. • There is also the potential that the development will reduce light to my property which has a window to the side. • My property has windows to the rear which directly face onto the rear field, and with no significant back garden to act as a shield or barrier, there will be serious impact on privacy from increased footfall/local use of the small tract of land directly to the rear. This may be an indirect effect but the impact on privacy is still of concern.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We are pleased, regarding boundary amendments projected for adoption under the new Plan for this land designation, that The Highland Council have put forward that a proposed extension area be included to cover a northern extension around the River Findhorn valley at Streens (Drynachan), the 'Three waterfalls' gorge and much of the length of the Wade's military road to its A939 co1mection around the Aitnoch area. Save Our Dava agree with this decision. We also agree with the Council's decision to maintain within the S.L.A. the two areas that were suggested for exclusion by other parties at earlier consultations. As recommended by The Highland Council as a future course of action. Save Our Dava have been in contact with The Moray Council with a view to consider formally the inclusion in the Moray section of the S.L.A. the northern extension to the designation boundary around the area of the Dava Lochans.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Designation boundary should continue to follow the route of the minor public road until its connection to the A939

Representation

We note, however, that, at the easternmost end of this extension area, the designation boundary deviates to the south of the minor public road that otherwise follows the line of General Wade's military Road from Dulsie Bridge. At this point, it takes a line that has no definition on the ground, and excludes the track that actually is the route of the former military road. For consolidation purposes, therefore, we would recommend that the designation boundary continues to follow the route of the minor public road until its connection to the A939, encompassing within the designation the whole of the historical route's connection to the S.L.A. in this locality. (The A939 between Aitnoch and Dava junction follows the route of the old route.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

This document is a preliminary response by the Association of Nairn Businesses (ANB) to consultation on the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan. Since the consultation was first sought, it now seems likely that there is to be a “Charrette” in Nairn. In the light of this, the ANB reserves the right to make further representations when the charrette has been completed and after the ANB and its committee has had time to discuss the outcomes and formulate any new proposals. It is now recognised (Katie Briggs, 19 November, 2013) that the ANB will in future be treated as a stakeholder under item NA7 of the plan. Effects of the Plan Upon Nairn Businesses Our responses will be limited to items which are likely to affect our member businesses and will not be confined to the town centre (site NA7) Community and Enterprise in Scotland’s Town Centres The ANB supports the principles and aims of the report to the Scottish Government of the External Advisory Group, chaired by Malcolm Bruce and published in July, 2013. Town Centres First The evidence that out of town retail development continues to have a disastrous effect upon town centre shops is overwhelming and Nairn is no exception. The number and quality of Nairn High Street shops has fluctuated over recent decades with cycles of empty shops being taken up by new businesses which then turn out not to be viable, leading to a fresh wave of vacant premises. The principle of “Town Centres First” should be paramount in the Highland Council planning process and out-of-town and edge-of-town retail planning applications should be subject to the closest scrutiny in order to minimise the effect upon town centre businesses. Of particular concern in Nairn would be any move to increase the number and variety of new retail outlets which might be proposed as a cluster around or near the Sainsbury’s store on the Eastern edge of the town. We believe that any such future application should be turned down and that any lapsed existing consent should not be renewed. Car Parking Free car parking for up to two hours in central locations is paramount to the viability of town centre businesses. Signage on the A96 indicating that car parks give access to the High Street will encourage motorists to stop in Nairn and combined with easy direct pedestrian access to the town centre this will improve retail footfall. Residential Development A vibrant town centre retail environment requires footfall. Whilst the ANB recognises that there is strong local opposition to further residential development in and around Nairn, we consider that significant increase in the number of homes within Nairn can only enhance the quality and number of businesses which can survive in Nairn High Street. We recognise that existing out of town developments will continue to attract a proportion of Nairn residents but increased population will inevitably benefit the vibrancy of our town centre retail area. We realise that there is strong opposition to developments South of Nairn. Objections to developments at Nairn South are widely predicated upon the inadequacy of the road structure. Improvements to the Cawdor Road route into town are possible and should be more closely investigated. When the Nairn bypass comes to fruition, every effort should be made to provide a link from it into the town centre via Cawdor Road and Nairn South. Town Centre Living There are a number of buildings with residential potential within Nairn town centre which are currently unoccupied or under-occupied. The quality of some of the buildings reflect the popularity and prosperity that Nairn enjoyed during the earlier parts of the last century. The exteriors of some are clearly in a poor state of maintenance but such deficits may be largely cosmetic. Ground floor living in former shops is likely to seem unattractive but there are buildings where this would not be the case and there are certain to be higher storey spaces that can be converted to residential use There is great potential for some of these buildings to be brought into residential and other community uses and steps should be taken to encourage this. In particular owners should be made aware of any financial grants which may be available and that there are UK government tax breaks available that make conversion from business to residential use a very attractive proposition. Transport The long awaited Nairn Bypass if it ever comes to fruition, can only benefit Nairn as a whole and in particular, enhance the experience of parking and shopping in Nairn. Junctions between the bypass and the A96 to the West and East should be of a design which makes it clear that they form a gateway into the town as well as easing the experience for through traffic. Currently, the volume of traffic and the controls upon it required to promote road safety are a discouragement to visiting Nairn. Allowing traffic which has no intention of stopping in Nairn to proceed rapidly on a bypass will enhance the experience of those intent on visiting the town and using the facilities of our town centre. Business Development and Employment Nairn is in a beautiful and in some ways unique geographical position. It is well served by its transport links, particularly as the closest town to Inverness Airport. Steps should be taken to publicise the assets of Nairn with the aim of encouraging the migration of significant businesses to our town. The appearance of new businesses with larger workforces will justify new residential development and enhance the viability of town centre retail and catering outlets. Community Enterprises Nairn has an excellent and well used Community and Arts Centre. There is however, potential to use town centre buildings as venues for additional community recreation,

education and enterprise activities. Highland Council planning processes should take account of and encourage this form of development. The Future The Association of Nairn Businesses seeks a brighter future for this town. In the short term, we wish to halt the decline in the number and quality of businesses in our town centre. We see the immediate path to achieving this being the arrest of out of-town and edge-of-town retail development. No Nairn resident would welcome the prospect of one third fewer businesses in the centre of our town. In the medium term, we see increased residential development and enhanced transport infrastructure as the catalysts to a more vibrant town centre. In the long term, we wish to see Nairn become a destination of choice for shopping and tourism visitors. Town Centres First We make no apology for repeating that we believe that the Highland Council planning processes should be firmly guided by "Community and Enterprise in Scotland's Town Centres" and its key principle of "Town Centres First".

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

It is more a confirmation of procedures involved rather than an objection. My concerns relate to phases 1 and 2 of the proposed development. The considerable impact that an extra 200 homes would have on an already overloaded Ussie Burn is somewhat worrying. Being flooded twice in the past 7 years and coming close on a number of other occasions I seek some confirmation that adequate provision for additional drainage will be made. Also that the Ussie Burn maintenance will be taken into consideration from the outset of the building works. If this is overlooked my concern is that the entire lower Maryburgh will experience flooding to some extent as a direct result of the building works.

Representation

My reasons for clarification on this point are fairly self explanatory. As a concerned resident who has already experienced the devastating effect flood damage can have on your own home, to know that the problem is not entirely resolved at present should highlight my concern that building work will exacerbate a problem which has been merely laying dormant for the past few years. Again I stress that this is not an objection to the development per se, I am simply looking for some kind of confirmation that appropriate action will be taken to make formal provision for upkeep and/or upgrading of this area to enable suitable preventative action to be put in place, to prevent this from being a future concern.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Maximum 10 new houses – no more!

Representation

There are already about 10 houses “for sale” so why do we need more? If the new houses will be “affordable” we do NOT want more out of work dependant residents. There is already a shortage of work for local young people.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Maximum 10 new houses not 100!!!

Representation

This is a village dependant on seasonal tourism:- it is a very pretty village and must not be made ugly by unwanted housing. There is no work in winter even for existing residents. Who would the “incomers” be? Immigrants? Present population of 550 people is a warm friendly community – to double the population with strangers would be a disaster for the community and spoil our dependence on tourism.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Re para 2.1 We welcome the recognition that the region contains important and sensitive natural assets which need to be protected. The Plan makes special mention of the importance of the bottlenose dolphin population in the Firth, the significance of Loch Flemington for the Slavonian grebe, the great crested newt in the Beaully and Muir of Ord area, and the bat population in Tain. Re para 2.3 With regard to the designated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs), there appears to be a contradiction between these as shown on the map on page 11 which includes Whiteness as a SLA and the statement on page 19 that Whiteness is a key site for economic growth, particularly for renewables industries. The environmental implications of industrial use of the Whiteness site are known to Scottish Natural Heritage, and we urge full attention to be paid to these. With further regard to SLAs, we would of course like to see these expanded wherever possible as an adjunct to the green network concept. We note that the entire northern shore of the Cromarty Firth has been designated a growth area and ask whether or not this could be broken up to allow more integration of green areas. Highland Deephaven abutting Alness Bay is an important migration site for wildfowl and waders. Re para 2.16 We would urge the enhancement of the existing green networks in the region. These links between natural areas are important for the movement of wildlife and are also a prime component of an attractive landscape. We welcome, for example, the concept in the Plan of maintaining green corridors along the burns and burnside on the southern outskirts of Inverness. In this context of green networks (National Ecological Networks, which are championed by Scottish Wildlife Trust), the Longman landfill site has been turning into an attractive stretch of wild land. In its future use as a brown-field site for industrial purposes we would welcome the retention of as much as possible of this natural space as a green area on the edge of the city. This would ameliorate any threat to the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar commitments mentioned in the Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We note that this is first of three new plans to cover the Highland Council region and urge that it is important to establish from the outset a wise regard for the rich natural heritage of the region. It is important to recognise that nature operates on longer timescales than the years foreseen for the life of this plan and we argue that the environment should not be jeopardised more than necessary for short-term development. We note that the fundamental concept in the new Plan is 'more of the same', i.e. expansion of housing and other developments to be focused on the existing settlements of Inverness, Nairn, Dingwall, Evanton, Alness, Invergordon, Tain and other smaller villages. The only significant departure from this is the addition of a new town at Tornagrain. We recognise the need for housing in the region but urge that wherever possible construction of new buildings takes place on brown-field sites. As the plan is developed the Scottish Wildlife Trust would appreciate the opportunity to discuss wildlife and conservation issues.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We feel that an allocation of 134 houses for this site represents overdevelopment of the area. The developable area is quoted as being 6.7 hectares, whereas in fact due to a large very old Beech wood to the East of the site, a line of trees with preservation orders on them to the West, and the need for a drainage system the developable area is considerably smaller. The most recent planning application for 131 houses on this site was turned down at appeal on the grounds of overdevelopment. This area of land adjoins Green belt land to the East, and an old area of low density housing to the North, and we feel that any development should be in keeping with what already exists in the area. Inverness has too much high density housing and too few green spaces.

Representation

wood to the East of the site, a line of trees with preservation We We feel that an allocation of 134 houses for this site represents overdevelopment of the area. The developable area is quoted as being 6.7 hectares, whereas in fact due to a large very old Beech wood to the East of the site, a line of trees with preservation orders on them to the West, and the need for a drainage system the developable area is considerably smaller. The most recent planning application for 131 houses on this site was turned down at appeal on the grounds of overdevelopment. This area of land adjoins Green belt land to the East, and an old area of low density housing to the North, and we feel that any development should be in keeping with what already exists in the area. Inverness has too much high density housing and too few green spaces.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I feel that this project should be shelved until such time as it is fully and realistically costed from the Capital and Revenue point of view. I question the level of local support. I feel that there should be a full impact study. I also feel that the length of run proposed does not justify the financial outlay. Accessibility to and from the station is not good and causes problems for users.

Representation

The project has not been fully thought through from the Capital and Revenue point of view. How are Capital and Revenue cost to be funded? What is the availability of grant support and what about the impact on other local demands for finance? Proposed length is too short to be worthwhile for users. If there were to be a future extension at least two bridges would require to be constructed at great expense. Transport of plant to and from the site during construction and during repair and maintenance periods would cause considerable problems for the road network. There would be considerable noise pollution and nuisance during the firing-up of the engine. The whole project is incompatible with the existing use of the site, the Education Centre associated with the Childhood Museum does not suffer from overuse. To put another such facility associated with the railway would be overkill. Public consultation has been scant. The area leading to the rail track is liable to considerable flooding. Many attempts have been made to alleviate this over the years with no success whatsoever. As far as I understand the main sewer runs on or parallel to the rail track. I feel that this could present problems I do not see a market for the project. Other facilities of a similar nature are struggling to carry on operating.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

No housing for this area.

Representation

* No mention is made of any further school provision. Both Lochardil and Holm primary have had to build additional units for nursery which have impacted upon recreational space available at the schools. We cannot keep adding extensions to these existing schools whilst we build more and more houses in this area. What primary school will be utilised for this new estate and have they got the capacity ? As far as secondary education how many students will the new IRA be able to accommodate and is it enough for the amount of development in Inverness south. As seen recently with other new build schools in Inverness within several years they have had to consider extensions. * The natural fields provide an important resource and enhance the beauty of the area for all those in Culduthel mains and Holm Dell. Deer are regularly viewed in this area. Wildlife will be shunted back with more development in the area. * It would be a real shame to loose agricultural land which appears to be used throughout the year. We should be trying to keep this for its original intended purpose. Why is this considered as "surplus land" ?

Allocated to

Customer Number 04529 Name Johanna Watt Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AL17 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Re AL17, Overhanging boundary trees, bushes have been blocking access to my home also I have phoned service point numerous times over the years about fly tipping on that ground only to be told the council could not do anything about. Please clear that litter and keep Alness tidy.

Allocated to Alness AL17 Alness Industrial Estate

Customer Number 04529 Name Johanna Watt Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AL17 Type Change

Comment Changes

Representation

Re AL17, Overhanging boundary trees, bushes have been blocking access to my home also I have phoned service point numerous times over the years about fly tipping on that ground only to be told the council could not do anything about. Please clear that litter and keep Alness tidy.

Allocated to Alness AL17 Alness Industrial Estate

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

It is difficult to give considered comment on something which gives little or no detail as to the type of homes that may be constructed however based on the scant information provided I would have to say that eight homes would appear to be rather excessive on a parcel of ground which was originally earmarked to accommodate only three houses. Further if the area marked out in red is accurate then it encroaches on to land which was part of the Castlehill Phase 2 estate and blocks off part of the pathway leading from Castlehill Park to Caulfield Road. This is a pleasant unspoiled parcel of land used by the local population to exercise their pets. There is also a varied wildlife including roe deer and various forms of birds predominately crows which inhabit the rookery in the established woodland close by and I can only presume that excessive building would only have a detrimental effect on the survival of all wildlife. Unless you can convince me otherwise and I look forward to your comments I would have to object to your proposal on the reasons I have stated.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Designate area for leisure centre

Representation

I am writing to make my objections known to The Highland Council's proposal to allocate the land in the centre of Conon Bridge for housing. The question of land ownership apart, there is a very strong case for developing the designated area for leisure use by the village. In its present form, it is neither good for agriculture nor for recreation. The population of Conon Bridge has grown rapidly over the past decade and the provision of adequate amenities in Conon Bridge has been an issue discussed in the village for quite some time. The publication of the latest Development Plan provides an opportunity to address this concern and put the necessary changes in place. I would like to invite The Highland Council to give careful consideration not only to a change in their designation of the area, but also to provide the community with help and support for its better use. If the village was to lose this parkland to housing, the opportunity to develop a significant green open space for recreational use where it is most needed, adjacent to the High Street and accessible to all, will be lost. I am sure that a good number of the people in the village would be keen to work with the Council to turn this vision into a reality.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Assumption of ownership of the playing field should be removed.

Representation

The assumption that the playing field in CB3 is owned by the Planning Authority is I believe an error. This land is still in the hands of the local Amenities Association.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Proposal to build 39 houses on this area.

Representation

This is green space at the centre of the village and should be retained as such. THC has wrongly assumed that they own the land presently occupied by the playing filed. It would be more appropriate to allocate this entire area for recreational uses and support the local community in developing as such.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the housing allocation FR1 removed from the Proposed Plan.

Representation

I would suggest that to designate the FR1 zone as a medium density development (an equivalence gleaned from Highland Council's Torvean and Ness-side development brief) , is no less than preposterous. The character of Rosemarkie is such that to build 50 houses on a 1.9 hectare site would be tantamount to vandalism on a grand scale. (The proposed Ness Gap extension in Fortrose (FR2) has 80 homes within a 5.9 ha site, a vastly reduced density when compared with the Rosemarkie proposals). The village already has natural boundaries, which are established by the shoreline, the surrounding topography and the less than satisfactory road network. When viewed on the plan, it is clear that planners are trying to inappropriately squeeze as many homes as they can into a very small area, which would destroy the character of that area of Rosemarkie. The proposal for FR1 actually looks like a "carbuncle" , which extends outwith the natural boundaries described above. I am equally concerned at the impact on infrastructure of the overall number of new houses proposed for Fortrose and Rosemarkie as a whole. In particular, none of the previously promised road or traffic management improvements have been implemented on the A832 road which already presents dangers to motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. Notwithstanding the main road traffic problems, little has been said of the access to Courthill Road from the A832, other than some vague notion of "stopping up" Courthill Road. Courthill Road is a single track road with no passing places - to increase the traffic flow would need a redesign of a very dangerous junction, as well as an upgrading of the road and drainage (of which there is none currently). It is my view that the designation for housing in FR1 should be removed, as it would destroy the character and boundaries of the village, and would be eventually used as a lever for pernicious creeping of the development further along the rear of the existing Courthill Road dwellings.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

A more realistic, lower growth scenario for the future of the plan area. A more detailed timetable for when growth will happen.

Representation

Disagrees that comments should be restricted to those directly relevant to the plan's content. Disputes that the plan's overall vision is realistic because there is no hard evidence that a growth in jobs and population will happen. Disputes that the necessary supporting infrastructure can ever be provided to service this level of growth. Believes that Scotland will not have enough resources in future to fund major infrastructure because of declining North Sea Oil revenues.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Section dealing with the development for housing of the land referenced NA8 should make it clear that development should only be allowed if and when the necessary road infrastructure is provided.

Representation

The Council, on 20 August 2013, rejected a planning application for 319 housing units on the same land. The rejection was founded on the inadequate road infrastructure surrounding the development. The revised version of the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan must reflect that refusal. Not to do so would leave the Council open to legal challenge and make a mockery of local democracy.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

DW6: Remove the business/tourism element.

Representation

It would be wrong to bring business use to a residential area with the potential increase in traffic that would inevitably result, access to the area via the one way system does not lent it self to this increase so would make the representation that the area should only be for residential use and that 10 houses would be the correct use for the planned area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Summary only, elaborated at Section 5. The IMFLDP should: (1) reaffirm that any allocation of land is subject to consideration of transport and infrastructure and any first phase should not exceed 250 units (NA8/9); (2) reflect Transport Scotland confirmation that a by-pass access to Nairn South is feasible in principle, specify grade-separated form at developer expense, and requirement to serve the sawmill (NA8/9); (3) state any future allocation of land or planning application to be subject of a structural open space review; the deliverability of any such facilities to give added separation to the sawmill; and confirm this as an action for supplementary guidance (NA8); (4) specify “a 20-30m set back of development from Balblair Road” (NA8/9); (5) state “avoidance of any adverse impact on the economic opportunities offered by the expansion of the sawmill, through the provision of all necessary mitigation measures to reduce noise levels at the mixed use allocation site; a buffer to separate any development at Nairn South from the sawmill expansion area to be provided by developers should be a minimum of 35m-wide” (NA12).

Representation

Ground of Objection Our client has participated fully in the Local Development Plan, the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan including in the “collaborative approach between all interested parties” the Council has promoted, and in the planning applications (11/04355/FUL) and (13/01276/PIP). Their interests are referred under the PLDP reference “INDUSTRY NA 12 Sawmill Expansion”, but are not adequately represented in that regard. The future of the sawmill is affected by development at Nairn South. This objection is to the PLDP provisions relating to NA8 and NA9. This objection should be read in conjunction with objections to NA8 and NA12 on behalf of John Gordon & Son. The Council is therefore fully aware of the critical impacts and potential conflicts that development at Nairn South poses for the future of the sawmill and the economy of Nairn. It is absolutely vital that appropriate provisions are made to safeguard the sawmill and its potential for development. Critical to this are (1) the operating effects of the sawmill, at present and as part of the proposed expansion, and the requirement on developers/landowners at Nairn South for an appropriate buffer, separation distance and noise attenuation measures; and (2) the need for developers/landowners at Nairn South to deal appropriately with the transportation requirements of the sawmill as an existing, long established strategic land use. In the light of two planning applications affecting land at Nairn South [one refused (11/04355/FUL) and one to be determined (13/01276/PIP)]; our client lodges the following grounds of objection to the PLDP. Nairn South (NA8 and NA9) Phasing and Transport

1. Land at Nairn South is phased 520 homes short term and 410 homes long term in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (PLDP). The same land in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan is phased 330 short term and 600 long term. 2. This phasing is controlled by the capacity of the existing road network that strictly limit (according to policy as set out in the HWLDP) a first phase to 250 houses. However, 520 houses as a first phase (as expressed in the PLDP) appears to set that policy and the decision recently to refuse a proposal for 319 houses (11/04355/FUL) for reasons relating to the capacity and capability of the local road network, aside. 3. There is no explanation for the serious discrepancy between the Council’s policy as referred in the HWLDP and as referred in the PLDP, in which provision is made (in the latter) to more than double the size of a first phase development at Nairn South; or the discrepancy between the policy in the PLDP and the Council’s decision to refuse planning permission for 319 houses. 4. The PLDP should reflect that decision of the Council to refuse; the land should not be allocated. That is the essence of the HWLDP (the development plan as approved in 2012) ie. that the allocation of land at Nairn South is subject to consideration of transport and infrastructure. It is not inconceivable that a further current planning application for 250 houses (13/01276/PIP) could be refused also. It therefore remains that if a “first phase” is to proceed, it needs to be found to be deliverable ahead of a new access to the A96(T) by pass. That is not proven and the PLDP is presumptuous in assuming that it can be. 5. The PLDP should be realistic and informative about the timing of a by-pass and - in the context of the limited options for strategic junctions to the A96(T) under consideration by Transport Scotland - that access to the by-pass is feasible at Nairn South, and can reasonably be sustained at developer cost (bearing in mind that these would already by dint of policy, include a pedestrian crossing of the railway and upgrading of the local road network, amongst other contributions). With a view to improving the accessibility of the business, John Gordon & Son has made representations to Transport Scotland in respect of its position as a significant traffic generator and an established existing user, as distinct from a developer from whom contributions might be sought 6. Further to the declaration in the PLDP para. 4.37 that “longer term development options at Nairn South are largely dependent on a vehicular access to the proposed A96(T) by-pass” the discrepancy above is placed in perspective by the HWLDP that anticipates 680 houses would require access from the proposed by-pass; and by the PLDP which reduces that critical mass to 420, ie. by almost 40%. The PLDP presents no justification for any of this or the implications it brings for added pressure on the existing road network linking Nairn South to the town centre

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments.

Page 363 of

The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

946

which caused refusal of 11/04355/FUL. 7. The phasing, scale and timing of development at Nairn South has particular significance for John Gordon & Son because these determine (1) the positioning and proximity of future residential (or other occupiers) in relation to the sawmill expansion area; (2) the extent of a “buffer area” (see objection to NA8) and the magnitude/intensity of potential future complaint; and (3) the capability of a later (longer term) phase of development to support a connection to a by-pass and thus a substantive improvement in access to and from the sawmill. 8. In that regard, the allocation of land at Nairn South for mixed uses but primarily housing (and any planning permission that would derive as a result) will have a profound impact on the sawmill, by defining its potential for expansion per se and land-locking the site for all time; thus allowing no further scope for expansion beyond the present allocation of 5.1 ha. (NA12). The risk to the sawmill operations and expansion intensifies with the commencement of development at Nairn South. As a result, the development plan is crucial in establishing the terms that inform the location and proximity of development at Nairn South (see objection to NA8 paras. 7-10). 9. The above factors would justify a review of the principle of an “allocation” at Nairn South and any phasing of it, since the PLDP is intended to reflect the availability of land and deliverability of development. In light of the refusal of planning permission (11/04355/FUL); the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should be assimilating the implications of that decision. If Nairn South cannot reasonably be delivered to the extent and in the terms the development plan intended; then the land should not be allocated. In any event, the policy provisions for development, phasing and access/transport at Nairn South in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan are not coherent or consistent with the aspirations that Nairn South is served from an A96(T) by-pass. The viability of a major allocation for expansion (short or long term) at Nairn South, deserves much closer scrutiny and may have no place in the development plan at this time. Recommendation: In view of the integration of the Nairn South provisions NA8 and NA9 with one another and the A96(T) by-pass and their implications for the sawmill (NA12), the following recommendations arise from the objections lodged on behalf of John Gordon & Son in relation to NA8 and NA9 and the representation in relation to NA12; each is applicable as relevant to the appropriate PLDP allocation: (1) In accordance with the Highland-wide Local Development Plan any provision within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should recognise that the allocation of land at Nairn South is subject to consideration of transport and infrastructure; and that the unexplained increase in a first phase of development from 250 to 520 units should be corrected in that context and explained in relation to aspirations for an access to Nairn South from an A96(T) by-pass (see (2) below). (2) In view of the decision to refuse planning permission for (11/04355/FUL), any phasing plan for land at Nairn South should be subject to: (a) shared understanding with Transport Scotland that an access serving Nairn South is feasible in principle and clear specification given in the development plan of the grade-separated form of any A96 intersection at developer expense; and that; (b) that principle takes into account the consideration to be given by Transport Scotland to the access requirements of the sawmill (as invited by Transport Scotland). (3) In view of the decision to refuse planning permission (11/04355/FUL); the recommendations (1) and (2) above and the objectives of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Strategic Masterplan in relation to “a buffer area” and residential amenity, any future allocation of land at Nairn South or planning application should be subject to a review of the requirements for structural open space (playing fields) in the context of major growth proposals for the town as a whole; the deliverability of any such requirements on land at Nairn South in view of the added separation (ie. beyond a 35m wide dedicated earth-bund) that could afford to the sawmill and future residents; and that that should be an action the planning authority will undertake and publish as supplementary guidance as necessary. (4) In view of the inadequate attention given thus far to Balblair Road, the development plan should state (NA8/NA9) that “a 20-30m set back of development from Balblair Road in the interests of residential amenity and any requirement for upgrading that route, will be sought as part of any proposals”. (5) The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should follow the provisions in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan and the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan, and reference should be specifically made to avoiding any potential impact on the expansion of the sawmill. In that regard and in view also of the decision in relation to (11/04355/FUL) and the recommendation therein; NA8 “Requirements” should also state “avoidance of any adverse impact on the economic opportunities offered by the expansion of the sawmill, through the provision of all necessary mitigation measures to reduce noise levels at the mixed use allocation site; a buffer to separate any development at Nairn South from the sawmill to be provided by developers should be a minimum of 35m-wide”.

Allocated to	Nairn	General	General	
--------------	-------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Summary only, elaborated at Section 5. The IMFLDP should: (1) reaffirm that any allocation of land is subject to consideration of transport and infrastructure and any first phase should not exceed 250 units (NA8/9); (2) reflect Transport Scotland confirmation that a by-pass access to Nairn South is feasible in principle, specify grade-separated form at developer expense, and requirement to serve the sawmill (NA8/9); (3) state any future allocation of land or planning application to be subject of a structural open space review; the deliverability of any such facilities to give added separation to the sawmill; and confirm this as an action for supplementary guidance (NA8); (4) specify “a 20-30m set back of development from Balblair Road” (NA8/9); (5) state “avoidance of any adverse impact on the economic opportunities offered by the expansion of the sawmill, through the provision of all necessary mitigation measures to reduce noise levels at the mixed use allocation site; a buffer to separate any development at Nairn South from the sawmill expansion area to be provided by developers should be a minimum of 35m-wide” (NA8).

Representation

Grounds of Objection Our client has participated fully in the Local Development Plan, the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan including in the “collaborative approach between all interested parties” the Council has promoted, and in the planning applications (11/04355/FUL) and (13/01276/PIP). Their interests are referred under the PLDP reference “INDUSTRY NA 12 Sawmill Expansion”, but are not adequately represented in that regard. The future of the sawmill is affected by development at Nairn South. This objection is to the PLDP provisions relating to NA8 and NA9. This objection should be read in conjunction with objections to NA8 and NA12 on behalf of John Gordon & Son. The Council is therefore fully aware of the critical impacts and potential conflicts that development at Nairn South poses for the future of the sawmill and the economy of Nairn. It is absolutely vital that appropriate provisions are made to safeguard the sawmill and its potential for development. Critical to this are (1) the operating effects of the sawmill, at present and as part of the proposed expansion, and the requirement on developers/landowners at Nairn South for an appropriate buffer, separation distance and noise attenuation measures; and (2) the need for developers/landowners at Nairn South to deal appropriately with the transportation requirements of the sawmill as an existing, long established strategic land use. In the light of two planning applications affecting land at Nairn South [one refused (11/04355/FUL) and one to be determined (13/01276/PIP)]; our client lodges the following grounds of objection to the PLDP. Nairn South (NA8) 1. The allocation of land at Nairn South for mixed uses but primarily housing (and any planning permission that would derive as a result) will have a profound impact on the sawmill, by defining its potential for expansion per se and land-locking the site for all time. Consequently, and as a result of operational emissions including from noise and transport which are integral to the sawmill, the proximity of future (residential and other) occupiers could constrain the business and its prospects for expansion. 2. Notwithstanding the Strategic Masterplan, there are three factors that, in the course of the representations John Gordon & Son has made, have not been fully considered and/or assimilated to the extent that the sawmill is adequately protected. These are matters that have either not - it is believed - been considered from the outset; or have emerged in the latter stages of the Strategic Masterplan and subsequent to it. 3. These therefore remain factors for the Local Development Plan since they refer to the use of land and policy. In that regard, it is not satisfactory that the PLDP requires “development in accordance with Nairn South Strategic Masterplan”. Expansion - Uses 4. The PLDP should state - in view of the sawmill activities, its heavy industrial nature and the provision being made in three successive development plans (Nairnshire Local Plan, Highland-wide Local Development Plan and Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan) for expansion - that adequate separation of residential and other development from the south-west edge of the land allocated for expansion of the sawmill, should be a prerequisite of development proposals at Nairn South. 5. In that regard, no material change has occurred in the layout and extent of (11/04355/FUL) and (13/01276/PIP) since pre-application consultation; and these proposals continue to feed roads into a “buffer area” such that it could serve development beyond the 250 and 319 dwellings proposed. Uses other than residential are not immune to noise, nor according to the position of the environmental health authority, immune to raising complaint, against which the Council is obliged to act. 6. It is essential therefore that in addition to the provision the Strategic Masterplan makes for a buffer and noise mitigation by developers, that any other reasonable planning outcomes which could reduce the potential for conflict between any future occupiers at Nairn South and the sawmill, are fully and properly accounted for and implemented. Noise/Buffer 7. The PLDP does not refer to a “buffer area” at all either in relation to Nairn South (NA8/NA9) or the sawmill (NA12); whereas it refers to other “requirements” which were also part of the Strategic Masterplan. That is selective and inconsistent. The “buffer area” is - in the context of Nairn South and the separation it could give to residential development by a 35m-wide earth-bund which was recommended as a condition had (11/04355/FUL) been approved - a strategic land use. As the

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

Strategic Masterplan refers, the responsibility rests with developers at Nairn South to recognise the uses in the existing sawmill and its expansion area, and deal with their effects to the extent that will (as the planning authority declares in its Strategic Masterplan Representations Appendix) “...prevent future complaints of noise nuisance...”. 8. Notwithstanding, the environmental health authority whilst setting the parameters for developer mitigation is unable to guarantee that any future complaint in the interests of residential amenity may not lead to action against the perpetrator of that nuisance ie. the sawmill, in terms that could constrain its operation, operating hours and any proposed use of the land allocated for expansion. That is a very significant risk that undermines a business investing substantial sums in the local economy and supporting 100 jobs. The sawmill is and has been the subject of complaint and action by the environmental health authority. 9. The circumstances arising from refusal of (11/04355/FUL) offer an opportunity to redress that matter in terms that are practical and efficient, and sustainable use of land. It is not clear that any of the underpinnings of the development plan (but certainly not the Strategic Masterplan) - all of which provide for substantial urban expansion of Nairn (upwards of 2,000 houses) - include any assessment of the need for structural recreational open space. 10. Nairn is not overly provided for in sports pitches and land adjacent to a “buffer area” could provide extra set back for development at Nairn South whilst being identified for structural playing fields. There is no evidence that that exercise has been done in the interests of the recreational needs of the town. If such facilities were provided adjacent to a “buffer”, it would also, importantly for the sawmill and future Nairn South occupiers, lessen the prospect that its operations might be incompatible and raise nuisance concerns that could be damaging to the prosperity of the business, Nairn and the local economy. Transport - Balblair Road Set Back 11. Balblair Road will not function as a residential street. It will be an urban distributor route with a special role carrying up to 130 HGV movements per day expected to rise to 165 when approved expansion plans are fully operating. The principles of a set back of residential development from Balblair Road, separated by strong landscaping, should have been an essential precedent for the masterplan, but does not appear to have been considered further to John Gordon & Son representations dated 3rd September 2012 and 8th March 2013. 12. This set back should form an appropriate green corridor either side to minimise the impact of intense, regular daily HGV movement on residential amenity and to enable any necessary upgrading, improvement or widening of the route. Such corridors through urban areas in Highland including Nairn extend to 20-30m either side of a distributor route ie. the existing A96. The potential for sawmill traffic - at the volume and frequency proposed - to cause nuisance to occupiers, and vibration to nearby buildings should not be underestimated. A forward planning exercise should recognise that and seek to mitigate, and in this case the development plan should seek to achieve a layout and design of any residential (or other) proposal that is sensitive to these considerations. Recommendation: In view of the integration of the Nairn South provisions NA8 and NA9 with one another and the A96(T) by-pass and their implications for the sawmill (NA12), the following recommendations arise from the objections lodged on behalf of John Gordon & Son in relation to NA8 and NA9 and the representation in relation to NA12; each is applicable as relevant to the appropriate PLDP allocation: (1) In accordance with the Highland-wide Local Development Plan any provision within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should recognise that the allocation of land at Nairn South is subject to consideration of transport and infrastructure; and that the unexplained increase in a first phase of development from 250 to 520 units should be corrected in that context and explained in relation to aspirations for an access to Nairn South from an A96(T) by-pass (see (2) below). (2) In view of the decision to refuse planning permission for (11/04355/FUL), any phasing plan for land at Nairn South should be subject to: (a) shared understanding with Transport Scotland that an access serving Nairn South is feasible in principle and clear specification given in the development plan of the grade-separated form of any A96 intersection at developer expense; and that; (b) that principle takes into account the consideration to be given by Transport Scotland to the access requirements of the sawmill (as invited by Transport Scotland). (3) In view of the decision to refuse planning permission (11/04355/FUL); the recommendations (1) and (2) above and the objectives of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Strategic Masterplan in relation to “a buffer area” and residential amenity, any future allocation of land at Nairn South or planning application should be subject to a review of the requirements for structural open space (playing fields) in the context of major growth proposals for the town as a whole; the deliverability of any such requirements on land at Nairn South in view of the added separation (ie. beyond a 35m wide dedicated earth-bund) that could afford to the sawmill and future residents; and that that should be an action the planning authority will undertake and publish as supplementary guidance as necessary. (4) In view of the inadequate attention given thus far to Balblair Road, the development plan should state (NA8/NA9) that “a 20-30m set back of development from Balblair Road in the interests of residential amenity and any requirement for upgrading that route, will be sought as part of any proposals”. (5) The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should follow the provisions in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan and the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan, and reference should be specifically made to avoiding any potential impact on the expansion of the sawmill. In that regard and in view also of the decision in relation to (11/04355/FUL) and the recommendation therein; NA8 “Requirements” should also state “avoidance of any adverse impact on the economic opportunities offered by the expansion of the sawmill, through the provision of all necessary mitigation measures to reduce noise levels at the mixed use allocation site; a buffer to separate any development at Nairn South from the sawmill to be provided by developers should be a minimum of 35m-wide”.

Allocated to	Nairn	NA8	Nairn South	
--------------	-------	-----	-------------	--

Customer Number 01031 Name John Gordon And Son Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Administrator Yvonne Macdonald G H Johnston Building Consultants

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA12 Type Change

Comment Changes

The IMFLDP should: state under NA12 (Requirements) "avoidance of any adverse impact on the economic opportunities offered by the expansion of the sawmill, through the provision of all necessary mitigation measures to reduce noise levels at the mixed use allocation site; a buffer to separate any development at Nairn South from the sawmill expansion area to be provided by developers should be a minimum of 35m-wide".

Representation

Grounds of Objection Our client has participated fully in the Local Development Plan, the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan including in the "collaborative approach between all interested parties" the Council has promoted, and in the planning applications (11/04355/FUL) and (13/01276/PIP). Their interests are referred under the PLDP reference "INDUSTRY NA 12 Sawmill Expansion", but are not adequately represented in that regard. The future of the sawmill is affected by development at Nairn South. This objection is to the PLDP provisions relating to NA8 and NA9. This objection should be read in conjunction with objections to NA8 and NA12 on behalf of John Gordon & Son. The Council is therefore fully aware of the critical impacts and potential conflicts that development at Nairn South poses for the future of the sawmill and the economy of Nairn. It is absolutely vital that appropriate provisions are made to safeguard the sawmill and its potential for development. Critical to this are (1) the operating effects of the sawmill, at present and as part of the proposed expansion, and the requirement on developers/landowners at Nairn South for an appropriate buffer, separation distance and noise attenuation measures; and (2) the need for developers/landowners at Nairn South to deal appropriately with the transportation requirements of the sawmill as an existing, long established strategic land use. In the light of two planning applications affecting land at Nairn South [one refused (11/04355/FUL) and one to be determined (13/01276/PIP)]; our client lodges the following grounds of objection to the PLDP. Recommendation The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should follow the provisions in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan and the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan, and reference should be specifically made to avoiding any potential impact on the expansion of the sawmill. In that regard and in view also of the decision in relation to (11/04355/FUL) and the recommendation therein; NA8 "Requirements" should also state "avoidance of any adverse impact on the economic opportunities offered by the expansion of the sawmill, through the provision of all necessary mitigation measures to reduce noise levels at the mixed use allocation site; a buffer to separate any development at Nairn South from the sawmill to be provided by developers should be a minimum of 35m-wide".

Allocated to Nairn NA12 Sawmill expansion

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Development of Ardersier would require more than building housing on various greenfield sites, the village at present lacks suitable amenities for children & adults, there is no community hub where sports can be played indoors etc later in the day. would the increase in population push the council to provide a suitable sports facility for the existing residence along with the proposed increase?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

IN 49 Bogbain West My wife and I were shocked to discover that such a development is possibly going to take place in such a beautiful and natural area. My wife and I walk our dogs there regularly and we frequently see deer, foxes and badgers as well as many beautiful birds. As well as this many other people enjoy this area for cycling jogging and walking. I do not see the need to develop an area of wild moorland like this which has not changed for hundreds of years and which is of considerable amenity value to the whole community of Milton of Leys. If there is a need for more housing at Milton of Leys, why can a suitable brown field site not be sought out and developed. With over a thousand homes at Milton of Leys already if this development goes ahead is there not a danger of over urbanisation. My wife and I strongly oppose this proposed development.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04098 Name John M MacIntosh Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG12 Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove IG12 from plan as problems with smelter, when working with fallout as animals bones breaking.

Representation

Sufficient industry capacity in Invergordon already and not used. Loss of agricultural land and prone to flooding in winter. Existing road access, as not allowed new access from A9. Problems with junction at Tomich premature with plans as industry too close to houses.

Allocated to Invergordon IG12 Delny

Customer Number 04438 Name John M MacIntosh Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alan Ogilvie G H Johnston Building Consultants

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG12 Type Change

Comment Changes

Insert in requirements section the need to maintain a buffer area of at least 150 metres setback from the A9 Trunk Road.

Representation

We act for Mr John MacIntosh of Broomhill, Invergordon an area that is bounded by this major industrial site allocation. We write to question how much longer the local development plan should continue to safeguard land for this purpose. We understand that this was originally a site of national importance safeguarded in national planning guidance at a time when the government sought to attract significant inward and heavily public subsidised investment. This approach brought the smelter to Invergordon which proved not to be sustainable. Other similar major developments in other parts of the country like pulp and paper mills, Far Eastern electronics factories and car manufacturing plants have all come and gone in the last 30 to 40 years. Whilst our client understands the need provide land for major employment uses, development of the scale that this land at Delny is safeguarded for will have a significant impact upon the local environment, not least at Broomhill Farm. In this regard one requirement that the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan included was a landscape buffer area of 150 metres from the A9 Trunk Road. We note that this requirement is now excluded from the allocation at IG12 and we question why this is so. At least this would help provide some buffering to Broomhill and we request that this is restored.

Allocated to Invergordon IG12 Delny

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Allocate 0.26 ha of land North East of Shore Street, Shandwick with a capacity of 5 houses. 2. Indicate requirements for reflecting pattern of surrounding development, setback from coastal path, a landscaping scheme, a Flood Risk Assessment and maintain peripheral path links to the coastal path and beach.

Representation

Section 5 We act for Mr John MacIntosh, owner of 0.35 ha of land at the north end of Shandwick within the Seaboard Villages Settlement Development Area (SDA). This is outlined on the attached location plan and an over-marked copy of the Seaboard Villages Inset Map. The land is identified as Amenity in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (R&CELP). We now note that in the Proposed Local Development Plan it forms part of the odd shaped proposed Open Space designation varying in width between the existing built up area and the shore. Our client is concerned that this designation implies that it is in public ownership and that it is freely available for people to wander across it or for other recreational purposes. The site slopes gently eastwards from a line of houses on Park Street and the east part of the site is protected from the shore by a dune feature. To the east is the coastal footpath and to the south is a public car park with path to the beach. There are informal path links from Park Street and Shore Street to the beach along the north east and south peripheries of the land. It sits at between 4 and 6 metres above sea level. Mr MacIntosh purchased this land from the local estate long before the R&CELP was prepared and specific amenity land or open space designations were placed on it. This was with the intention of bringing forward proposals for a small scale infill housing development including a home for his retirement. Mr MacIntosh currently lives and farms land at Broomhill, Invergordon, which is adjacent to the large scale industrial land allocation at Delny (IG12 in the Proposed Plan). He does not wish to live with the continued prospect and significant impact of that development on his doorstep in his retirement. As such, he seeks to build a home for himself on his land at Shandwick, which will also be feasible with additional plots. This form of development proposed is in keeping with other similar developments undertaken in the last 30 years on the seaward side of the village's main street between Balintore harbour and the south end of Shandwick. In that time the availability of such plots has helped to meet the local demand for low cost one off plot developments and, in the case of Harbour View, other housing needs in the area. This development opportunity contrasts with the larger land allocations such as at Murray View (SB1), East of the Primary School (SB2) and North East of the Cemetery (SB3), which all require more extensive servicing and have been or are more expensive to develop. In this regard it is no surprise that the rate of development on these sites, which have been allocated in successive development plans in the last 30 or more years, has been very slow. The only land allocated for development in Shandwick, south of Shore Street (SB4 for Mixed Use), also requires significant investment in overall servicing. Whereas there are public sewers and a water main already passing through Mr MacIntosh's land and it has access to the public road and other services. The Proposed Plan at paragraph 4.166 states that "with the renewed vigour of the employment market in the area, the Seaboard Villages has a key role to play in meeting the demand for housing for the in migration of skilled workers to the area." Then at 4.168, "Development in the village has largely been in the form of infill development in recent times however, a number of planning permissions have been secured on larger sites prior to the economic down turn. These sites remain suitable for development and will meet the existing and future needs and demands for the villages. As such there is no need to identify any significant areas for future expansion." The point we make in relation to these paragraphs is that if the demand is on the increase and more recent demand for housing development was met in the form of infill despite the availability and permissions on larger sites, there is still a need to identify small scale opportunities to meet demand locally. The availability of smaller scale infill sites within the such as Mr MacIntosh's or the previously approved and R&CELP allocated site 3 north of Park Street, offer a choice of locations and scale or be "significant areas for future expansion." In light of the above we feel that inclusion of Mr MacIntosh's land as a housing development opportunity or at least as an unallocated infill site within the Local Development Plan would be in keeping with the existing settlement pattern whereby the precedent has already been set for development of a second line of houses between the main village street and the shore or dune system. In addition, it would not extend the built up area any closer to the shore than existing development or extend the SDA in any other direction. Furthermore, it would not have a significant landscape impact if built to a similar height to adjacent houses or represent a significant loss of informal amenity "open space" between the main street and the shore. In terms of the potential for development we consider that the site has capacity for 4 or 5 houses. While the form and layout of development would be matters for a detailed design brief or planning application some general guidance or requirements could be indicated in the Local Development Plan. This includes siting houses to reflect the pattern of adjacent houses, but far enough apart from these to minimise impact on their outlook and amenity. The eastern site boundary would also be set back from the coastal path and the intervening land made available for public open space. In more detail, houses could also be set back from the dune feature

to minimise visual impact and maintain it as a natural landscape feature. One house could be sited on the higher western part of the site with a frontage to the adjacent single track public road, in line with the adjacent house, Marhaba. The other houses could be sited parallel to the shoreline with the same orientation as the traditional row of houses fronting Shore Street. Access to these could be taken via a private road from a point just north of No 10 Shore Street, to maximise visibility. To illustrate these points we attach a number of plans and photographs of the site and nearby development in Shandwick and Balintore. We also appreciate that the proximity of the site to the coast and only being a few metres above sea level there will be a requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. This would be consistent with the requirement for site SB4 to the south of Shore Street and will help clarify whether there is a risk from coastal flooding

Allocated to Seaboard Villages General General

Customer Number 04294 Name John Machin Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN44 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduction of allocation

Representation

This representation is made on behalf of myself and my wife. The proposed IMFLDP shows, on pages 43 and 44, the numbers of houses allocated for sites IN42 to IN45. These appear to be formulaically obtained by multiplying an area by a density of 20 per hectare. For site IN44, IMFLDP gives an area of 6.7Ha. However, the notice (8.1.08) refusing an appeal about this area refers to the reporter's impression of 4.6Ha agreeing reasonably with the area proposed for housing and roads in the appealed application. Therefore, the figure in IMFLDP appears to be too high by 2.1Ha. and the appropriate formulaic allocation ought to be 92 houses. We think that the decision to allocate site IN44 for 134 homes is based on a false premise about the area developable. On the actual developable area, the density would be 29 per hectare, a grossly excessive figure, particularly for such a significantly sloping site. An agent for the owner of this land responded to the council's call for sites on 29.04.11 with a submission (ref. INV78) which noted the following: • existing low density housing to the north of the site (site analysis) • approximate site fall 1:14 (site analysis) • a developable area of 4.6 Ha (movement framework). The agent noted that a planning application (08/00613) for the same site was under consideration at that time. That was for 131 houses and was subsequently refused on 16.11.12, one of the several grounds being a layout which was considered an overdevelopment of the site. The submission (ref.INV78) was for either 120 or, if the existing house site were to be changed, 125 units. The unit mix was stated as 34 affordable 2 storey "townhouses", 77 "linked / semi-detached" 2 storey houses" and 9 plots for 1½ storey houses. The layout plan appears to show 107 units, comprising 32 "townhouses", 66 "linked / semi-detached" and 9 plots, accommodated in what "could be considered as a cul de sac layout". We appreciate that the layout plan is purely indicative. Nevertheless, even with 107 units, an overall density of 23 per hectare, it conveys an impression of houses so tightly packed as to assume a terraced appearance. This tends to support a lower figure of 92 units as more appropriate. The very concentrated, terraced 2 storey townhouses are placed at the part of the site nearest to existing low density housing, none of which exceeds 1½ storeys and one of which is a listed building. It would seem appropriate that the density be reduced here. The site also bounds to the north-east with a green buffer zone which is rural in character. It appears to us desirable that the density of buildings should be reduced towards this also. Such a sympathetic approach is well exemplified in the Briargrove estate, particularly Briargrove Drive and Gardens which are adjacent to the Inshes Burn and blend well with the ten properties off West Drive and West Park. No good reason is apparent not to locate higher density housing on the south-west of IN44, near to the remaining designated development area (IN 42, IN43 and IN45) at Inshes. This would prevent an undesirable concentration of high density housing all around IN53.

Allocated to South Inverness IN44 Inshes Small Holdings (north)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As our house 'Roebank' is going to be built all around with the purposed development of 'IG2' it would make more sense that the Council would purchase the property and incorporate it into their plans, as any future development will certainly hinder our plans to put our house on the market next year, as I have now reached 81 years of age.

Representation

Reasons as stated above

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Principle access to site. (secured)?

Representation

The principle site access is NOT secured. The proposed access is running through my land (see plan enclosed). I own 1.7 mtr of the area and without any discussion from anyone. These proposals are not correct. I am not prepared to sell, or allow any site access through my land. Any access to the proposed site should be through the existing development on site KH3.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

NO DEVELOPMENT in the NA8 (Nairn South) area until the difficulties outlined in Section 5 have ALL been RESOLVED (changes made, not just plans, proposals or ideas)

Representation

Talk about flogging a dead horse! Do the planners at the Highland Council not remember that just a few weeks ago the latest in a series of planning applications for development of the NA8 area was soundly rejected by the people of Nairn? And that was all the town's residents, not just the neighbours. The town's residents are not against the concept of development per se, but if, and only if, a sound case for it can be put forward. But, there should be NO DEVELOPMENT IN THE NA8 AREA until, AT LEAST: 1) Nairn bypass is COMPLETE, 2) the problem of the road bottleneck at the railway station is SOLVED, 3) traffic flow to/from Nairn hospital is RESOLVED, 4) School capacity can cope (it can't - more schools must be built FIRST), 5) hospital capacity can cope (it can't with the present size of the hospital - the hospital must have more capacity FIRST), and 6) the people of Nairn are convinced that development in the NA8 area is in NAIRN'S BEST INTERESTS (not just a planner's dream of allowing development where none can logically, economically and practicaly be a demonstratable sound proposition). Try to do a little joined-up thinking for a change! If the rest of the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan is as poorly thought through as this small section (NA8) was, the planner's efforts will be laughed out of court by the people who live anywhere near. Planning for hundreds (thousands?) of new homes without the demonstrable prospects of employment for the owners/tenants is just wishful thinking. The modern world has changed in the last few years, and the prospects for a return to the glory days of huge development prospects are very small. There will be growth, but not on anything like the scale of past decades. Plan (if you must) for REALISTIC growth - very slow and very limited - in the next decade or so. Graniose plans, such as this one, are not what the punters want, or need. Get real, you guys, and look to see where the world is headed - and it isn't to a place where plans such as this make any sense!

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to see "Camper Vans, House, Office and Shop" added to the proposal as at the moment it seems worded to limit development to Caravans and Toilet/Changing block only

Representation

I think the above ie "Camper Vans, House, Office and Shop" need to be added at this stage to avoid any problems or difficulties later when full planning is applied for. They are after all a standard requirement in such a development.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04001 Name John Ross Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.87

Reference AR5 South of Cromal Terrace, Ardersier Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

I would like to support this plan as written. It is an obvious compromise to previous proposals and as such should go ahead.

Allocated to Ardersier AR5 South of Cromal Terrace

Customer Number 04000 Name John Ross Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.87

Reference Site Ref AR6 North of Ardersier/ Tourism/Business Type Change

Comment Changes

As it stands the proposal states that development is limited to Caravan accomodation and changing block. I would specifically like the words "Manager's House/Office and Shop" added to avoid future difficulties and/or objections that may arise when my planning application proper is considered.

Representation

Obviously if the proposed development is left in the IMFLDP as the wording stands at present I may perhaps have future difficulty adding a House/Office/Shop for approval in the future. A Touring Caravan Park and changing block will have to be administered from somewhere ajacent. I am more than willing to discuss the proposed nature of "House/Office/Shop" and will take on board any suggestions from Planning Dept and any other concerned parties

Allocated to Ardersier AR6 North of village

Customer Number 04017 Name John Sehar Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.75

Reference IMFLDP/PP/NN Site MO4 Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like the site containers moved from outside of my house, street lights and the road completed prior to the developer being allowed to continue developing.

Representation

My family bought a home from this developer in March 2010, at this time we were told that the containers would be removed from our view. We were also assured their would be lighting outside our property. I raised an issue with the grates on the road and our cars, they put some tar around the grates outside my property nearly three years ago but have done nothing with the road since.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO4 Ord Hill

Customer Number 04509 Name John Sharkey Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Removal of allocation CB3

Representation

I hope this mail is not too late to be included in the consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. I understand that the plan lays out a zone for housing development on the playing field in Conon Bridge. I object to this on the basis that this facility is a considerable asset to the community of Conon Bridge. Community based projects have been based on this field and once lost, this area can never be regained. This objection is in my name and my wife Susan

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish to see the Council withdraw the proposal to allocate land to build 75 houses at site IN49 (Bogbain West).

Representation

The loch within this site is the only area of standing water within close proximity to the current housing development at Milton of Leys. The loch is a significant breeding site for frogs and toads, species which are in decline both locally and nationally. Any development of housing nearby would inevitably mean the site would be lost as a breeding area for them. Further amphibian interest may also be present in the form of newts. The loch also has a significant growth of reeds during the summer and may therefore be a breeding area for birds. An environmental assessment should be carried out as a matter of urgency to confirm the conservation status of the loch. The proximity of the loch to the local school would make it ideal for environmental education. This has a central role in the new Curriculum for Excellence and the loch should be utilised for this purpose rather than destroying its interest by building yet more houses alongside. In addition, I believe the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of the area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. The land on which the development is proposed is much used by the local community for a range of outdoor activities and should be protected for current and future generations.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Remove IN32 from IMFLDP (assumed)

Representation

I wish to object to the field being used for housing for the following reasons: 1. The field is currently used for training prospective young farmers. The field is near the farm and is an asset to the college. It would mean yet another loss to the fast depleting farm lands. 2. Wildlife from nearby woods would be deprived of their feeding grounds. 3. The Essich Road is unsuitable for extra traffic, particularly near the Essich Roundabout, it could cause considerable hold- ups for residents in the area getting in and out of their housing estates on Essich Road. 4. School children will be put at higher risk getting to and from school. There are insufficient crossings and there will be considerably more traffic.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Our clients wish to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use.

Representation

Continued from previous Comment 1 Please find enclosed an indicative sketch layout showing details of the proposals for the site and how it can be delivered. The proposed development will incorporate a new access point to the site at the existing roundabout. This proposed access will be extended through the site to provide access to the consented 5 a-side sports complex and provide a formal entrance into the District Park. Parking provision will be provided at the site that will service the proposed community and commercial uses at the site. In addition this could also be utilised as over-spill parking for the sports complex and primary school. We believe this is of multiple-benefit to residents, visitors and to Highland Council in terms of delivering a solution to the matters outlined by the Council in the Main Issues Report response. In accordance with the Proposed Layout for the District Park we propose to provide boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. This will have the additional effect of 'rounding off' Inshes District Park and containing the parkland and its managed recreational open space within. An area for the provision for formal recreational activity will be provided, this may be classified within Class 10 or 11 of the Use Classes Order. This will enhance the amenity value of the site and comply with the Council's aspirations for the park. In order to enable these requirements to be achieved and assist the Council in delivering their proposals for Inshes District Park an element of commercial development will be required. We are proposing to include a 1,000 sq m commercial unit at the site. It is proposed that this unit can be used for Classes 2, 3, 4, 10 or 11 use. It could offer services relating to the proposed managed recreational open space such as indoor and outdoor sports or uses compatible with the existing surrounding land uses. We trust that the above comments will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the Local Development Plan and that the Council will allocate this site for commercial and community use. It would be appreciated that you contact either Neil Gray (Associate Director, Colliers International) or Kerri McGuire (Principal Planner, Graham and Sibbald) on the details provided, in the event that you wish to discuss these proposed changes to the Proposed Plan. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04419 Name Joint submission on behalf of Mr and Mrs Gra Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Kerri McGuire Graham And Sibbald

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN61 Type Change

Comment Changes

Our clients wish to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use.

Representation

Following on from our pervious comments, we have prepared an indicative completed site plan and indicative landscape plan to demonstrate how the commercial/community uses can be delivered at the site.

Allocated to South Inverness IN61 Inshes Park

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Our client wishes to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use.

Representation

This is a joint submission prepared by the above landowners' agents Colliers International and Graham and Sibbald. The submission of these representations presents a joint approach by both landowners to demonstrate that the site (as per attached red line boundary and indicative masterplan) is a deliverable and viable commercial opportunity. The proposed development of the site can assist the Council in achieving their aspirations for Inshes District Park. Our clients wish to object to the exclusion of this site as a commercial development allocation in the Proposed Plan. We request that this site is allocated for commercial/community use in the emerging Local Development Plan. The subject site lies vacant, positioned on the northern edge of Inshes District Park and adjacent to Inshes Primary School. It presently offers no amenity value or economic benefit to the local area and it is not in the ownership of Highland Council who is leading the completion of Inshes District Park. Our clients fully support the Council's proposals for Inshes District Park. However, this land has been allocated for community use/park use for a number of years without being delivered. We have undertaken a review of the Council's Proposed Layout for Inshes District Park. The proposals for this area of land include the creation of access to the adjacent consented 5 a-side sports complex and boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. The remainder of the site has no specific requirement indicated in the Council's Proposed Layout, suggesting this will be utilised as open space. We consider that there is an opportunity to support the proposals for Inshes District Park by combining delivery of the Council's requirements for this site alongside delivery of the proposed commercial use in a complimentary fashion which does not impact on local residential amenity or detract from the parkland setting of this part of the District Park. It would offer a solution to Highland Council in enabling a formal entrance to the Park from the north edge, along with car parking for shared-needs and parkland boundary edge planting to 'finish off' the Park setting itself. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Both landowners previously promoted this site for commercial use at the Call for Sites and Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The site was not identified at the MIR as a preferred site for commercial use. As detailed in both parties' comments submitted at the MIR consultation stage, this site was promoted for commercial use (retail, commercial, business or leisure). In the assessment of the site at the MIR stage, the Council identified the commercial visibility of the site due to the nearby compatible uses. It was also identified that the site was flat and developable. The Council's concerns in relation to this site are due to loss of greenspace and the requirement for the creation of an entrance to the Inshes District Park. The Council also considers that there is restricted capacity of local road network. In terms of loss of greenspace, this site currently offers no amenity value and is not utilised by local residents. There have also been episodes of unlawful occupation of the site by travelling people. This representation puts forward a proposal that would allow the Council's aspirations for Inshes District Park to be delivered along with a commercial use at the site which is demonstrated in this submission to be compatible with the park land setting and benefit to the local and wider community. In terms of the restricted capacity of local road network, this site is in an easily accessible location that can be accessed by foot, cycle and public transport as well as private car. The proposals put forward in this representation and the submitted indicative layout will be for the benefit of the surrounding local residents. Given the small scale of the proposal and the proposed retail and commercial development at Inshes Retail Park, it is unclear why the capacity of the local road network is a particular concern for this site. The comments made to the proposed Lidl store by the Council's Roads Department did not indicate any capacity issues that would impact on the development of this site. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site R8 the Council states that: "The safeguarding and development of Inshes Park is a considerable achievement in working with the private developers and the community. However, the lack of suitable "gateway" entrance on its northern and most public frontage is a drawback which is why this land has been allocated as part of the Park for many years and successfully defended as such against alternative retail proposals at application/appeal. There has been no material change in circumstance since these decisions to justify a different approach. The respondent's claim of consolidating the City and allowing the expansion of the Inshes district centre are spurious given the availability of vacant land within the Inshes centre and in other commerce centres across the City. Matters of inadequate road capacity relate primarily to Inshes Roundabout and its associated junctions. It is accepted that the site access is adequate or can easily be made so. The site should be retained as allocated for community use – i.e. as an entrance to Inshes Park. Land to the north east comprising a wide road verge should be left as verge or be considered as part of wider proposals for improved parking, turning or drop off for

the primary school.” We have taken into considerations the comments the Council has raised in response to the representations submitted at the Main Issues Report stage. We fully recognise the importance of Inshes District Park and support the delivery of the park. We consider that there is an opportunity to ensure that this site can be developed to create an entrance to the park as well as providing commercial and community uses. The Proposed Plan zones the site as part of Inshes Park (Site IN61) for community use. The policy requirement details that the site should be developed in accordance with planning permission 07/00145/NIDIN. We request that this allocation is amended to allow for commercial and community use at this site.

A Compatible Use at Inshes District Park The landowners recognise the key position the proposal site presents in relation to its location at the northern ‘entrance’ to the recently developed Inshes District Park. We are aware this has been a long-standing policy priority for Highland Council to provide the District Park, a key component of the Inshes and Milton of Leys community growth area plans for the south side of Inverness since the mid-1990’s. We are also aware the District Park has been planned in a manner which seeks to offer visitors and residents a more rural ‘country park’ environment in the Milton of Leys area, utilising its steeper topography and wooded landscape close to residents. Whereas in the Inshes area, particularly as one progresses north towards Sir Walter Scott Drive and transition into Inshes Retail Park, the Council’s masterplan for the District Park aspires for a more formal parkland layout, including for “managed open space” and an element of “boundary screening” all of which are identified to be sited on the proposal land. In granting permission for the adjacent site for a five-a-side football facility, the officer report to Highland Council pointed to the compatibility of that proposed use compliant with the aims and objectives of creating the Inshes District Park. The landowners of this proposal site envisage the same compatibility and complementarity of development, in proposing a use or uses within Use Class 2, 3, 4, 10 or 11. Broadly the use would befit the vision for “managed recreational open space” at this location of the Park; and may include activity such as organised physical activity offered to visiting members of the public.

Proposals for the Subject Site The proposals submitted for the subject site seek to take all of the above matters relating to Inshes District Park into context. These include matters relating to:

- compatibility of use with the District Park setting and proximity of the site to Inshes Primary School and the Southern Distributor Road;
- Position of the proposed use relative to public access provision (on foot, cycle and by motor vehicle) into the northern entrance of Inshes District Park;
- Types of use considered compatible with the site, its setting and potential function as a “managed recreational open space” for visiting members of the public.

It is also relevant to comment that the proposals for the site must also be geared to bring commercial reality into the development proposals. The proposals will not be delivered in full by the landowners for the wider enjoyment of the community without an understanding that private investment may only be sustained by commercial value returned to the development. Therefore the proposals also bring an ancillary use with a higher commercial value into the site. The landowners of this site have taken into consideration the comments made by the Council at the previous consultation stages of the Local Development Plan and also the reasons for refusal of the Lidl proposal. We have also recognised the importance of Inshes District Park and that the delivery of this Park is a key priority for The Highland Council. We have prepared a proposal that we consider will assist the Council in delivering their aspirations for the park as well as providing commercial and community uses that will be of benefit to the local community. The site currently offers no amenity value or function and these proposals are an opportunity to bring the site into economic use, create employment opportunities and assist the Council in meeting their aspirations for the delivery of the District Park. Increasing sustainable economic growth is the stated overarching purpose of the Scottish Government. SPP advises at paragraph 45 that authorities should ‘... respond to the diverse needs and locational requirements of different sectors and sizes of businesses and take a flexible approach to ensure that the changing circumstances can be accommodated and new economic opportunities realised. Removing unnecessary planning barriers to business development and providing scope for expansion and growth is essential’. In particular it advises that the planning system should support economic development in all areas by, amongst other things: • ‘Promoting development in sustainable locations, particularly in terms of accessibility supporting development which will provide new employment opportunities and enhance local competitiveness’.

Allocated to	South Inverness	IN61	Inshes Park	
--------------	-----------------	------	-------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

We act for Messrs Jonathan & Alistair Martin of Garguston Farm, Muir of Ord and owners of land immediately to the south of the Tore grain mill and agricultural storage complex, indicated as TR4 in the Proposed Plan. We now write to object to the omission of the land on the south side of the grain mill from the TR4 allocation for the reasons indicted below. At the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage we had expressed concern that this potential IMFLDP land allocation was too restrictive in order to allow the potential future expansion to accommodate the demand for agricultural related uses. We also questioned why this agri-industrial complex, which is detached from the village of Tore, was not just left in the open countryside to allow further development to be treated on its merits and on the basis of operational practises, need and employment potential. We also expressed the view that if it was necessary for this complex and additional land to be included within the Tore Settlement Development Area with a specific boundary then expansion should be to the south and south east side. This was to give greater flexibility and reduce the potential impact on existing houses, which may not be compatible with large scale industrial processing and storage buildings. Our clients are aware of the demand for agricultural related businesses that offer a number of full time jobs and a degree of synergy with the existing Tore Mill facilities in terms of weighbridge, office/ administrative support etc. Expansion to the north would also potentially impact upon the ancient woodland and once developed result in coalescence with the allocated industrial site to the north east. In addition, development into the existing landscape bund and tree screen to the north is likely to open up a view of the imposing grain complex and its large silos to traffic approaching along the A9 from the north. This is because there is limited room for expansion without the significant removal of trees. This view aligns with the advice/views of SNH who expressed concerns “about the potential effect on long established plantation origin woodland that covers part of the site.” SNH also suggested that “over-riding public benefits should be demonstrated, alternatives ruled out, losses minimised, pre-determination surveys undertaken and high standard of compensatory planting” provided. It is also their opinion that the existing woodland fulfils an important visual screen to the A9. On the southern approach along the A9 the buildings complex is already very visible and any future buildings erected on this side would be set against this established backdrop. However, development of this land would also offer the opportunity to provide some significant screening, which could be undertaken in advance and perhaps as part of a farm woodland scheme. We are concerned that the Council had given hope to our clients through indicating their land as “preferred” in the Alternative Sites and Uses consultation, recommending that it is included in the Plan subject to the relevant requirements only to then dash this hope. The Council must therefore have seen some merits in including it even accounting for the pros and cons listed in the consultation material. The pros – “not prime agricultural land, allows scope for expansion of business, possible economic benefit” – weigh more heavily in its favour. Whereas the cons – “outwith settlement boundary, landscape, visual and amenity impact needs to be mitigated by significant landscaping and tree planting, possible access issue” – can all be addressed or overcome. It is also of note that “SNH responded to this consultation suggesting that there might be scope to make part of Site I1 (ancient woodland Type 2b – long established of plantation origin) non-preferred rather than allocate both.” This suggests that the ancient woodland should not form part of the allocation and allow for the two “industrial” areas to be separately allocations. The limited access to land on the north side of the grain mill to allow development by any party other than the grain mill owners also suggests that the relevant area be removed from the allocation or at least the wooded area be safeguarded from development. Alternatively, we suggest that the grain mill complex and the development of additional agri-industrial uses do not require an allocation to be included within the Tore village SDA. Such uses generally require some separation from a settlement and the original development was considered on its merits accounting for the needs of agricultural industry. This approach is suggested in the Council’s response following the Alternative Sites and Uses consultation. This states: “However with advance planting this site’s ability to accommodate industrial expansion would be enhanced and if this were to be carried out it could be considered through a future Local Development Plan review or through assessment of a planning application against the general policies of the HwLDP including Policy 41 Business and Industrial Land which provides a policy exception for proposals outside of existing allocations where, “there is an unforeseen element to the requirement”. It is considered that it is more appropriate for the Plan to support I1 and not support this extension therefore it is recommended that this site is not included in the Plan.” In respect of the last sentence we therefore question why the existing grain mil complex is retained as part of TR4. In light of the above we request changes to the Plan as indicated in section 4 of this form. At the very least this should include allocation of our clients’ land as an extension to TR4. In doing so the matter of where boundaries of this land are drawn should be discussed in detail with the owners of the mill

complex and adjacent land, as previously advised. This will help ascertain any constraints and operational needs. In drawing up such boundaries there would also be a need to include sufficient land to allow for suitable landscape buffering notably on the southern edge and between the A9 and developable land on the west side. To help illustrate these points above we again attach an annotated aerial photograph of the area together with an over-marked copy of the Tore Inset Map.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

IN47 reads "Development in accordance with planning permission 07/00264/OUTIN..." and claims to be designated for 16 houses. This is incorrect and should be returned for use specifically for a Care Home (maximum 28 beds) as identified in the before mentioned planning application.

Representation

This is clearly not what is referenced in the before mentioned planning application. The planning history for IN47 reads "07/00264/OUTIN – outline planning permission granted for a district centre incorporating school, equipped play area, care home, commercial and retail facilities, public house/restaurant and community building. 09/00249/FULIN – full planning permission granted for a district centre comprising retail units, residential care home, children’s nursery, and community building. 09/00/FULIN – full planning permission granted for a community primary school which includes day care facilities. There is absolutely no acknowledgement of IN47 being used for housing in any of the before mentioned applications. It is clearly designated for the development of a Care Home (maximum 28 beds). This issue was identified to Tim Stott, Malcolm Macleod and Thomas Prag at the Inverness South Community Council meeting on December 2nd 2013. Please ensure this is amended and identified appropriately as accounted for in the before mentioned planning application.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Maintain Bogbain Woods as a protected green space and prevent any development on it.

Representation

The area identified as IN49 is a green space of significant importance. It forms a natural city boundary, offering the residents of Inverness and the wider community with a wonderful natural playground, used daily by runners, cyclists and walkers of all ages. It is an area rich with plantation and wildlife, including deer, badgers and of course the many species that call the wetland and pond home. It is for these reasons that the pupils of Milton of Leys Primary School use the site for their 'Forest School'. Where they engage the pupils with nature and their local environment, taking learning outdoors which is a key expectation of the Scottish Governments Curriculum for Excellence. I can think of no other green space in or around the City of Inverness that offers the many things that Bogbain woods does. It will be a travesty for the environment, wildlife and many users of the woods if you are to support the development of IN49. It will of course, also create further issues with the education provision for the area. Milton of Leys Primary School is already not fit for purpose, with the library being turned into 2 classrooms, which is totally inappropriate. The proposed development of IN49, along with the continued development of IN40 (305 homes), IN46 (45 homes), IN48 (40 homes), along with the proposed development of IN42 - IN45 (505 homes) seems absolutely ridiculous. There is nowhere near available education provision between Inshes Primary and Milton of Leys Primary for this level of development. Save Bogbain woods in its entirety and return IN49 to green space and protect it.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Within the policy for the Hinterland a stated presumption against development within any SLA.

Representation

I note that in places the Hinterland proposed overlays the SLAs. In my view the priority for any development proposed in such overlay areas should be the SLA, and the existence of the Hinterland in such areas should not be seen to undermine that in any way.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Removal of DR5, DR6 and DR7 from the Proposed Plan with substitution as Open Space. 2. Consideration of possible development along the Beauly Road on the periphery of the Drumnadrochit settlement to meet residential land requirement if any with adjustment of Settlement Development Area boundary accordingly.

Representation

The proposed sites flagrantly disregard the importance of the open fields which are a fundamental part of the rural character of this tourist centre, and which is acknowledged in 4.104. The Drumnadrochit settlement has been and remains two distinct communities separated by two of the field affected by the proposals. Urbanisation in the way proposed will destroy both the rural character, the community distinction and much of the visual attraction of the place. Development locally over time has been linear along the highways of the area, and given the already significant development of residential housing outside the Settlement Development Area boundary, any increase in housing thought to be required may be made with much less damage to the visual heritage in such areas, and in particular along the Beauly Road, away from the A82 and still within good access reach of the Drumnadrochit centre. I am further concerned that allocation of the proposed sites will threaten the open Space adjacent in the future by setting the wrong precedent. In particular I fail to see why a site of at least an acre should be required for a medical centre when we already have a good site in use that is proposed for further improvement. I would expect to see a change of use proposed in short order if the site is allocated.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Do not include this area in the development plan.

Representation

In addition to my previous comments, I failed to point out that the proposal for Cromarty also includes CM2 at the other end of town which is considered suitable for allotments. As there are already allotments at the eastern end of town, it makes more sense and is much fairer to spread the amenity to the western end so that those living there can enjoy such a facility closer to their properties. It does not make sense to condense these facilities in one area of the town.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I refer to the above proposal and would like to comment as follows: The old tennis courts to the east of our property have recently been developed as allotments and this seems to be perfectly adequate for the demand in the town. We have a good relationship with the local allotments society and are happy and supportive of the tennis courts allotments. I cannot see that an area of this size will be required for further allotments as I do not believe there is the demand locally for more. It is a lovely amenity in the spring for people when the daffodils grow. Since we have been here, there have been applications for growth at Nigg, the walled garden in Miller Road and now this suggestion. It would be nice to preserve our privacy which is why we bought the property in the first place and have lost some of this already with one lot of allotments, so another would be to our detriment as both sides of our property would be affected and taken over to this kind of use. I would not like to see the character and peace of Miller Road changed further - which is why we chose this house over others.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We own a holiday chalet business directly across from the proposed development site. We have worked so hard to renovate our own dwelling, and also spent years growing trees on one side of our land to enclose the chalets, protecting them from the road noise of the Evanton to Alness road. My husband and I both intend to retire soon, to concentrate on cultivating our existing holiday chalet business. If this development goes ahead our plans and our business will be severely negatively affected. We will have no rural outlook at all. At the moment we have lovely views of the Firth over to the Black Isle. We already have some noise from the Skiach services and the industrial units nearby, I fear the lack of view and added noise will severely compromise our retiral plans, as we will not be able to attract tourists. Our property and land will be devalued.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I would make the following general comment about the housing development proposed This appears to be approximately 1900 houses over the next 10-20 years. This is a very significant number, and is not supported by the Highland Council Briefing of July 2012 which indicates an annual increase in population of 52 until 2035 which would suggest no more than 25 houses should be built annually. Such a rate of construction is also supported by the recent level of house completions ..3The only reference to road provision is a bland statement referring to road transport provision with linkages to the A 96 (T) and forthcoming bypass. without any detail. The Development Plan requires to be far more specific on this matter. First the building of any bypass is liable to be some years away, and the improvement to the internal road system requires to be addressed now before a further 1900 house with consequent increase in population and extra road traffic is added. In addition to the difficulty in Waverley Road as above there is a major bottleneck on the Cawdor Road under the Railway, and the junction with Balblair Road is quite unsuitable for existing traffic. 4The Plan makes only minimal provision for commercial development .At NA 11 there is only 3.2 Ha for Business development and at NA 12 only 5.1 Ha for industrial development which would be earmarked for possible expansion by John Gordons SawMill Site. In relation to the proposed housing expansion of 1900 houses this does not appear to be enough in a community the size of Nairn Otherwise the expanded population will be obliged to travel elsewhere for work which in the supposed green environment we are asked to embrace cannot be in the best public interest.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site from plan and retention of greenspace

Representation

I have read this plan with great care and would like to make the following observations. 1, First I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed housing development at NA 1 for 30 houses. I travel up and down Lodgehill Road several times a day and the road is inadequate for the existing volume of traffic. The road is a cul de sac and the junction with Al Waverley/Westbury Road is dangerous. Waverley Road carries a lot of traffic particularly 15/ since the rebuilding of the hospital and the moving of the local G.P. Surgery to that building. The NA 1 proposed site is known as the showfield locally and is a very valued open space which is used by many local residents at all times and is part of which sets the whole character of the town. It is also used very regularly as a football field and reducing it by half would not be an adequate substitute. Some years ago when there was a proposal to build a supermarket on it, there was a public outcry and a petition of 3000 signatures was produced. I have no reason to believe that the public would change their view on development now.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

object due to visual impact and scale of development. Too many houses on too small plot. The building should be in keeping with the expo site. The plot is too small to merit an allocation. Due to loss of the only green space on the estate, proximity to woodland and impact of wildlife, including badgers suggestion of using the plot for the community use.

Representation

I would like to object plan as the existing development is still not finished, although it meant to be finished 3 years ago. The large plot on the right as you enter is empty, plot in the middle of the estate is also empty and 3 of the stone houses are not completed. There are ongoing problems within existing buildings. It is a disgrace that new houses are built where existing development is still not finished. Within the estate there is more than 25% of social housing and building another 40 affordable houses would have impact on the Eco housing scheme. Within the estate there are parking issues and creating 40 houses on the tiny plot will add the problems with the parking. Also we have noticed the badgers setts and building the new houses will have impact on the wildlife.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Safeguard for education provision or supervised community use only.

Representation

Due to very secluded location, regulated supervision required.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

EV5 encircles 14 private houses. There needs to be more of a 'buffer' area between any development and the houses to maintain the amenity of the existing properties.

Representation

EV5 encircles 14 private houses. At present there is no mains sewerage, low water pressure, no mains gas, poor road provision. I do not see how there can be further development down here without significant investment in infrastructure. I would also question how close to the houses the developers will be allowed to operate, whether there will be provision for there to be no activity close to the house outside of normal office hours, both in the initial development phase and for any industry that then operates out of the development, and what likelihood there is that there will be provision for upgrading the infrastructure to the benefit of the householders at time of any industrial development. The amenity of these 14 households must be maintained during any planning consultations.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I have lived at this address for 12 years and 10 months and have never been asked for my views on the possibility of the land proposed for development and if I had I would be strongly against it. I live in Lewiston which I was always under the belief was always going to be kept as a separate village from Drumnadrochit. This, I also was lead to believe was being done by NOT developing in this field any further than already had been. The plans are very vague which leaves me very worried to where exactly these houses planned to be built. I would really like more clearer information on this proposition.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the proposal to allocate land to build 75 houses on the site IN49 (Bogbain West) - i.e. I do not want this land to be disturbed / developed for housing.

Representation

1. The loss of valuable open space. One of the council's broad aims is to protect and enhance local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area concerned is full of wildlife and I regularly take my children walks there to enjoy it. I would not this to become more house. 2. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities - I believe it will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by my family and others.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I wish to clarify that I am on agreeing to these plans assuming there are no changes to the original plan ref 09/00313/FULIN, and in particular, that the area most north on this site between the new road and Boswell Crescent remains as a green area with bunding, trees and hedging. As your plans don't go into the detail of where the houses are on this development land, we assume there are no changes to the original plans and therefore are supportive. If there are changes, it is unclear from the information provided and in that case we would reject the plans until they have been further consulted.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

My property removed from the development.

Representation

Part of my property has been included in the area identified for development and I would like this error corrected when you next update the plan please. See attached plan and title deeds.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like this site to be removed from the proposed plan or at least a considerable reduction in the number of homes proposed for this site.

Representation

As it exists today Corrie Road and the surrounding area are semi-rural. The addition of 51 homes at Ardnagrask will completely change the nature of the area. It will become built-up and urban, the opposite of where my husband and I chose to live! The day to day noise created by an extra 51 homes living in such close proximity would be unacceptable and would have an adverse effect on the existing residential neighbours. The high density of the homes would also have a devastating effect on the amount of traffic using Corrie Road. It is narrow and unsuitable to take anymore traffic, as highlighted by the additional traffic generated by the construction of the Beaully-Denny Transmission Line. The increased noise and light pollution caused by the vehicles accessing so many extra houses would be unacceptable. The safety of pedestrians is already a concern on Corrie Road due to the footpath being narrow and poorly maintained in parts. Further up Corrie Road, past An Tealloch, there is no footpath at all. I have 2 young children and the walk to school and back can be perilous. This problem will only be exacerbated with the extra traffic from the proposed development. The land to the north east of the proposed site (directly in front of my home) is prone to flooding and building on this may simply push this problem somewhere else. If the water coming down the hill, through my and neighbours gardens, has nowhere to drain off to, it may back up and cause significant damage and disruption to the existing homes above and to the side of the site. Surely this deserves considerable attention. The north-east field is directly in front of my house and there is only a narrow track (wide enough for one car) and a post and wire fence separating us from this field. I am deeply concerned about the close proximity of the development and the loss of our privacy. I am also concerned about the loss of our existing view across the valley to the hills beyond. I put these concerns forward for your consideration. Kate Malecha An Caorann Corry Road Muir of Ord IV6 7TL.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Adjoins TM4 to East of that site. Comments as above regarding inappropriateness of site. Improved recreational access to site appropriate to AW site welcomed but not development. Strongly opposed.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Proposed industrial site requiring removal of significant area of woodland. The SW to NE strip at NH608514 is ancient woodland and must be preserved and managed. Development of this site is opposed.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Southern border is ancient woodland, setback from area, and rehabilitation of woodland recommended.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Majority of site not currently wooded but entire site AW site and potential for rehabilitation. Development will isolate existing woodland to North from rest of Conan Wood.
Strongly oppose

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Description includes retention and protection of ancient woodland. However the vast majority of this site contains existing woodland – all of which is an ancient woodland site. Housing development on remaining site likely to cause undue disturbance to the existing woodland. Any development on this site is opposed.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

AW at NH880546 between building at Broadley and River Nairn and along river banks. Any development should protect these and provide for management, buffering and potential expansion of woodland.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Remaining patch of trees in middle of area is on OS 6 inch 1843-1882 and should be assessed for its potential as ancient woodland. Opportunity for retention and expansion of this area.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

AW on NE border at NH687426. Buffering required. Southern part of development at NH699422 already prepared for development. This has destroyed an AW site. Appropriate compensatory planting- or rehabilitation of other site required.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Development area surrounded by AW which is still standing with the exception of a strip around the West and to the SW of the small loch. While some of this area is thinly wooded now, it has long been part of the larger woodland. We hope the management plan recognises this and development of this area is avoided.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site sparsely wooded but entire site is AW and part of Broad Wood adjoining to S. AW already lost to housing on East of site. Site is appropriate for rehabilitation of AW. Opposed.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Existing wood on Eastern edge is AW. Current permission includes setback from mature trees of 20m. This should be applied to the entire area of AW.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

houses on current conifer plantation with planning permission already granted 07/00355/OUTIN. While planted in conifer this entire site is AW and has significant rehabilitation potential. Opposed.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04364 Name Katharine Rist Organisation Woodland Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DO1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Entirety of site is AW and part of an original expanse of woodland. Strongly opposed. Proposed compensatory tree planting inappropriate as AW is irreplaceable considering the nature of the site and its existing and potential as part of the core area identified by the Forestry Commission. This site is better suited to woodland retention and rehabilitation. Land to the North of Dores such as at D04 are more appropriate for housing.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to Dores DO1 Land South of Dores Hall

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Development area bordered by existing AW along both Eastern and Southern edges. Requirement for Tree Protection Plan in place includes 20m setback from all mature trees. Setback should be applied to entire woodland.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Woodland Trust has previously commented on this application. Long standing woodland has been felled at NH904568. This area has been wooded since at least the first ordinance survey maps. Rehabilitation of this area and exclusion from housing preferred.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Trust recognises that the master plan for this site is approved and the site (per 4.19) is “shovel ready”. Large area of existing woodland at NH 757514 and smaller woodland at NH768511 are AW. Total of 37ha to be lost. Loss of woodland on this site is strongly opposed. Developments must take into account effect on any remaining woodland. National Planning Framework 3 Main Issues Report recognises importance of the development of this site (p 67) but also requires consideration of A96 developments to how they “contribute to the area’s sense of place, environmental quality and community wellbeing”

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

AW on borders of site at NH692432 and NH693435 to NH693433. Woodland management plan in planning permission for IN42,43. WT recommends appropriate buffering between houses and woodland.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Each of these neighbouring housing developments have a strip of ancient woodland on the South Eastern boundary which is connected to a strip between IN38 and IN39. Sufficient buffering between the houses and the woodland should be put in place

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Safeguarding of AW on this site and management welcomed. Could be continued through AW currently designated as open space alongside A82 to AW at IN 25.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site bordered by Milburn Woods running down East of Old Perth Rd. This shows on OS Six Inch 1843-1882 map. Most adjoining areas already developed but further development of retail space planned. The NW corner of IN55 is currently green space but not safeguarded. If this is intended for development then adverse effect on AW must be avoided.

Representation

Please see previous comments on why ancient woodland is important.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

AW on S border. Buffering required. Pleased to see plan in principle includes protection of existing woodland and additional tree planting.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Marked for 535 homes. The woodland between General Wade’s Military Road and Ness-side House along the Northern side of Holm Burn at NH647422 is ancient woodland with the continuation of this woodland closer to Ness House itself marked on OS Six Inch 1832-1882 map. Housing proposed for either side of the woodland. On the South edge of the road to Ness-side are two veteran trees Tree 29625 and 29626. This road set to become the major transport link for the development, either side of the road to become open space. Trees must be protected. The Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief states that “as much woodland as possible” is to be retained with compensatory planting to be required. The “indicative masterplan” for Ness-side at p22 shows housing to the south of this road without consideration for the existing veteran trees.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04364 Name Katharine Rist Organisation Woodland Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference EV5 Type Change

Comment Changes

Trees on banks of Allt Graad are AW, protection already required. Suitable setback also required.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to Evanton EV5 Highland Deephaven

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

More housing on wooded AW site. Retention of woodland “framework” and planting mitigation not enough as entire site is AW. Strongly opposed.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04364 Name Katharine Rist Organisation Woodland Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG8 Type Change

Comment Changes

Pleased to see protection of existing trees. Trees alongside Academy Road are ancient woodland.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to Invergordon IG8 Invergordon Mains North

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Community Park. Continued planting supporting as AW on either side of park.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Surrounded by AW linking back to Dunain Wood. Access to development for access must avoid loss of this wood. Designation of IN29 could be continued through to this site.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

S border adjoins DW3. AW along most of southern border including large portion between sites. Substantial buffering required.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Area encompasses large part of Tornagrain Wood, patches of woodland either side of School Brae at NH779503 and NH781505; and a substantial part of High Wood at NH779498. All of these existing woodlands are long standing ancient woodland. Development proposal at 09/00038/OUTIN recognises the larger areas of woodland – as commercial woodland with a view to replanting with a mix of species. This must be managed as appropriate to an ancient woodland site. However long term plan shows loss of much of Tornagrain Wood and part of woodland to the South. The plan regards the larger woodlands states at p 51 as “The only woodland being removed is part of a commercial plantation already programmed for felling”. This does not recognise the nature of the woodland as plantation on ancient woodland and its potential for rehabilitation and enhancement of the development. The Highland Policy on AW is not recognised in the planning statement.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04364 Name Katharine Rist Organisation Woodland Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NG1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Development avoids AW at NH769967. Appropriate buffering required.

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage’s Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to Nigg NG1 Nigg Yard

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Appears to skirt around existing ancient woodlands that is Dingwall Wood at NH544600. Buffering required. Encompasses AW on Northern edge at NH545602 and NH543602

Representation

The Woodland Trust Scotland considers that any woodland included in Scottish Natural Heritage's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) which is present on historical maps or which exhibits a significant number of ancient woodland indicators can be considered as ancient and is therefore high value for conservation and worthy of further study and is likely to pose a constraint on development. We believe that ancient woodland is amongst the most precious and biodiverse habitats in the UK and is a finite resource which should be protected. Highland Council supplementary guidance notes that woodlands and trees offer multiple benefits in terms of addressing climate change, improving the water environment, providing valuable habitats, timber industry and creating recreational opportunities. Considerations include the cumulative impact of woodland removal, and fragmentation of habitat. Both Scottish Government policy and the Highland Wide LDP policy create a presumption in favour of protecting woodland. The Highland Wide LDP in policy 57 recognises ancient woodland as (depending on the category) of regional or national importance. Both the Woodland Trust Scotland and Scottish Planning Policy at para 148 consider ancient and semi natural woodland to be an important and irreplaceable national resource and should be protected and enhanced. The Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see a clear statement that the loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and therefore warrants protection from development. Development impacts on ancient woodland in a number of ways including chemically, disturbance by human activity, fragmentation, and colonisation of non-native plants. The cumulative effect of development is more damaging to ancient woodland than individual effects which should not be considered in isolation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I have lived adjoining the Nairn Showfield for over thirty five years. I wish to object to the proposed changes as outlined in the Inner Moray firth Proposed Local Development Plan for the following reasons: The field is a beautiful green lung to all the residents of the area. I have walked four generations of dogs in the field. As I get older and perhaps stop driving there is no suitable alternative nearby. It is our dear green space. Football played in the field is well attended and parking is required for all attending the matches. Youth football also takes place in the field. The children of the surrounding area use the field for playing all sorts of games. Many Mums take their toddlers around the field. The primary school use it for exercise classes in good and bad weather. Lodgehill road is used by pupils from Rosebank, Millbank and the Academy and the narrowness of the road with the increased traffic the thirty houses would generate must be a concern. It is also where the helicopter lands for uplifting medical emergencies. 2014 is the year of the Commonwealth Games to encourage sporting activities and here we are in Nairn digging up half of our beloved, well used, field to build houses!! The field would be greatly missed by all who use it. I strongly urge the Council to reject this proposal. [redact]

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish to express my deep concern regarding the proposed development of Bogbain Wood.

Representation

This area is a wildlife haven. I have seen deer, pheasants, grouse, herons, swans, foxes, varieties of birds too numerous to mention. Each year a fawn is born very close to our home. Milton of Leys has few enough amenities and my belief is that the government aims to protect wildlife habitats. This a wonderful open area which is enjoyed by residents and visitors alike for outdoor activities such as walking, cycling ,running and even horse riding. Again I believe government policy seeks to protect these sort of amenity areas. (Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1, Pars 17-19) In summation I do not believe this is a suitable area for development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

•The Farmers Field is a public amenity which should not be sacrificed to becoming a residential development. There is an established football club using this ground with a junior section deriving considerable enjoyment and exercise from activities geared to younger player. It is frequented by many people exercising their dogs. It is an open space for siting various attractions visiting the town. •Residential development would pose a traffic hazard by virtue of the increased volume of traffic on Lodgehill Road. Increased congestion of traffic would take place at peak times, primary- school children and Academy pupils walk and cycle along Lodgehill Road in considerable numbers. Winter months with reduced visibility and increased traffic poses an added hazard. •Concern of overloading the already heavy volume of traffic in Waverley Road, accessing the Cawdor Road. Parking too near the junction of Lodgehill and Waverly Roads already causes gridlock at peak times, creating the potential for an accident black-spot during school commuting times. •The Plan as it stands points to a possibility of land at Sandown being made available 'in exchange' for the farmers field in order that it may remain a public amenity. There would be merit in exploring this option further.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Deletion of site

Representation

My objections to this proposed housing development taking place as are follows: The land is zoned for amenity use. Access would be of major concern. Use the Culloden Woodlands regularly and find that tower road is very busy road indeed, from early morning till late evening. The last thing needed is traffic hold up, particularly as vehicles approaching heading down hill are usually moving at speed. Access from murray Terrace would be an absolute no go. Only as far back as August 2011, I was struck by a motor vehicle while standing on the payment. Hospitalised, out of work and still bearing the cost. Access through the church property area would not be welcomed either, the church has a large congregation which is growing, along with the daily activities and evening classes at both the community centre and church hall. Every available parking space currently there is required, especially when functions take place. The ground owned nby the church is managed very well, with all the necessary groundworks being carried out as required. The last thing I wanted is more pressure put on me as a result of this work interfering with my surrounds. Rubbish like bottles, cans, paper, and all sorts of rubbish get discarded regularly from the main road and pavement area above. A play area with access by path will only create a much worse situation for me. The proposal of "landscaping" "waste ground" sounds ominous, to this experienced person, all ground/rubble bulldozed into the corner putting more pressure onto what is already above me. At this moment I do have limited daylight from both facing rooms (living room and main bedroom) if further trees were surrounding it would totally block out my daylight. Noise level would be increased, when my windows were open, and, as this road above is regularly perhaps surprisingly used by a lot of younger people, I feel that any "play area" is more likely to be abused. Flooding in this area has been well highlighted in the past, so the last thing one wants is to be directly below another development. Increased noise levels from all sides give position, it would be pretty much like being totally resident on a building site. Everybody seems to have cars, so this private development proposal will attract more vehicles to this contained area. There are far too many contentious issues regarding this development, I feel it should be dismissed and continue to be available for amenity use.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

That no houses be built on the Conon Bridge Car Park and football pitch/playing Field at (CB3 Land West of Hight Street) as the villagers use this green area all the time. This would mean a great loss to the local community.

Representation

The Highland Council 21/11/2013 Regarding CB3 - Land to South West of High Street Dear Sir, Having myself, grown up in Conon Bridge, I would like to start by saying that the whole proposal of building houses on the lorry car park and on the only grass playing fields within Conon Bridge is madness! The villagers of Conon Bridge were given this area 60 years ago. The villagers all got together, cleared and built the playing fields as a community. Today it is used as a football field, playing area and gathering area by most parents and many if not all the children at some time or another. There are regular functions and gatherings that take place there every year. Many children use this area to stay healthy and active as it is easily accessible and open to all. My own two children use the playing field all the time, as I did with my friends when I was a child. It's a pleasure to sit there in the summer and even play in the snow in the winter. This is not a town we are talking about, but a village with the country side just a stone's throw away. It's not a cheap urban landscape, where children hang around street corners when not using their PlayStations. My children don't have a PlayStation, they play with a football, a shinty stick and run and cycle on the field. You must remember those things. The park is where I play football and shinty with my children and their friends. For a number of years there have been a lot of changes within the village and it is my personal opinion that the changes have not been for the best or in keeping with the village's natural aesthetic. Over the years the old church on Old School road was sold off and made in to a private house. The public toilet beside the main bus stop was built and then removed by the council!!! The nearest Public toilet is now at Dingwall or Muir of Ord. This stopped the bus load of tourists parking within the public /lorry car park to use the toilet and then look around the village. The Village town hall was sold off and turned into a private house. Shortly after this the main stone bus stop shelter was removed and replaced with what can only be described as a terrible cheap looking Perspex sheet instead. I would say bus stop, but this cannot be described as one. The Conon Cold store was sold then destroyed and left like a bomb site. We are currently on the 4th post office premises with in Conon Bridge, every time you go on holiday and come back the dam thing moves!!! It is presently in the Spar shop but, for how long, who knows! The old, old School and School house was burnt to the ground some years ago and were replaced by terrible looking flats. The Conon Woods were cut down, a haven for birds and wildlife. This area will, no doubt be houses in the future according to your plans. The Conon petrol filling station closed and has been allowed to run down and become derelict. It is a real eye sore and an embarrassment to the villagers. The Drouthy Duck public house closed and now looks like a slum area. A proposal was put forward for more flats to be built. This was rejected, by some sensible people, or was this because of the petition the villagers started? Yes I do believe so. The old school above Seller Place was flattened and a new school was built, (for how long it stands we do not know as it's sinking due to inadequate survey and prior preparation of the site and of course very poor workmanship from Barr construction. Complete incompetence!) Every villager that grew up here knew that there was a stream there going to the local farm. The Shinty pitch/ Football field was dug up. The all-weather pitch was built instead! A fantastic amenity, but not at all very user friendly for the villagers, due to limited access and quite substantial cost of hiring it. It's not like the local villagers can just walk on to it and start playing football when they want to, can they? Not like the grass football pitch you are proposing to build houses on. The new railway halt built at a ridiculous price to the tax payer. This is probably due to the company having all new plant machinery bought and delivered to the site. They then had the cheek to say they had run out of money before its completion! The railway halt, I have to say has been the best idea in this terrible catalogue of events. I will be signing up for the petition against this most disagreeable proposal and will do what I can to save our grass playing field/football pitch and car park and save what's left of our scenic village ...Conon Bridge. One extremely angry village member and his family. Kenny.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site from the Plan & retention of greenspace

Representation

We are writing to you as office bearers of 'Save our Showfield' – a group of people who formed a committee in 1998 following great public concern regarding the proposed building of a supermarket on the showfield. Through local public support, with several public meetings, many letters of objection and over 3000 signatures on a petition to “keep the showfield green” we ran a campaign for 2 years and the planning proposal for a supermarket was rejected by a Scottish Office Reporter in 2000. We object to the present planning proposal of a housing development of the showfield for these reasons: 1. This is a valued green field space used by the public for general recreation where people walk their dogs, children play, as well as being the location of the Nairn St Ninian’s Football pitch. It is also in regular use as the location of car boot sales, a vintage car rally, a circus and is crossed by the public at all times. In 2000 it was noted that there was a deficit of 45% of available recreational land in Nairn. Since then the town has grown and so the deficit will now be greater. This space is a vital green lung for Nairn as it expands and a housing development would not only cause loss of this local amenity space, but also change the character of the town. 2. Viscount Finlay of Newton sold the field to the Farming Society in 1928 for £1000 with money paid by the Farming Society and public subscription. There is a restriction in the title that no house building will take place without the consent of Viscount Finlay or his descendants. In 1998 Lady Hays, his grand-daughter, was not willing to grant that consent and we see no reason why this will have changed now. 3. We consider the high density housing development now proposed for the green space is inappropriate and not in accordance with the existing surrounding houses in the area. What would be left of the field would be unsuitable for much of its current use, especially for football. 4. The Draft plan projects approximately 1900 new houses in 20 years. The removal of 30 from this total is not going to significantly affect the plan. 5. Our concerns are also for the detrimental impact such a development will have on the surrounding roads and as a direct result on the safety of pedestrians. The local residential roads - Lodgehill Road, Chattan Drive, Waverley and Westbury Roads are already struggling with the volume of existing traffic. There has been an increase in traffic flow since the relocation of both GP surgeries to the Nairn Hospital, and this, combined with the new Vet’s Surgery on Lodgehill Road and the existing traffic to the 2 local primary schools means that congestion is a problem as well as road safety. The junction of Lodgehill Road and Waverley/Westbury Road is particularly dangerous and of concern, especially for school-aged children. As Lodgehill Road itself ends in a cul-de-sac the quickest access to the A96 will be via Waverley Road. With the proposed development of houses there could potentially be up to 30-60 extra cars using this junction and these local roads, which are totally inadequate to cope. We are aware that the field is owned by the Nairnshire Farming Society, and we have members of the Society on our committee. If the Society should decide to relocate within the town we would be happy to support their relocation proposals, on the basis that the whole field remains green, and its amenity is maintained. This is supported by the Council’s own evidence stated in 2000 which emphasised the showfield’s importance as a structural open space derived from its use, its scale and position and as we have already mentioned, this is also within the terms of the existing legal title granted to the Nairnshire Farming Society in 1928

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The area should not be developed for any purpose other than recreational outdoor use. The land is marshy, flooded and present serious flood risks to nearby residences.

Representation

We do not want the development to go ahead as there are established badger setts within the area. Birds of prey nest in the immediate area and are monitored by locals. An indigenous species of newt inhabits the pond area. There is an established frog breeding pond area, which is well-monitored and supported by various local residents. A group of young adults with social/behavioural difficulties have made dedicated trips to the area in hot weather to ensure the survival of the tadpoles- the first time many of them have taken part in either nature walks or animal protection. It's also a widely used and accessible fitness route-this is positive as the Highlands are third worst for obesity in Scotland. Loss of this area would be a serious step towards failure to provide the natural resources required to deliver the following Government policy: Supporting Young People's Health & Wellbeing - A Summary of Scottish Government Policy The Scottish Government recognises that youth is a unique and critical period for influencing future health outcomes. Supporting young people's health and wellbeing is at the core of both Getting it right for every child (GIRFEC) and Curriculum for Excellence (CfE). Take Life On The 'Take Life On' campaign covers physical activity, healthy eating, wellbeing and alcohol consumption. The campaign's major message is that simple switches in our daily lives can make a real difference to our health and give us a feel-good boost. Further information is available on the Take Life On website at: <http://www.takelifeon.co.uk/> The area is a resource used to deliver the Health and Wellbeing outcomes for young adults who are generally experiencing barriers to learning. Highland Council should be the advocate for ensuring this land continues to provide established, accessible learning opportunities which contribute to the Health and Wellbeing of Scotland's future adults and decision makers. The Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004 (as amended) provides the framework for education authorities and other agencies to support all children to overcome barriers to their learning. It provides duties on authorities to identify, plan and provide for the additional support needs of pupils for whose education they are responsible.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wholly object to the possibility of this vital green belt land, countryside and nature sanctuary being offered up to developers for an addition 75 homes.

Representation

This is a beautiful area used by many local residents but also the wider community & tourists. This walk is mentioned Internet wide on many sites & is therefore used by many tourists, these addition houses would ruin both the look, the natural beauty, the peace & quiet and the nature. I recently moved to the area for the same reasons as above & use this area daily for running, cycling and family walks. I would feel cheated if this was to be taken away. As a very local resident to the proposed plan I would feel violated by the mass increase in houses, traffic to what is an already overburdened community. This is the reason I did move here. The mass house building programme already ongoing has seen the school you recently built at Milton of leys been at maximum capacity with some children having to be taught in the library hence the reason why it is being extended already after only a few years in operation. I feel this would be extremely detrimental to the area, community and nature and urge you to shelf this plan before any more time & money is wasted.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Reduction in density of homes proposed for the FR1 site 2. No allocation of a particular number of homes (however indicative the plan states the number may be) before an adequate assessment that this number can be accommodated without compromising road safety on Courthill Road 3. No allocation of a particular number of homes (however indicative the plan states this number may be) before the Authority is certain that their exist solutions to the water pressure issues referred to.

Representation

Subject to our concerns relating to road safety and water pressure issues below being adequately addressed, we do not object to the principle of housing development on the FR1 Greenside Farm, Rosemarkie site. We do, however, object to the density of the housing development proposed on the FR1 site. In the adopted RACE LP, the final boundary of the area allocated for building houses at Greenside Farm was more or less the same as is now proposed in the FR1 allocation. We assume that the increase from the RACE LP designation of 1.7 hectares to the proposed FR1 designation of 1.9 hectares, has arisen because of greater accuracy of measurement (plus the inclusion of Greenside House itself and the originally-proposed access area within the proposed FR1 boundary). In relation to density, the indicative capacity in the RACE LP was "30 houses" on the then allocated 1.7 hectare area. The current proposal in FR1 is for "50 homes" on the now proposed 1.9 hectare area. Even allowing for the fact that some of the proposed "50 homes" are likely to be flatted properties, this is an exceptionally high density of houses and flats for this particular site. We consider that in terms of any reasonable planning assessment, the FR1 site should be regarded as an edge-of-village/semi-rural site. The proposed density of 50 homes is, however, akin to the density one might expect on an edge-of-city or indeed an inner-city site. This is not an appropriate density in this location, particularly since the site is a gateway to the village. Further, the proposed density would not be in keeping with the pattern of existing housing along the rest of Courthill Road. In addition, from the house known as "The Old School" north-eastwards, the properties on Courthill Road form part of the Rosemarkie Outstanding Conservation Area. As well as being a gateway site to the village, the FR1 site therefore forms part of the setting of the Outstanding Conservation Area and is accordingly an area where such high density of housing is inappropriate. Finally, the FR1 site also borders part of the Fairy Glen Designed Landscape and the high density of housing proposed is also inappropriate on what is part of the setting of a Designed Landscape. Secondly, we further object on the basis that there appears to have been no proper assessment of the feasibility of accommodating the proposed high density of housing development without compromising road safety along Courthill Road. An allocation for this density of housing is accordingly premature. We appreciate that detailed transport assessment and mitigation proposals would be required as part of any masterplan/development brief to be agreed for the site following adoption of the IMFLDP. However, the known deficiencies and constraints affecting Courthill Road, and the feasibility of overcoming these satisfactorily, ought surely to be properly assessed before allocating the FR1 site for such a high number of new homes. If the Authority allocates the site for 50 new homes without first being satisfied that the deficiencies of Courthill Road can be overcome, and if it then turns out that these deficiencies cannot be satisfactorily overcome, there is a genuine risk that sub-standard road solutions will be accepted, and that road safety will be compromised, under pressure to permit the development of 50 new homes to proceed. We consider it imprudent, therefore, that detailed assessment of road arrangements to accommodate 50 new homes should be required only after the site has been allocated for this number of homes. Of particular concern is the junction of Courthill Road with Bridge Street. While there will be land available to improve the junction at the Manse Brae end, there is no scope to improve the dangerously inadequate visibility splay at the junction with Bridge Street. Consequently, arrangements in respect of the proposed 50 new homes would have to be such as to ensure no increase in vehicular use of that junction. We fail to see how this could be achieved. While there is mention in the FR1 "Requirements" section of "road closure for Courthill Road", the junction at Bridge Street cannot be stopped up unless two-way traffic can safely be accommodated along the length of Courthill Road, from the Gordon Memorial Hall to the junction with Manse Brae/Rosemarkie Road. However, such a two-way system cannot be achieved because of existing pinch points, particularly where the road starts to descend steeply at the house known as "Courthill". There is no way of widening the road at that point to accommodate two-way traffic as on the one side there is a steep descent into the rear gardens of the houses on the High Street and on the other side sits the high retaining wall forming the boundary of the garden pertaining to "Courthill". Once a 50 home allocation is adopted in the IMFLDP, the principle that 50 additional homes can be accommodated on the FR1 site will be established, leaving the Authority little room then to resist an application for 50 homes on the site on road safety grounds. We fear there is a genuine risk that inadequate solutions to the road constraints may then be accepted on the basis that the principle of a 50 home development has already been established and agreed in the IMFLDP. We feel that the Courthill Road constraints, and the feasibility of any solutions to them, should therefore be fully assessed before any allocation of

the FR1 site for 50 homes. We note that a solution requires to be found to water pressure issues and, while the installation of a new link water main to service the development is mentioned, there is no mention of whether the feasibility of any such solution has been checked. For reasons similar to those expressed at point 2. above, we feel that the Planning Authority should ensure that feasible solutions to the water pressure issues exist before an allocation of the site for 50 homes is adopted and the principle of a 50 home development on the site thereby established.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

**Verbatim of attachment submitted by Strathpeffer Community Council
REPRESENTATIONS OF STRATHPEFFER COMMUNITY COUNCIL (SCC)
INNER MORAY FIRTH PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The SCC comment as follows:

Paragraph 4.171

The SCC welcome protection for the Conservation area which they believe has not been given sufficient protection in the past.

Paragraph 4.172

Agreed

Paragraph 4.173

The following rewording is suggested:

Tourism plays an important role in Strathpeffer's economy. The village has several hotels and guest houses and the Strathpeffer Pavilion is now a popular events venue.

The former railway station **hosting the Museum of Childhood** is an important facet of the local heritage, and is now occupied by a number of business and tourism uses. There are future plans to **reintroduce a steam railway which would involve** developing the former station further by building an engine shed and educational museum and reopening part of the railway as a visitor attraction. Housing growth **will now be** directed to the western fringes of the settlement.

The SCC also believe that the area designated for SP2 is incorrectly located: The Strathpeffer Steam Railway Association (SSRA) would intend to place the engine sheds behind the Scottish Woodlands /old Tourist Board building, although it is true that they would be looking to a length of track as well. Contact with the SSRA is suggested.

Paragraph 4.174

Noted although for clarity the SCC would like to see conservation matter separated from drainage with a fresh numbered paragraph.

SP1

Water run off

It has been explained that the IMFDP refers to future development not the correction of current problems, but in this case the SCC disagree. ANY possibility of increased water run off cannot be permitted until the existing system is upgraded/repared. Holding tanks, which seem to be the engineering solution, must run off at some point (unless they can be pumped out at a time of low flow). The SCC have asked for a full hydrological survey, and would like to see this made available, together with the cost of remedial works as a precondition of any development. Surface water run off regularly lifts drain covers and has in the past lifted tarmac, and any further run off increases the risk of flooding. It is believed that a significant part of the current drainage system is Victorian and not fit for current use.

The SCC see this as a critical matter and are not convinced that earlier holding schemes have been effective (although clear felling of Ord Wood may have compounded issues).

Housing capacity

Strathpeffer is already having difficulty in integrating the two ends of the village and the introduction of a further 67 houses is considerable increase, albeit that this is a 20 year plan.

Position of cost housing

The SCC strongly believe that housing should be integrated, and do not want to see the 25% allocation of high density low cost (affordable) housing 'parked' on the flat ground; housing types should be mixed throughout.

The SCC continue to believe that there should be a green belt between the main village and the Loch Kinellan area. Were this instituted this might partly solve the problem.

Sheltered housing

The SCC believe that there should be specific provision for sheltered housing to meet the needs of a community that is gradually growing older; this is 20 year plan.

Cycle links

These are not mentioned and should be integral to any plan.

B1

This refers to the abandoned request for a Business Park. In discussion at the road show it transpired that this had been in the balance but lost out because of visual impact (cross referenced by the Responses to Main Issue Report). Once again, this is a 20 year plan. The SCC believe that all communities should have places from which they can work, and that small workshop/office provision should be integral to community plans. If trees were planted now they would effectively shield business development in 10 to 15 years. The SCC would like to see this re-considered.

Allocated to	Strathpeffer	General	General	
--------------	--------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to see the following changes: The area should be kept as a green space for residents to enjoy. It is an area used by dogwalkers, walkers, runners and cyclists. It enhances the area and improves the quality of life of the residents who have chosen to live in MoL. There is a lot of wildlife and I would like to see the area respect their natural habitat. Deer regularly move around this area as well as other wildlife. I would like to see more paths, proper cycle facilities and more facilities created for young people.

Representation

I would like to highlight the fact that there are no facilities for the residents of MoL at present. We have a school and shops are coming but there are no recreational facilities nearby. The Scottish Government want the nation to become healthier. This green space gives the people of MoL an area to exercise that is beautiful and away from pollution. The area doesn't need more houses but more recreational facilities. It is a pity that the council does not improve the existing area for locals such as cutting back and maintaining the General Wade Military Road that is sadly very overgrown. The area is a quite residential area, we do not want business facilities (rumour of a hotel) that will not really benefit the local residents. Councillors should consider if they would like a big housing development and a hotel near to their homes!

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Any further retail development should not be encouraged.

Representation

The decline of the Town Centre following the opening of the Supermarket must result in a rethink in the out of town retail shops. Any proposed development at this location should meet with the approval of the Association of Nairn Businesses.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.32 to 4.41

Reference NA8 Type Change

Comment Changes

No development at this location until all of the concerns regarding infrastructure have been resolved.

Representation

The main road into the town under the railway bridge must be brought up to full standard before any development can be started. This is a School Route and it is presently dangerous. Gordons sawmill must be protected. Move the housing development well clear of the mill and of the proposed expansion zone. The existing foulwater system requires to be upgraded before any further development in this area.

Allocated to Nairn NA8 Nairn South

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph NA2

Reference NA2 Type Change

Comment Changes

No development at NA2

Representation

The Lochloy development has already over-loaded the Road and traffic trying to get on to the A96. Before development at NA2 can be considered there needs to be a By pass or a Road Bridge over the railway to provide a second exit from Lochloy. 90 houses would be a gross overdevelopment of this small field.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.32 - 4.41

Reference NA12 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

The Sawmill expansion should be encouraged / supported. Gordons presently has 100 employees - expansion would be good for the town.

Allocated to Nairn NA12 Sawmill expansion

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph NA3

Reference NA3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Your present assessment of capacity at 6 is very low. I was advised by the planners that this was a "guess" as they did not know the site.

Representation

This is a very suitable location for housing. The owner of the land should be encouraged to bring forward proposals to develop the site. There is a sizable area of land that could be used for housing with out any problem.

Allocated to Nairn NA3 Achareidh

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.32 - 4.41

Reference NA7

Type Support

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Regeneration of the Town Centre is the top priority for the town.

Allocated to Nairn NA7 Town centre

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.32 to 4.41

Reference NA4

Type Change

Comment Changes

This site should be considered in smaller sections. Waiting for a major developer to take it on is unacceptable.

Representation

The Sandown Land needs to be developed. This is Common Good Land and should be developed to provide the funding for other projects in Nairn. The site should be split into smaller more managable sections in order that development can get underway.

Allocated to Nairn NA4 Sandown

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.32 - 4.41

Reference NA5 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Lochloy is a good development and the standard of housing being built should be maintained. The lack of infrastructure that has been provided is a poor reflection on the Planning authority and our local councillors. The problems at the Lochloy / A96 junction need to be addressed.

Allocated to Nairn NA5 Lochloy

Customer Number 01837 Name L G Kerr Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Nairn 4.32 - 4.41

Reference I agree with all of the comments made Type Change

Comment Changes

NA 1 This area is used for recreation and should not be developed. It might be possible to enhance this area with a small development. Nairn Community Councils should be consulted if you wish to look at this option.

Representation

The Lodgehill Road is already a high risk School Route and extra traffic in this area should be avoided.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Braes of Balvonie Residents' Association is concerned that the housing in this area will obstruct the views of existing residences in our development and in the neighbouring development to the west.

Representation

Housing proposed on site IN46 should be of a similar density to that of Phase 1 of site IN48. Rooflines should not obstruct the views of current residents. The topography of the area has been recognised as a key feature and should be protected. This should be a consideration for any future development of this site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We are concerned that the planning permission of site IN63 may result in unnecessary development, inappropriate development, as well as posing a threat to badger setts resident in area.

Representation

The site adjacent to Braes of Balvonie has been designated for "community" use. Many residents are concerned that this site will be developed --unnecessarily & needlessly -- simply because it is available. Many residents would contend that its current use, as productive agricultural land, is a good use. Agricultural land, once developed, is rarely or never returned to agricultural use. Secondly, we are concerned that any development of this site may not be in keeping with the "green wedge" philosophy under which it was originally zoned. The green wedge was overridden by the current development for the Housing Expo. We would be concerned that further encroachment of the green wedge would diminish the natural habitat. We are concerned for the well-being of a badger sett which has been observed and filmed on this site. We also note that the site is habitat for deer and would conclude on this basis that it is a transportation path for wildlife generally. Further, we are concerned by initiatives to develop this site as a for-profit private development, under the guise of "community use". To date we have been approached by "community developers" from outwith the area, and have been subject to date of their wish to impose their vision for the site onto residents. We believe this is anathema to the concept of "community" use, and would suggest the Council take a conservative approach to any development of this site. We would favour, if pushed, a 'grass-roots' development, and not something imposed by those living outside the area, who are in any case, unlikely to ultimately be users of the site due to distance, etc. We note that parents at Milton of Leys school have indicated to us that they would not permit their children to use recreation facilities at the IN63 site, as it is simply too far from their homes, and they would not wish their children to travel that far. We would suggest that the proximity of the A9 may have a negative impact in at least two ways: by posing a danger to site users, and by introducing an undesirable element. With potential site users occupying facilities unobserved by anyone, the capacity for anti-social behaviour is high and would be expected. Lastly, the Highland Council Ward Manager for this area has confirmed that any recreational or similar development at the site WOULD NOT be maintained by Highland Council. We therefore believe it would be foolish to invest in infrastructure in the case where a private body would have to be funded in perpetuity to ensure maintenance of the site.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN46 Type Change

Comment Changes

We would like assurances that any development at site IN46 will have its own recreation area for children, sufficient to meet "in-house" demand.

Representation

Our small playpark at Braes of Balvonie, which residents fund the maintenance of, has been inundated with users from out-with the area. This includes dog-walkers, as well as unsupervised children. This has resulted in anti-social behaviour, including vandalism and dog-fouling, by non-residents. We would request that any future development incorporate sufficient play areas for the children within the development, to reduce the demand on our park by residents from outside the development.

Allocated to South Inverness IN46 Balvonie, Milton of Leys

Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN48 Type Change

Comment Changes

We would like the proposed development to be put on hold until completion of Phase 1.

Representation

The proposed development at site IN48 as notified by Council is for 40 homes. The site is identified as being 5.5 ha. Previous planning application for the Expo site identified this as "Phase 2". We are concerned that the construction of Phase 2 will commence whilst Phase 1 remains incomplete and unfinished. We would suggest it is inappropriate to commence Phase 2 until Phase 1 is complete. There are 3 incomplete houses at the top of the site, "Balvonie Terrace" which should be completed and offered for sale, or simply offered for sale "as is".

Allocated to South Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site

Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN48 Type Change

Comment Changes

Housing type/design

Representation

We are concerned that the houses proposed as Phase 2 of the "Expo" masterplan will not be built in keeping with the current development's aesthetic. We would be concerned that the plethora of poorly designed houses that dominate Milton of Leys may serve as the format for Phase 2. We would be concerned that this would have an adverse effect on our community, including the re-sale value of properties, should the new development deviate from the aesthetic established by the Expo.

Allocated to South Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site

Customer Number 04256 Name Laura HC Bruce Organisation Braes of Balvonie HC Residents' Association

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN48 Type Change

Comment Changes

We would seek to limit the height of the proposed "Phase 2" dwellings on the Expo site.

Representation

The Expo site, and much of Milton of Leys, is unique in the aspect and views it affords. We would be concerned that existing homeowners' views of the area would be compromised by the development proposed as "Phase 2" of the Expo site. We would seek to limit the height of any new dwellings so that the views are not obstructed.

Allocated to South Inverness IN48 Land at Housing Expo Site

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Braes of Balvonie Residents' Association is concerned that the housing density of the proposed development of Phase 2 of the Housing Expo at the northern perimeter of the Expo site is too intensive. The current site "Phase 1" hosts 52 or 53 dwellings, many of which are too close together and parking has become a problem. As affordable units are proposed as 40 % of the site we are concerned that too many dwellings will be "shoe-horned" into the site to maximise the profitability of the site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Whilst increasing numbers of vehicles traverse Ness Road to and from Channonry Point Car Park and osbtruct the smooth rotation of the golfing teams clearway to tee off, the owners and dogs from these vehicles disembark and discharge their urine and faeces at the car park along the Access route to the beach , on the beach and under the tree/bush on the foreshore, generating a mounting health biohazard. There is a serious risk of transmission of human bacteria , protozoans, virions and prions between men women and children at these loci which warrants the provision of a civilised toilet facility (which could be built on the island at the Car Park with a subterranean tank processing system) Permission should be included in the local plan and the wherewithall to finance the project should be another matter. This is a separate matter from addressing the second danger which is from the from the dog faeces.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

CB3. Surely before this are is considered for inclusion in your plan a flood risk assessment should have been carried out. Not after inclusion in the plan. CB4.What arrogance to include in the plan suggestions to move the playing field and play are prior to any consultation with the community.

Representation

My first comment is that this form for inserting comments is very poorly designed and is not straight forward to use. I am unaware there was any opportunity for public consultation before this document was released. In this day and age I do not think that is correct and it is disappointing. Do we not have Community Councils that should be used for getting basic information from? Or are they seen as a nuisance by the Highland Council? Who do you think you are to include in your plans details to take away a villages play area and football pitch. I have lost faith in the council.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the proposal to allocate land to build 75 houses on the site IN49 (Bogbain West) - i.e. I do not want this land to be disturbed / developed for housing.

Representation

1 - The loss of valuable open space. One of the council's broad aims is to protect and enhance local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area concerned is full of wildlife and natural beauty and I regularly walk and cycle there with my family and friends. It is a space that is enjoyed by a wide range of people. 2 - Detrimental impact upon residential amenities - I believe it will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by my family and others.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the area DR3 to be designated entirely as green belt land as was originally proposed.

Representation

These comments regard the designated area DR3 between Balmacaan Road, Drumnadrochit and West Lewiston. 1) The allocation of this site for further housing runs contrary to assurances made to local residents when the 5 houses on the Balmacaan Road side of the site were erected a few years ago. At that time we were told that no further housing would be added. Councillor Margaret Davidson confirmed the green belt status of the whole site DR3 when we expressed concern about the impact of development to the rear of our own property. 2) Developing DR3 would create a link between the two hitherto separate areas of Balmacaan and Lewiston. Such a move has not been discussed in the local community and has not been part of the local plan. 3) There is no indication in the proposed local development plan of the point(s) of access, the siting, the proportions, height or area of the two proposed housing plots. Neither does it state the direction or position of the 'green corridor', its dimensions or who would manage and tend it. If the 'green belt' recently provided in East Lewiston is an example of what is intended, then we would consider this to be inadequately planned and maintained. 4) We see no need to extend the provision of new housing in this location, in view of the other, much more extensive developments proposed elsewhere in the area. There are also many existing, unsold, properties in the area. 5) Our own property (2 West Lewiston) is situated downhill of the site DR3 and any building in the area above us will make a significant impact on both our privacy and our visual amenity. The houses recently built on the edge of the site can now be seen from our house. A house or road any closer than that would look directly into the rear of our house and overlook the garden. 6) Over the past 19 years we, as well as our neighbour at 3, West Lewiston, have maintained the triangle of rough, common land which borders the site DR3 at the end of our properties. (Formerly, this formed part of an access track serving all of the properties in our part of Lewiston which border the field.) We have ensured that the trees there are kept safe, that the telephone cables positioned there are not impeded, and we have recently endeavoured to increase the tree screening from the new housing behind us. With a view to ensuring a properly maintained and visually attractive green belt area, we would welcome an opportunity to discuss with the Council the purchase both of this waste land and, with the seller, of appropriate adjoining areas of DR3. 7) Moreover, we are concerned that the existing mature trees in the triangle of adjacent land be retained and do not end up being sacrificed to serve nearby development objectives. Not only do they provide a visible boundary to our properties, but they help secure a rocky, potentially unstable slope of land between DR3 and the gardens of Numbers 1,2 and 3 West Lewiston. 8) Why not offer the whole of DR3 to our local Greenspace group to use for the development of allotments for the local community?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Deletion of or reduction in capacity of housing sites.

Representation

Opposes level of proposed growth because of: lack of supporting infrastructure, lack of employment to occupy new residents, loss of village character, excessive scale of sites, and need to absorb people socially which is better done by organic growth.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Objection to the proposal to allocate the land at Bogbain Woods for 75 houses.

Representation

1. The loss of valuable open space: The Council aims to protect and enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and woodlands. The proposed site is such an environment. It is a haven for many different species of birds and wildlife. 'General Wade's Military Road' runs along the south west edge of the proposed site. This significant historical route and the surrounding landscape should also be protected for future generations. According to Government Planning Policy PPS1, Paragraphs 17-19: 'The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole.' 2. Detrimental impact on residential amenities. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of this area. The current road network is not suitable for the number of cars that residents in the 75 houses would have. The streets are narrow and steep in places, and designed as quiet safe areas with dead ends, so they are safer for residents and local children walking to school. The local and wider community regularly access this area and enjoy the safe, peaceful, rural environment it provides. It used for walking, cycling (both young and old), jogging and by both primary and secondary schools for outdoor learning (now part of the new curriculum). I feel the proposal contravenes both the Government guidance quoted above (item 1) and the Council's own policies regarding protecting the local environment.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Objection to the development of land at Bogbain Wood (IN49) for 75 homes, Business (Tourism). As a direct neighbour to IN49 we believe it will have a serious impact on our standard of living. We also believe the development of this site will have a detrimental impact on the whole of the Milton of Leys community in relation to loss of valuable open space, local wildlife, education and traffic volume.

Representation

We wish to strongly object to the construction of 75 homes and business use on IN49. As a direct neighbour to IN49 we feel this would have a serious impact on our standard of living. The development would sit higher than the current houses which would have a negative impact on the natural sunlight available to these homes. The area behind Redwood Avenue is prone to flooding so developing this land could make this problem worse by subjecting the houses to ongoing flooding issues which then results in increased insurance costs. The proposed development would also harm the amenities enjoyed by local resident in particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential area. One of the council's broad aims is to protect or enhance the local environment including wildlife, trees and woodland. The site at Bogbain Wood (IN49) is a beautiful part of our Scottish Countryside which is used by many not just in the Milton of Leys Community but throughout Inverness. It is also used by the local school as they take the children on walks into Bogbain Woods to teach them on the wildlife and countryside that surrounds us. This area is also home to a lot of different wildlife including pheasants, frogs, rare species of newts, birds of prey, red squirrels and deer - where would they go? There would be a significant impact on the local school if further development was permitted. The school is already at capacity if not more with not enough classrooms for the kids and currently having to use library space to accommodate this. I know this is being sorted by adding on extra classroom space but however this will only sort the immediate numbers and with all the building going on further down the hill the role numbers are just going to continue rising. We can continue to build on to a school but then you have the risk of a primary school being too big and kids not getting the desired level of education they need. With this additional housing brings additional traffic around the school area which then increases a risk to the children. Given the natural beauty of the land at IN49 why are we planning to build on it when there is plenty of land closer to the centre of town that could be built on?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The supporting text for DW7 (and also DW8) should expressly state that, notwithstanding the provisions of the Dingwall Riverside Development Brief, proposals that adversely affect the operation of adjacent premises and business will not be acceptable.

Representation

By reference to the text for Site DW7 the Proposed LDP requires that development proposals for site DW8 should be in accord with the Dingwall Riverside Development Brief. This Development Brief is relatively vague in terms of identifying potential uses for site DW8 – two options are identified but it is clear from these that a number of potential development mixes could be potentially acceptable on the site. However both options identify the requirement for “improved access” along the existing access road to the Lidl foodstore at Tulloch Street. Any proposals for “improving” this access that have adverse implications for the operation of the existing Lidl foodstore will be unacceptable and should not be supported through either the development brief or the Local Development Plan. Furthermore the Proposed LDP is seeking to provide an enhanced status to the Development Brief as a “Supplementary Guidance”. This proposal to enhance the status of this document is confirmed by the requirement in the LDP that development proposals should be in accord with the brief. Given this change in status it is necessary that formal consultation, as part of the development plan process, is undertaken for the proposals contained in the Development Brief to ensure that any proposals on this site do not adversely affect any owners, occupiers or uses of the land and/or adjacent premises.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04356 Name Lidl UK GmbH Organisation Lidl UK GmbH

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Hargest Planning Ltd Hargest Planning Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site AL21 Invergordon Road East Type Change

Comment Changes

Amendment to both proposed "Uses": This should be amended to specify Non-Food Retail/Comparison Goods only.

Representation

Whereas it is accepted that retail use of site AL21 would be appropriate this should be restricted to comparison goods only i.e. food retail should not be permitted on this site (except insofar as this is ancillary to other retail goods sold from units). The market area served by retail in this location comprises Alness, Invergordon and nearby rural areas. This market area has a limited population but already significant supermarket retail offer. Using the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics the population of Alness, Invergordon and surrounding rural areas is approximately 12,500 which equates to available expenditure convenience goods of only approximately £22m (net Special Forms of Trading - 2012 prices). However within Alness and Invergordon are the following supermarkets/principal foodstores: •Morrisons, Alness (est 3300 sq m GFA) •Lidl, Alness (1650 sq m GFA) •Co-op, Alness (est 1100 sq m GFA) •Co-op, Invergordon (est 1150 sq m GFA) •Farmfoods, Invergordon (est 400 sq m GFA) In addition to these there is a significant range of small and independent convenience goods shops in both Alness and Invergordon. There is therefore already a good range of choice for convenience supermarkets and foodstores within the local area. If one considers the notional average turnover of these shops, based on typical average sales densities for the operators/types of units this would equate to an average turnover of approximately £35m-£40m pa. In other words the existing available expenditure within the catchment area of Alness will not support additional convenience floorspace or, if new additional convenience floorspace is proposed, it will adversely affect the viability of convenience goods shops in Alness and Invergordon town centres. Even with the significant new housing proposed within the local area in the proposed LDP this will not sustain any significant new convenience floorspace without adversely affecting the town centres. In contrast there is a very limited retail offer for comparison goods within Alness and Invergordon with the result that there is substantial expenditure leakage to Inverness and elsewhere. Site AL21 should expressly encourage this type of retail floorspace to assist in reducing retail expenditure leakage. In conclusion site AL21 should expressly support the provision of retail floorspace for comparison goods only and not permit additional convenience floorspace at this location.

Allocated to Alness AL21 Invergordon Road East

Customer Number 04290 Name Linda Lyle Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Overdevelopment of site.

Reference IN44 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduced development. Alteration of siting of higher density housing.

Representation

Reduced development due to 1) rural nature of site ,2) grossly excessive overall density of 29 sites per hectare and 3) existing drainage and water pressure problems in this area . The designation of higher density housing to be reconsidered and relocated again due to rural setting at IN53.

Allocated to South Inverness IN44 Inshes Small Holdings (north)

Customer Number 04309 Name Lindsay Macphee Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN46 Type Change

Comment Changes

1). No further house building in this zone

Representation

1) no amenities for teenagers at present. Increasing this age group will add to youth aggravation with consequently more trouble for existing residents 2)natural habitat destroyed . Deer badgers and other species documented on the site 3)more traffic , parking, and access diminishing quality of living 4)local school already having problems with numbers

Allocated to South Inverness IN46 Balvonie, Milton of Leys

Customer Number 04245 Name Lisa Handcock Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.11 to 4.14

Reference IN67 Type Change

Comment Changes

No development at this site, leave it as a natural green space to benefit the local residents and wildlife.

Representation

IN67 is identified as a natural green space by th Highland Greenspace Audit. Policy 75 of the HwLDP states that such sites will be safeguarded unless; a) it can be suitably demonstrated that the open space is not fit for purpose. b) substitute provision will be provided meeting the needs of the local area c) development of the open space would significantly contribute to the spatial strategy of the area. IN67 does not fulfill (a) b) the needs of the local people and wildlife are access to natural Greenspace. We do not wish you to substitute what we have. The development along the edge of General Wades Road has already had significant negative effect on the wildlife in this corridor. I particularly notice the decline in bird life including yellowhammers (a bird on the red list of conservation concern). To extend development further up this corridor will have a large negative impact on wildlife. Especially as the proposed area includes wetland and bog - a type of land fantastic for biodiversity and poor for building on. c) I cannot believe that this area would be key for spatial strategy, being on the edge of development. Please leave this area alone and give us all, people and wildlife, room to breathe!

Allocated to South Inverness IN67 Bogbain (East)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Notification letter regarding IN52 indicates that the Psychological Service Building is within the boundary (red) of this proposal. We should like this rectified as the building is a listed school building used for staff accomodation for the Pscyhological Service, meeting rooms and consulting rooms for parents, children and young people. It also contains staff parking - which is very important for a statutory, often peripatetic Council service.

Representation

We should therefore like the boundary redrawn to omit 11 - 13 Culcabock Avenue from within the site around Drakies House. Planners need to be aware of the very restricted access Culcabock Avenue would give to IN52. It is a narrow road, frequently congested with residential parting.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Extent the "Mixed Use" classification to the field on the North East side of Croyard Road. (Outlined in red on the enclosed file and noted as R1)

Representation

Beauly already has a considerable area allocated just for housing. This proposal would not prevent housing in the area marked R1 but gives flexibility to accommodate housing, business and community projects on either side of Croyard Road. Once the link road is in place Croyard Road would give a direct, safe and close link to the centre of Beauly (the Square) If the area were to be extended it could allow the Allotments to be moved to within the new enlarged BE2 area. Still providing good access from the centre of the village but also releasing an area of ground very close to the Square for Close care housing, assisted living or day care centre.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04230 Name Lovat Highland Estates Ltd Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr George Reynolds Reynolds Architecture Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.120

Reference Unallocated site at Mansefield Kirkhill Grid 84530 Type Change

Comment Changes

The above noted area and per the attached plan should be included as part of the allocation for housing / mixed use.

Representation

This site to the south west approach of Kirkhill is served by an access which can be taken directly from the existing development at Mansefield. It avoid the access issues and improvements required in order to develop out the five other designated sites i.e. road safety issues within the village at the school, road widths and issues to be resolved regarding multiple ownership. The area has a single owner and is readily available for development. The extent of the site at 5ha could well accommodate mixed use such as retail and business and would be simpler to develop out than KH4. The constraint of the overhead pylons would allow for open amenity space, road access through the site and appropriate mixed uses. The sites currently favoured have multiple issues with ownership and access requiring new link roads and improvements to existing roads which will be costly to implement resulting in significant delay to development. This site is ready for immediate development. The concern is that should this site not be allocated that with the aforementioned difficulties on other sites the continuing development of the village could be significantly delayed with sites laying dormant for many years.

Allocated to Kirkhill General General

Customer Number 04230 Name Lovat Highland Estates Ltd Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr George Reynolds Reynolds Architecture Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.26 to4.31

Reference BE7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Redesignate the area noted as BE7 for Close care housing, assisted living, care home or day centre

Representation

If BE2 was extended as per our first comment the Estate would make land available within BE2 for new Allotments. This would mean that BE7 would be available for the uses we proposed above. The advantage of this proposal is that BE7 is adjacent to existing shelter housing. Access for residents and casual used is simple safe and convenient given the close proximity of the village square. Siting a care home or day care centre on the allotment site could improve the care facilities provided within the village and keeps them together for the convenience of users. Mid street and Croyard road give good, safe, level access to and from the Square rather than having to travel along the side of the very busy A862 from a site possibly beyond the link road junction with the A862..

Allocated to Beauly BE7 Fraser Street

Customer Number 04230 Name Lovat Highland Estates Ltd Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr George Reynolds Reynolds Architecture Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.112

Reference The north side of the A862 is developable Type Change

Comment Changes

Inclusion of the area to the north of the A862 at the village periphery per the attached plan.

Representation

This area was submitted at the call for sites at the request of the Planning Authority. Access is available off the B9164 which is a safer point of access than the sites to the south which would access off the A862. The development of the is corner of the village rounds off the existing settlement pattern creating a crossroads feature. The ground is flat and there are no issues with mature trees or gradients. The development of the site would not require disruption to the A862 for infrastructure crossings.

Allocated to Inchmore General General

Customer Number 04240 Name Lucy Gregson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.134

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Car parking adjacent to the church kept in its current location or possibly expanded. The playing field and play park need to be kept central.

Representation

I would like to see the car parking adjacent to the church kept in its current location or possibly expanded, many of the residents on the High street and small side streets of Conon Bridge do not have parking available to them on their own properties, it is dangerous to park on the road and roadside parking has been reduced because of the cycle path. The location of this parking is also important for those who have reduced mobility and have not been granted permission for parking at their properties. In addition, the playing field and play park need to be central, they provide an option for those resident in the centre of Conon Bridge to access an open area to exercise their animals or children with out needing to travel to the outskirts of the village. Again this is an advantage to those with mobility issues and helps to maintain the well being of those people when access to the wider world is limited.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The boundary line of the development should be moved. It currently extends up to the fence line of the properties right along Resaurie, on Cauldfield Road North. I believe at least the width of the first field, and preferably the second, directly in front of the houses should be retained as a green space or "parkland corridor". This would involve setting the boundary line some way back from the houses. It would go some way to protect the character of Resaurie and retain the beautiful views currently enjoyed by the householders whose properties face the open agricultural land with an outlook over the firth, the Black Isle and over the city to the Strathconon hills.

Representation

Resaurie is a semi-rural settlement of mixed houses of various sizes and ages, and very much enjoys a peaceful village atmosphere with many of the properties looking out to stunning views over the farmland across to the firth and the Black Isle. It is very different to the uniform modern housing schemes with identical houses which have been crammed into the nearby areas of Smithton, Westhill and Cradlehall. Despite its proximity to these large swathes of houses behind our community, Resaurie has retained its unique character as a quiet hamlet, set apart, and I genuinely fear that if this development in front of our homes goes ahead Resaurie will be swallowed up in a large suburban sprawl, and lose its character, amenity and beautiful views so treasured by its residents. The visual impact of a development of 1,300 houses in front of this small community of houses dotted along a narrow single track, tree-lined, dead-end road will be extremely damaging. In an ideal world I would prefer it if this development proposal is scrapped and no houses or other buildings be erected on the parcel of fields facing our homes. However, if a masterplan for this development is drawn up I strongly urge planners to retain a strip of greenfield between Resaurie and the new scheme to allow our community to retain its character. It would be a disgrace if Resaurie was allowed to be strangled by being encircled by strips of high density housing, with no thought being given to the existing thriving little community that is already there. We who are lucky enough to live here enjoy a peaceful atmosphere with one of the most stunning outlooks in Inverness. I feel strongly that Resaurie should be protected. Local development plans should consider the environment and surroundings of the people who already live in the area and should strive to retain and enhance these surroundings, not destroy them. I respectfully request that the boundary line of the development be set back some way from the fence line of the houses in Resaurie to ensure that a section of green field separates our community from this proposed Ashton Farm development. Resaurie is currently separated from the housing schemes behind it by the railway line and a strip of woodland, which gives the community a definite boundary. I feel this masterplan should also include a definite boundary of undeveloped fields between Resaurie and the Ashton Farm scheme to save our distinct community and allow it to keep its identity.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Proposals Map should be adjusted to omit land between the properties 2-8 Moray Park and Barn Church Road which is inappropriately identified for community uses as part of IN87; and that land should either be coloured green or recognised as existing uses, as per the land to the west

Representation

1. This objection concerns the Proposals Map and its presentation of IN87. It refers to land between the properties 2-8 Moray Park Avenue and Barn Church Road identified for community uses with "requirements" to "safeguard for community facilities including allotments, meeting space and neighbourhood shop". 2. We represent M Cameron, resident at 8 Moray Park Avenue, Culloden and the owner of that property. The property is one of four houses located east of Moray Park Avenue facing from the rear, towards Barn Church Road. The intervening ground - is open space; it has been open space since the Thains/Muir Homes development was built some 35 years ago, and appears to have been integral to the layout of that development. 3. The land is maintained regularly as amenity space, it provides amenity and outlook for the residents that overlook it and an appropriate set for development from Barn Church Road the principal district distributor through Culloden. That separation is given greater importance by the restricted depth (12m) of the rear gardens of the adjoining properties. 4. These circumstances appear to have arisen (in part) as a result of the line of the trunk sewer that runs parallel with the rear boundary of the properties (2-8 Moray Park Avenue) and diverts through the open space, in effect centrally, east to west, dissecting the land to which this objection relates (see diag.). The sewer and its operational safeguards (for which a 10m corridor would be applied) and the configuration of Barn Church Road and Moray Park Avenue (and their junction) would completely nullify any realistic potential for any development on the land in question. 5. This is a small, discrete open space - grass with trees - that is separated from other land with potential under the policy IN87 by structural woodland of high amenity value. The land does not "read" with IN87, it "reads" with the open frontage and parklands which extend west of Moray Park Avenue along the whole length of Barn Church Road as far as Smithton - some 1 km. It is part of the structure of Culloden; the amenity of Barn Church Road as a main thoroughfare, and the separation afforded to some of the districts main residential areas to that route. 6. The Proposals Map should be adjusted to omit land between the properties 2-8 Moray Park Avenue and Barn Church Road identified for community uses as part of IN87; and that land should either be coloured green or recognised as existing uses as is the land to the west; and indeed numerous other incidental open amenity spaces throughout Culloden. 7. The land is not suitable for community facilities including allotments, meeting space and neighbourhood shop for the following reasons: Having regard to the above, the reasons are: • the land in question is separated from the wider IN87 allocation, it comprises only about a twentieth of it and it is physically separated from it. It has no discernable functional or even visual association with the wider allocation IN87. Its purpose and value is in its existing use. It should not be identified for community use or as "safeguard for community facilities including allotments, meeting space and neighbourhood shop". • development would impose on a longstanding recognised and established open space that is of value to the residents that overlook it, to users of the main thoroughfare through Culloden and is part of the structure, set back and separation of residential development from the districts main distributor. Development would remove the maturing (planted) trees from the open space that also give the land an association with the parkland to the west. Any community use - other than the purpose of the land as incidental open space - would impose unduly and unnecessarily on the amenity of the adjoining residents; • a trunk sewer running through the land would dissect it and completely nullify any potential for development; • the proximity of the junction of Barn Church Road and Moray Park Avenue offers no reasonable prospect that an access - off one or other or both of these roads - could safely be formed to serve development. This is one of the primary junctions in Culloden and a public transport route and close to an existing staggered junction on the urban distributor network; • the land in question is bound by these roads to the north and west; and by housing to the south and woodland to the east. The line of the trunk sewer and the operational safeguards required for access to it, the (20m) set back from large trees to the east as required by policy and the visibility splays for access, make the proposition that a building, for an intensive community use, with parking and servicing and a safe access to standard, is a completely impractical proposition. The site is too small; • the terms of the Proposed Plan are vague. It presents three "uses" of different character and implications with no indication as to where these might be proposed. However, the land in question comprises some 4% of the allocation IN87. There can be no reasonable presumption (in the context of the whole allocation of 4.3 ha) that it is essential to any of the "uses" proposed; • furthermore, and in any event, allotments and the paraphernalia that goes with them - sheds, fencing, parking, services etc. - would be prominent and intrusive on established amenity at this location; could not be serviced as a result of the access limitations above; and would lack critical mass to be viable as a "community use"; and the use "meeting place" is not recognised in statute and is an inappropriate reference in a development

plan; • finally, there is a well established structure of neighbourhood shops within the Culloden urban district – at Cradlehall, Westhill, Smithton, and Balloch (the established neighbourhood centres) and at Culloden (the district centre): five general stores in total, but with a greater range of shops (baker, butcher etc) in these centres. The Inner Moray Firth Local Plan does not allocate any further land for development in the vicinity of the allocation IN87 – none at all that might offer any hint that a further shop at Moray Park Avenue could be viable. Conclusion The site of this objection - the land between 2-8 Moray Park Avenue and Barn Church - Road is unsuitable in principle for any of the uses the Local Development Plan proposes and it should be deleted from the Proposals Map. It conflicts with amenity, residential amenity, safe access and strategic infrastructure and the value of the land in its existing use as open space. The land is physically and visually detached from the substantive part of the allocation IN87; and is of different character and use. Its use is longstanding and settled as part of an infrastructure/amenity corridor; and it is of the same character and appearance as neighbouring open land that affords a parkland amenity, set back and separation to housing. There is no overriding reason to alter that character and purpose; and it should be retained as existing. The Local Development Plan is vague as to the “uses” and their location; but in any event, the land to which this objection refers is too small to offer any reasonable development potential, nor could it be safely accessed; and the alignment of the sewer through it presents an absolute constraint on its potential for uses other than as existing open space. Our client is disappointed that the planning authority has not recognised the technical constraints imposed by the trunk sewer and access which clearly affect the land. Had these been researched and considered, they ought not to have led to the proposed allocation. Documents Diag: Location of Sewer/Letter dated 26 October 1981 from Divisional Planning Officer Extract Proposals Map

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Clarify the extent of transport improvements required or cross reference to the HwLDP and refer to the need for a Transport Assessment if proposals brought forward in advance of wider improvements to the network. 2. Delete the housing capacity figure. 3. The Plan should explain: (a) how the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar can be determined; (b) What a recreation access management plan is; and (c) why mitigation works are required in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail for land allocations distant from it.

Representation

Our client, Macdonald Hotels Ltd, welcome the fact that the Proposed Plan continues support the Stratton Lodge Hotel site for housing development. However, as with previous stages of the preparation of the LDP, the Proposed Plan fails to clarify the servicing and phasing relative to the Highland wide LDP provisions. This is not helpful and neither is the lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network in the area. The reference in the draft Schedule 4 response to our comments on the MIR about dependency upon others for transport improvements was all too easily dismissed as being “noted” and then by stating that this “is a reality given the site’s location and need for connectivity to local and strategic road networks.” The response goes on to say that “there is no quantitative need to accelerate the supply of housing land within or close to the City. Earlier phased proposals would have to be justified by developer funded transport assessment and not be prejudicial to sensible future transport improvement options.” The list of transport provisions in the HwLDP relating to the development of the area to 2016 as per Phase 1 is extensive and, as previously asserted, our clients are concerned that most of these provisions/ requirements will depend on the action of others. As such, the restoration/ redevelopment of the former Stratton Lodge Hotel will be significantly delayed whilst commitments are made. For example, the recent consultation exercise by Transport Scotland on options for dualling the A96 gave no confidence that even the initial improvements between the Smithton and Inverness Retail and Business Park roundabouts would be delivered in the near future. We also question whether the need to contribute to transport improvements some distance from Stratton Lodge, such as at the Inshes roundabout, is fair and reasonable. Our clients have recently had to deal with the fall-out from further extensive vandalism of the former Listed hotel (a serious fire), which has more or less completely destroyed the building. If the building can be saved, which is a serious doubt, at the very least remedial works need to be undertaken in the near future. In doing so our clients have to be mindful of the development potential and how realistic the provisions of the LDP are to allow an acceptable proposal to be prepared and delivered. The feasibility of restoring the building also depends on a degree of enabling development within the grounds. However, if such development triggers off the need to meet the extensive list of developer requirements and/or await implementation of many of the transport provisions listed in the HwLDP then we anticipate that any hope of saving the building will disappear. As such, the requirement to respect the fabric and setting of the Category B Listed building will no longer be relevant. In addition, we question how the housing capacity of the land allocation can be stated in the Proposed Plan when a Flood Risk Assessment and the retention and management of the mature policy woodland “may affect developable area” (wording in the document)? Furthermore, as IN76 is indicated as a Phase 1 housing site in the HwLDP we are concerned that taking account of the whole range of development factors, it may not be financially feasible or acceptable to the roads authority without allowing access through the open part of the clients’ land (IN84) in conjunction with some early development of it. In this regard the indication of our clients’ part of this allocation in the HwLDP as Phase 2 or part of the Milton of Culloden land is not helpful. The housing capacity figure of IN76 can only realistically be determined by a feasibility study of the restoration/redevelopment of the Listed building together with the transport, flood risk and tree/woodland assessments which will provide development parameters for a suitable design solution. Finally, we seek clarification about the meaning of the first sentence of the “Requirements” listed under this allocation. How can the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar be determined? What is a “recreation access management plan”? Why would mitigation works in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail be required for the development of this allocation?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Separate out our clients' land from this allocation and show it as a stand alone housing allocation or as an extension to housing allocation IN76. 2. Indicate the requirement for a master plan/development brief. 3. Clarify the extent of transport improvements required or cross reference to the HwLDP and refer to the need for a Transport Assessment if proposals brought forward in advance of wider improvements to the network. 4. The Plan should explain: (a) how the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar can be determined; (b) What a recreation access management plan is; and (c) why mitigation works are required in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail for land allocations distant from it.

Representation

Our client, Macdonald Hotels Ltd, owns the former Stratton Lodge Hotel (IN76) and adjoining land to south, the smaller part of IN84. The fact that the Proposed Plan continues support the inclusion of the land for development is welcomed, albeit mixed uses. However, as with previous stages of the preparation of the LDP, the Proposed Plan still fails to clarify the servicing and phasing relative to the Highland wide LDP provisions. This is not helpful and neither is the lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the proposed strategic road network in the area and local connections to it. There is no reference to the Council producing a master plan/development brief as the Plan does for IN82. At least this might produce a development framework that clarifies the future road network and related/required off site improvements to serve the development of IN84. The reference in the draft Schedule 4 response to our comments on the MIR about dependency upon others for transport improvements was all too easily dismissed as being "noted" and then by stating that this "is a reality given the site's location and need for connectivity to local and strategic road networks." The response goes on to say that "there is no quantitative need to accelerate the supply of housing land within or close to the City. Earlier phased proposals would have to be justified by developer funded transport assessment and not be prejudicial to sensible future transport improvement options." However, our clients consider that the survival of the former Stratton Lodge Hotel Listed building depends upon the ability to bring forward proposals for housing development on IN76 in conjunction with the development of their part of IN84. The list of transport provisions in the HwLDP relating to the development of the area to 2016 as per Phase 1 is extensive and, as previously asserted, our clients are concerned that most of these provisions/requirements will depend on the action of others. As such, development at Stratton Lodge/Milton of Culloden will be significantly delayed whilst commitments are made. For example, the recent consultation exercise by Transport Scotland on options for dualling the A96 gave no confidence that even the improvements between the Smithton and Inverness Retail and Business Park roundabouts would be delivered in the near future. It also omitted details of the East Link between the A96 and A9 which the strategy for delivery development across the Corridor, as indicated in the HwLDP, is based upon and where there is a requirement that development of the later phases of Stratton have to contribute to. Our client fully understands the need for the link between the A9 and A96 through East Inverness but has concerns about its route, the connectivity with his and adjoining development land, its deliverability and the nature of the major junctions with both the A9 and A96. It is still not clear whether this Strategic Link Road has to be completed in its entirety in advance of commencing Phase 2 or what the timescale is for its completion. There has also been some doubt in the past about whether the section through Ashton Farm (part of IN82) can be completed as it may remain in agricultural use for some considerable period of time. It is also unclear if Transport Scotland will commit to the building of the East Link. This is not part of the current consultation exercise on the A96 dualling and Transport Scotland officials attending the recent exhibition for this advised that the East Link will be the subject of yet another consultation exercise in the Spring of 2014. This will presumably follow up on the one conducted for the Inshes to Nairn link early in 2012 at which there was a notable absence of detail about the nature and timing of the provision of local road connections and improvements required to open up development land at Stratton. Our main concern here is whether there is a need to upgrade Barn Church Road from the A96 Smithton roundabout to Smithton in advance of any of our client's land being developed (both IN76 and part of IN84). In addition, the former Stratton Lodge Hotel and immediate grounds are indicated as a Phase 1 housing site in the HwLDP but we are concerned that this may not be feasible or permissible without allowing access through the open part of their land, indicated as Phase 2. Please see attached plan of the preferred means of access. As previously stated but not fully addressed by the Council, it is vital that the Stratton Lodge area is not land-locked or hindered by the uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. As such, we would prefer that the open part of our clients' land and forming part of IN84 is separated from that allocation (as it is in terms of ownership) and shown as a housing site. The intention here is to allow proposals for its development to come forward in the same timescale as IN76. Our clients have recently had to deal with the fall-out from further extensive vandalism of the former Listed hotel (a serious fire), which has more or less completely

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

destroyed the building. If the building can be saved, which is a serious doubt, at the very least remedial works need to be undertaken in the near future. In doing so our clients have to be mindful of the development potential and how realistic the provisions of the LDP are to allow an acceptable proposal to be prepared and delivered. The feasibility of restoring the building also depends on a degree of enabling development within the grounds, where flood risk and tree assessments allow. The alternative would be to promote development on the adjoining open land to the south. This is the smaller part of IN84 which is also in our clients' ownership. If this cannot be achieved and if the development of IN76 alone triggers off the need to meet the extensive list of developer requirements and/or await implementation of many of the transport provisions listed in the HwLDP, then we anticipate that any remaining hope of saving the Listed building will disappear. We also seek clarification about the meaning of some of the "Requirements" listed under this allocation. How can the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar be determined? What is a "recreation access management plan"? Why would mitigation works in connection with the Inverness-Nairn Coastal Trail be required for the development of this allocation?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Identify a "future area for growth" east of Muir of Ord, north of Black Isle Road for development in future plan periods, in particular MIR site MU4.

Representation

Scottish Planning Policy (para 73) states that Local Development Plans should identify a range of sites which are effective or capable of becoming effective to meet the strategic requirement up to year 10 (from date of adoption), and should also provide an indication of the possible scale and location of housing up to year 20. This is to provide landowners, developers, infrastructure and service providers with certainty as to where future development is likely to occur. Muir of Ord forms part of the Ross-Shire growth area (Map 6) with good accessibility to Inverness, Dingwall and further afield via a range of modes of transport. Whilst we accept that there are sufficient opportunities allocated in this plan for the short term, we do not accept that the future areas for growth of Muir of Ord will be to the south and north of the settlement (as stated at Para 4.74). We believe that the area hatched in Blue on the attached plan, north of the Black Isle Road is better located in relation to the school, shops and train station than the potential areas north and particularly south of the settlement. There is also the opportunity to form a public park, and to improve an existing junction arrangement to the east as part of development in this location and to form a logical rounding off of the settlement. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Muir of Ord will continue to be a location where development allocations are made in future LDP's and therefore future areas for growth should be identified in line with SPP. Whilst this site was not "preferred" in the Main Issues Report, the significant "pro's" were identified as being its close proximity to the town centre, and Primary School. The significant "con's" were that it was outwith the settlement boundary and would result in the significant expansion of the settlement, and that development would result in the loss of open space. We had clarified that there was no intention that the open space would be lost, rather retained and enhanced as part of the development. We have attached an example of how another Local Authority has taken this approach and would support the use of this in this instance.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The plan is not clear as to what is intended. All that is stated is "energy from waste" I am against any incinerators and hope the Council will instead consider anaerobic digestion as a viable alternative.

Representation

I am very much agianst an incinerator either on the Longman or in Invergordon for the following reasons:- 1 there would be pollution by wind to any areas downwind of any incinerator. Depending on wind direction this could include the Black Isle if the prevailing wind is blowing from the SW. However if there is a northerly wind then the whole of Inverness could be affected and again the Black isle if there were to be an incinerator in Invergordon. Pollution could include heavy metals, dioxins and small particles damaging the lungs. Research downwind of Incinerators both in the US and in the UK has found increases in Infant mortality , asthma and brain tumours and a reduction in IQ levels. 2 An incinerator would very likely divert material currently being recycled towards the incinerator. A much more earth friendly option would be to have an Anaerobic Digestor rather than an incinerator which would be a Greener and a cheaper option.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

No building in this proposed plan.

Representation

I feel very let down if this proposed development should go ahead, as the main selling point from Tulloch when buying my property was that the field beyond my garden would stay free and green from further housing development.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04259 Name Margaret Bluefield Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.173

Reference SP2 Type Change

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the proposed railway development on this site.

Representation

I have lived at Railway Cottage in Strathpeffer for the last 27 years after purchasing it as a derelict property and have acquired over that period of time considerable very local knowledge of the area proposed for development. The first point I would like to raise is that the trustees of the Museum and station have rejected plans for the steam train to come into the station on the grounds that it would disturb the peace and ambience of tourists and locals who use the station for recreation and with this in mind the railway association have lodged a planning application which falls well short of the station itself making nonsense of the proposal. The plans are for a very short length of track on a recognised, sign posted footpath used by locals, tourists, farm access and the acclaimed Knockfarrel Hill Race. A cycle path from Strathpeffer to Dingwall has been proposed which meets the criteria for lowering our carbon footprint, improving the safety of cyclists, preserves the habitats of wildlife whilst enabling walkers to continue to use a very popular access to the countryside. The development of a track and steam train will create the opposite - very high carbon footprint, spoil heaps, reduced or no access to walkers, disturbance of wildlife habitats and high levels of pollution and noise.

Allocated to Strathpeffer SP2 Railway Station

Customer Number 04091 Name Margaret Fraser Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN19 Type Change

Comment Changes

A Nature Reserve Park

Representation

I think the quarry would be much better suited to a nature reserve park with animal feeding stations, picnic benches and childrens play area. A log cabin café also. Certainly no flats. The red squirrel frequent this area also the deer and birds of prey it a little area of beauty in conservation village. Any more flats would ruin the village. The area needs protecting.

Allocated to West Inverness IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

totally disagree to plan, Where do our Green boundries start and finish? This piece of land appears to be very productive to Knocknagael Bull farm.

Representation

Again i must comment to where our green boundries start and finish and this productive land. This area is surrounded by beautifully kept countryside, wild life, quiet, sleepy, location with little traffic. My concerns are, Over development, more traffic on road, especially where joining the Southern Distributor Road, where children are walking to both primary and secondary school.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I do not believe that site CD 2 should be developed. I believe that site CD 1 should be developed in a manner which is sympathetic to the historic surroundings of the central village. I feel that sites CD 3 to CD 11 should be developed with caution and only after detailed consultation with local residents and stakeholders. If the whole area were developed I am concerned that this would irrevocably change the unique feel and character of the village.

Representation

I own and live in a house in the centre of the village of Cawdor. I have lived in the house since 1974 (39 years) with my husband until 2011 and since then on my own. My house faces towards the proposed site CD 2 (opposite the old school) and my garden directly abuts the proposed site CD 1 (the old school playground). I am not against development in the centre of the village, however I am concerned that it does not take place in a way which seriously damages or destroys the unique historic feel and look of the village. I believe that it should be possible to develop site CD 1 in a way which enhances the community in the village. This site, although in the centre of the village, is well protected by mature trees and other properties and I feel that an appropriately designed development scheme, which retains the trees and the main stone buildings of the old school would not detract from the look and feel of the village. I am, however, very concerned about and oppose the proposed development of site CD 2 (opposite the old school). Such a development would destroy the current open aspect and relationship between the centre of the village and the historic Cawdor wood. The fact that the wood is directly visible and accessible from the centre of the village is a key aspect of the unique character and charm of the village. The development of site CD 2 would, I believe, have a materially adverse effect on the historic character and amenity of the village and would have a directly negative impact on the quality of life of the village residents. I am concerned that the extent of sites CD3 to CD11 may also have a very significant impact on the nature and character of the village. In all, the areas flagged for potential development are significantly larger than the current area of the entire village. I am concerned that the development of this entire area, even over a 20 year period, would simply be too much for the current village to take and there must be a danger that the current charm and character would disappear. However I understand that there is a need for development generally and understand that the existing community and facilities could support some growth. If there is to be development in some of these sites (as noted above, I believe it should be some, not all) then such development should only be done cautiously and after detailed engagement with local residents, the community council and other stakeholders. Clearly there would also need to be a lot of work done on local infrastructure too.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As this is only a proposed plan with no drawings it is difficult to make detailed comments/concerns, therefore, this does not constitute a "change" but more of queries and observations.

Representation

As the properties in Bishops Road that adjoin IN22 are all single storey properties I am concerned as to what type of buildings would be erected, also, whether they would be compatible with the designs of existing buildings in the surrounding area. I am also worried that my privacy (especially in the garden) would be compromised by being overlooked by adjoining properties. The proposed Local Development Plan shows that this area would be for 50 homes/business. Is this for 50 homes OR businesses or a mix of both? If the proposed plans were to be implemented would this have any effect on the value of my property? If Highland Council HQ moves to the University Campus would this not be more inconvenient for the majority of Inverness constituents to get to? At the moment it is far easier for people to visit being so close to the town.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site IG11, additional text to recognise permitted development rights of port authorities

Representation

The on going noise from the service base of generators all day every day. The banging noise of metal on metal every day the number of banks range at any given time from 5 or 6 to 10 or 20 or more horrendous at times, no peace from it at night either intermittently through out the night I have being woken up every night for the past 3 months sleep depravation at its worst, I object most strongly to any more development at this service base. I think the wording of the Inner Moray Firth plan is misleading as the highland council cannot ensure any adverse effects if they allow permitted Development of the new Inner Moray Firth development plan. These requirements are all planning conditions but there is no planning consent in the case of the Cromarty Firth port authority.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04095 Name margaret walker Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 1G10

Reference 1g11 Type Change

Comment Changes

The highland council cannot ensure any adverse effects if they allow Permitted development. These requirements are all planning conditions But there are no planning consent in the case of CFPO.

Representation

Constant night noise sleep deprivation at its worst for the last month.

Allocated to Invergordon IG11 Cromarty Firth Port Authority

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 32 Knocknagael Bull Farm Type Change

Comment Changes

Lochardil and Drummond Community Council objects to the change of use of the area, it should be protected for farmland or amenity use such as community allotments.

Representation

The plan proposes the allocation of part of the farm to housing development use. Lochardil and Drummond Community Council objects to the change of use of the area. This is valuable agricultural land that should be protected for farmland or amenity use. There was a planning application last year subsequently withdrawn that caused strong opposition from the local community. The IMFLDP should protect this land -it could be rented as farmland or would provide an ideal site for allotments. As an alternative to farmland the preference for use would be allotments, community facilities with some left as rural land. The site is actually below the flood channel, which could put at risk of flooding any houses that are built beside the channel. In addition as the land currently acts as a flood reservoir, a housing development could increase flood risk down hill

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN82 and IN83 Type Change

Comment Changes

The Community Council would request a reduced density and the creation of a green corridor along the burns and retention of some farmland.

Representation

The Community Council would request a reduced density and the creation of a green corridor along the burns and retain of some farmland to maintain the rural character of the area.

Allocated to East Inverness IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Lochardil and Drummond residents value living in an area that has a significant greenspace – and would like to see that protected and enhanced in any new developments affecting the area. We would like to see more emphasis given to planning paths and cycle/walking routes in the developments closeby and further afield. It is important that a Safe to School Walking Routes plan is prepared in advance of any planning developments requiring new school to avoid the parking and car problems in existing schools. The whole south (and central and eastern) Inverness have no allotment provision, and this needs attention.

Allocated to South Inverness General General

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN31 Ness Castle Type Change

Comment Changes

The Community Council objects to the proposed density and requests a requirement to prepare Core Paths and Safe to School route plans.

Representation

The plan proposes a housing allocation of 934 houses. The Community Council objects to the proposed density, it is far too high considering the woodland and amenity value of the site, and lack of clarity on flood risk. The Community Council would seek a revision of the current density if the Planning Permission 04/00585/OUTIN comes up for renewal.. Further housing capacity is now being provided in the area under IN24 Tornean & Ness-side via Planning permission for the site was approved before the proposals to develop the area around Tesco's (IN24 Tornean & Ness-side) were approved. The CC would like to request the identification of core paths and a safe to School Walking Routes plan. Primary education provision for developments in IN31 and IN24 need to be looked at in an integrated manner and early on – particularly since existing local schools (Lochardil and Holm) have reached full capacity.

Allocated to South Inverness General General

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN58 Land at Gaelic Primary School Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove zoning from plan as inappropriate. Development on this site would be opposed by the Community Council and local community.

Representation

Land is part of Culduthel Park and covered by a Section 75 Agreement for public park. As such there is no need for a development zoning. If Highland Council wishes to form sports pitches or recreational areas on the land this would meet its obligations under the Section 75 Agreement and meet the needs of both the Community and the school, provided that the Community was given free access when not needed by school activities. As such there is no need for any development zoning . Any proposal for any building development on the site would be opposed by the Community and Community Council

Allocated to South Inverness IN58 Land at Gaelic Primary School

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

This is an area allocated for Business/Tourism potentially 26 homes in the IMFLDP. Lochardil and Drummond CC would like to object to the proposed house density. We appreciate that once the agricultural college moves to the Inverness Campus, the site could be redeveloped for housing. However the site is within a conservation area and contains a listed building, a lower density level of housing (and with low rise buildings) will be more in keeping with the area. The site has also a very restricted access to a busy road. The Community Council is concerned about the increased risk for pedestrians and cars that additional traffic from a development could cause. The Community Council considers that the proposed density does not take into account sufficiently the existing woodland and is concerned about the potential loss of trees particularly since most of the adjacent woodland has been recently lost to development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The plan proposes the allocation of part of the farm to housing development use. Lochardil and Drummond Community Council objects to the change of use of the area. This is valuable agricultural land that should be protected for farmland or amenity use. There was a planning application last year subsequently withdrawn that caused strong opposition from the local community. The IMFLDP should protect this land -it could be rented as farmland or would provide an ideal site for allotments. As an alternative to farmland the preference for use would be allotments, community facilities with some left as rural land. The site is actually below the flood channel, which could put at risk of flooding any houses that are built beside the channel. In addition as the land currently acts as a flood reservoir, a housing development could increase flood risk down hill.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 24 Torvean and Ness-side. Type Change

Comment Changes

Identification of Core Paths and Sate to School routes plan

Representation

The road to Dores is a key tourist destination and also a well-used recreation route by cyclists, walkers and runners. The Community Council would like to see improved core paths clearly identified in detailed plans for the site so that these became a requirement to any planning permission– in particular an extension of existing core path IN 19.36 along the river (see attachment) and a new built core path along the B862 road to Dores. The CC would also request that a safe to School Walking Routes plan is prepared early on.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN7 Cameron Barracks Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduction in development proposals

Representation

The Cameron Barracks was built between 1880and 1886 and has a significant history in the eyes of the public. Any development on this site should not remove the parade square, now laid in grass. This sets the scene for the Listed Barracks buildings,.and development of the site would harm the buildings and remove a tourist attraction

Allocated to Central Inverness IN7 Cameron Barracks

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

This is a village of no more than 600 people spread over a largish area. 150 or so people all together would totally change the village, which is not suitable in any way to this change. Where is the employment - there is none other than tourist associated in the Season. Even supplying some new industry would not be for many people. Are these people supposed to commute to Inverness? Or are they going to be retired? Also will the school be able to cope with lots of children - I don't think so. A scheme of 150 or so people will be like creating a new village. Will there be amenities for these new residents? We probably could do with a few new houses, possibly 20 or so/ at the present moment we have about 20 houses which are empty and for sale.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

In the allocation for development of proposed site NA2 I have no objection to the development per-se other than the access. It appears that the development requires access onto the Lochloy Road. At present the road from Druim to the beginning of the 30 MPH speed-limit area at the golf course is far too narrow to cope with the existing traffic. Further access on the scale proposed under NA2 will take the traffic flows from being inconvenient to ludicrous. Traffic currently has to use house drive ways as lay-bys from the Eastern side of Kingsteps up to Derelochy. The road is steep with an S Bend at Derelochy where there have been numerous incidents with vehicles losing control in freezing condition and in one accident, a 4 x 4 ended up crashing through the bridge parapet and ended upside down in the burn. School buses already have no safe areas to drop young children off. I hope the council uses common sense and insists that access be through the existing and current development area (NA5) for any outline or full planning approvals

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We consider that retail use designation for the development site identified as IN71 is unsuitable and therefore should be changed.

Representation

I object to the proposed retail development at IN71 on the following grounds: • The shape and location of the site, coupled to its close proximity to the junction of Old Edinburgh Road South and Stephenson Drive, dictates that any off road parking and goods deliveries will have to be accessed off the foot of Old Edinburgh Road South. We consider that Old Edinburgh Road South is unsuitable for access to the development due to a number of factors. The existing road provides vehicle access to a small number of residential properties and farm buildings only, however is very popular with walkers, cyclists and runners all year round. Pedestrian links to residential developments at Parks Farm and Milton of Leys, designed to encourage non car travel into town have been very successful. However the road is only of single track, is poorly maintained and has inadequate surface drainage provision and no lighting. In addition there is no footpath provision anywhere on the road and currently is designated with a 60 mph speed limit. Due to the confined nature of the road there is no capacity to provide a safe footpath and therefore to increase vehicular traffic, whilst also encouraging additional foot traffic by provision of a retail outlet must be rejected on safety grounds. • Every day we witness drivers parking unsafely on the corner of Stephenson Drive/ Old Edinburgh Road South to access the existing corner post-box. This causes traffic obstructions and creates blind spots for their own convenience. We are extremely concerned, however would fully expect to see higher volumes of drivers parking on Stephenson Drive to access the retail development rather than drive off road to access any on-site parking. Again, on the grounds of safety the retail development designation of this site should be changed. • The Council states within the Development Plan that they “will not support any proposal for development that is likely to have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of any of the centres listed below”, including Inverness City Centre and Inshes Retail Park. Given the close proximity, the proposed development will certainly impact upon the Inshes Retail Park.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the area, currently referred to under Policy IN49, to be safeguarded from any development. In other words I would like Policy IN49 to be deleted and a new Policy written which would safeguard the land for its current natural recreational uses, habitat for flora and fauna and essential corridor of 'green space' which benefits both people and local wildlife .

Representation

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:- 1. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. (These Policies and some relevant Statements are copied in full at the end of this letter). 2. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people. 3. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected. 4. We are concerned about the threat any proposed development would have on the local wildlife. During our visits to the area we have spotted deer, hare and badger, and some of these animals are protected species. There is also a wide variety of birds and interesting pond life including newts, frogs and toads. We therefore object to the resultant loss of habitat and adverse disturbance to wildlife which would occur should this land be developed. 5. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. There is no need for artificial bunds, this land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary. 6. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies as outlined below:- Policies and Statements referred to in Objection 1 and final paragraph are herewith copied below as follows:- 'The Council's Vision for the Highlands': Paragraph 5.1: "By 2030... the Highlands will have created sustainable communities, balancing population growth, economic development and the safeguarding of the environment...and have a fairer and healthier Highlands." Paragraph 5.2.2: "We will have

safeguarded our Environment by ensuring the special quality of the natural, built and cultural environment is protected and enhanced.” Paragraph 5.2.4: “We will have achieved a healthier Highlands by providing places that contribute to increasing healthy lifestyles, opportunities for quality open space provision and access to enjoy the outdoors; and protecting and enhancing the green network within and around settlements leading to cohesive and fit for purpose network of greenspaces...” Policy 60: Other Important Habitats: “The Council will seek to safeguard the integrity of features of the landscape which are of major importance because of their linear and continuous structure or combination as habitat “stepping stones” for the movement of wild fauna and flora.” Policy 74: Green Networks “Green networks should be protected and enhanced. Development in areas identified for the creation of green networks should seek to avoid the fragmentation of the network and take steps to improve its connectivity where this is appropriate.The main principles of the Council’s Future Guidance on Green Networks are to help promote green space linkages and to safeguard and enhance wildlife corridors in and around new and existing developments...and to set out mechanisms for delivery of projects to maintain and enhance the existing green network.” Policy 75: Open Space “The Council’s long term aim for open space provision is for: -the creation of sustainable networks of open space of high quality -areas of local open space that are accessible by foot and linked to the wider network -fit for purpose green spaces and sports facilities that support and enhance biodiversity; and -open spaces that improve the quality of life of residents and visitors Existing areas of high quality, accessible and fit for purpose open space will be safeguarded from inappropriate development and enhancement will be sought where appropriate.” Public Access: Para 23.7.1: “Access to the outdoors is important to the Highlands for recreation tourism and to help everyone maintain a healthy lifestyle”.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Comments on Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan November 2013 Background HIE's purpose is to generate sustainable economic growth across the Highlands and Islands. Its vision is of a highly successful and competitive region in which increasing numbers of people choose to live, work, study and invest. The Inner Moray Firth is the most populous of the eight HIE operating areas and is the key economic driver for the Highlands and Islands, so HIE is concerned to ensure that the land allocations in this area are appropriate and balanced to support its growth aspirations for the area. The key opportunities for growth have been determined to lie in the following sectors:- Energy Sustainable Tourism Life Sciences Finance and Business Services Food and Drink Universities Creative Industries It is therefore essential that sites should be allocated to meet the development needs of these over the anticipated lifetime of the Local Development Plan, with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the variances which will inevitably emerge over time. Throughout the plan it is important that the allocation of land is balanced between industrial, commercial, residential, recreational etc. in order that the development of the Inner Moray Firth area can be achieved and the growth aspirations realised. In this respect, it appears that throughout the plan the primary emphasis is on housing provision with commercial and industrial uses a secondary consideration. It is appreciated that political pressure and landowner desire will always be weighted in favour of residential use. Given this situation it is important that a visionary and imaginative approach is adopted in land allocation policy. All too often the sites chosen for industrial use in particular are those with access, flooding or contamination issues rendering them unsuitable for housing. These issues make them unattractive to industrial and commercial developers also, placing the area at a competitive disadvantage in attracting inward investment. Allocation of development land uses should be determined by an integrated development strategy and not driven by development proposals per se. Growth Areas It is pleasing to note that the Inverness to Nairn and Ross-shire have been identified as Growth Areas with integrated growth plans described in detail. Specific information of the timing of the developments would enhance these sections and give the document more weight as a marketing proposal for the area to present to inward investors looking for confidence in the region. The different elements, particularly those relating to infrastructure, interact with one another on a 'whole is greater than the sum of the parts' basis and need to be brought to fruition against a specified timescale. Inverness Airport Business Park has a possibly unique set of attributes as a masterplanned business park with airside access, permitted rail halt and an SSCI exemplar new community co-ordinated in one place. Both the Nigg and Whiteness sites feature prominently in the National Renewables Infrastructure Plan (N-RIP) as two of only four sites in Scotland suitable for integrated manufacture of offshore wind turbines, based on the sites' physical attributes. It is considered that this is worthy of mention in the Plan. The Inverness Campus project is now well under way and will be a key economic and regeneration driver. It is felt that more narrative could be included to emphasise this and how it relates to other potential development sites in the East Inverness and A96 Corridor. Likewise the major industrial land allocations at Delny and Highland Deephaven could perhaps with advantage be included in the East Ross Growth Corridor rather than tucked away in the Invergordon and Evanton sections respectively. In the absence of specific proposals for the Delny site, it is unclear why the notes on oil spill contingency and ballast water transfer are included. It is now over ten years since Halcrow completed the Review of Ports and Sites in the Inner Moray Firth and in the context of spatial planning as well as economic development an update of this report would be useful. Given the anticipated growth in key sectors in key parts of the geography, the emphasis on additional and new housing stock is welcome, to provide homes for the anticipated additional workforce needed, especially around Ross-shire (notably around the Cromarty Firth, i.e. Nigg and Invergordon based developments), Inverness and Nairn (notably around Inverness Campus, Inverness Airport Business Park, and Ardersier).

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Delete "village would also benefit from a new community sports facility"

Representation

A new sports facility was recently completed in Kirkhill, from my observation it is little used, in fact I have yet to see anyone playing tennis on the all weather court.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Request that any housing development also contributes to the public infrastructure of the Clachnaharry area.

Representation

Evidence of the lack of investment in local infrastructure this is the recent Albyn Housing Association flats which added nothing to local infrastructure at Clachnaharry. Local infrastructure should be included in the IN19 development. Public Parking spaces, children's play areas, gardens and perhaps a pedestrian crossing over the A862 are all facilities I would like to see added to the development plan. I welcome the proposed determination to improve footpath provision at this site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Request more substantial safety measures put in place for vehicle and pedestrian access / egress to this site, and traffic calming measures added to prevent accidents at this blind corner.

Representation

Any housing development in this area at Clachnaharry Quarry will require a junction onto the A862. The local development plan identifies that it will improve visibility at this bend in the road to facilitate this. I request that more robust measures should be put in place to prevent vehicle accidents at this potentially dangerous junction. Evidence of the need for this consideration is that there has already been a child injured this year by a passing car at this bend. The local residents at Clachnaharry currently have a campaign to either reduce the speed restriction to 20 mph or to introduce some form of traffic calming measures. According to the Highway Code any vehicle travelling at 30mph would need a minimum of 75ft stopping distance. This identifies the need for there to be adequate visibility for traffic already on the A862 travelling in either direction. Request that the Highland Council considers all options to explore this safety issue and perhaps consider decreasing the speed limit or introducing traffic lights/mini roundabout/ pedestrian crossing?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Specific information on Road Safety, particularly in relation to pedestrians and cyclists. More attention to preserving amenities for existing and new residents by extending significant planting. Detailed information on how this development will be sympathetic to Evanton's rural environment. Map to include accurate position of burn and the implications of future flood risk.

Representation

1. Road traffic through Evanton village is already perilous to pedestrians, particularly in Station Road; my observation is that primary school children from Novar and Fyrish Crescents rarely walk to school unaccompanied by an adult. The pavements are currently narrow and hazardous with little room for expansion, and although the document mentions paths for cyclists and pedestrians there was not enough detail. Can residents be confident that, given the increased level of traffic through the village at peak times, creating a safe route to local amenities, including the primary school, is possible? 2. I note that the 'Requirements' include 'significant planting on the eastern boundary', but the residents in Glenglass Road, and the dog walkers in the adjacent lane, who for many years have enjoyed the benefits of the 'distinctly rural environment', including outstanding views over cultivated farmland, bordered by native flora and fauna, have not been considered. Could additional sympathetic planting to preserve the amenity be included in the final plan? 3. The word 'sustainability' has rightly been referred to repeatedly in this document, and yet the development is on prime agricultural land which can never be replaced. 'Significant' planting, protection of indigenous lizards, possible cycle tracks and footpaths have been mentioned but can residents be reassured that the development plan will be detailed enough to provide more information on how it will be sympathetic to Evanton's unique rural environment? 4. I notice that the map shows a 'drain' to the north-west of EV2. Strangely the 'drain' seems to come to an abrupt end beside Culcairn Steading. This is actually a small burn that continues beyond Station Road. Extensive flooding occurred here some years ago, with Culcairn Cottage and houses and gardens in Glenglass Road being affected.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04247 Name Mary Harrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.97 to 4.100

Reference Croy

Type Change

Comment Changes

Transport, I'd like to see consideration of good public transport from Croy to Nairn.

Representation

With development in the village there are likely to be increasing numbers of elderly people and young families. Car ownership is expensive, but necessary as there is no easy way to get from Croy to the local GP surgery or dentist. As this plan is long term, consideration should be given to this issue . The current road system is inadequate. transport infrastructure should be in place before further development is allowed. While I accept that development in Croy is inevitable, it is important that the necessary in fracture, sewage water etc are in place and that the development is in keeping with the village. It is a rural community and new housing should be low density in keeping with its surrounding. The community must be allowed to assimilate a new phase, before more is added. The threat of having the village as a 20 year building site is not appealing. As the community increases amenities for the youngsters, especially teenager needs to be provided, especially as there is not public transport in the evenings.

Allocated to Croy General General

Customer Number 04247 Name Mary Harrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.99

Reference Croy

Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

I support loch flemington Special protection areas and that the potential effects of development on water quality are to be addressed/considered by policy 5 of this plan.

Allocated to Policy 5 Development Within the Water Catchment of Loch Flemington

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I'd like to see sustainable development in keeping with the village.

Representation

While I accept that development in Croy is inevitable, it is important that the necessary in fracture, sewage water etc are in place and that the development is in keeping with the village. The proposed plan means doubling the side of the village in a short period. I am not happy with this. The time scale for this number of houses should be significantly increased to allow for a stable community Croy is a rural community and new housing should be low density in keeping with its surrounding. The community must be allowed to assimilate a new phase, before more is added. The threat of having the village as a 20 year building site is not appealing.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Our two main concerns are water supply and traffic. We have lived here for 28 years and this year was the first time that we have been seriously concerned about the lack of water from our source, which is a burn. We feel that as we are lower down the hill, the new houses, for which you have been giving planning permission lately, will help to lessen our supply of water. As you don't seem concerned enough to supply us with mains water we are getting worried about this situation, especially as you are still giving planning permission for even more buildings. Our other concern is the heavy amount of traffic on a road which is totally unsuited to the size of vehicle that it now has to accommodate. We have seen the school bus size rise from a taxi to a minibus and now it is a large single decker bus which is only half full. Our bungalow is situated opposite the kennels where the road widens slightly. Traffic often meets here and some of the wider vehicles have difficulty in avoiding the ditch which runs in front of our house, especially as it is now difficult to see there is a ditch there .. We would like to see a water pipe put in and the ditch covered over. This would avoid a vehicle getting stuck in the ditch which has happened in the past. We had to contact the garage to get it pulled out as there is no mobile signal in this area. We are writing to you as your Website isn't available at the moment. The single decker bus was also involved with another vehicle on the bend below us and got stuck. We helped by allowing the driver to use our phone to summon assistance.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Our two main concerns are water supply and traffic. We have lived here for 28 years and this year was the first time that we have been seriously concerned about the lack of water from our source, which is a burn. We feel that as we are lower down the hill, the new houses, for which you have been giving planning permission lately, will help to lessen our supply of water. As you don't seem concerned enough to supply us with mains water we are getting worried about this situation, especially as you are still giving planning permission for even more buildings. Our other concern is the heavy amount of traffic on a road which is totally unsuited to the size of vehicle that it now has to accommodate. We have seen the school bus size rise from a taxi to a minibus and now it is a large single decker bus which is only half full. Our bungalow is situated opposite the kennels where the road widens slightly. Traffic often meets here and some of the wider vehicles have difficulty in avoiding the ditch which runs in front of our house, especially as it is now difficult to see there is a ditch there .. We would like to see a water pipe put in and the ditch covered over. This would avoid a vehicle getting stuck in the ditch which has happened in the past. We had to contact the garage to get it pulled out as there is no mobile signal in this area. We are writing to you as your Website isn't available at the moment. The single decker bus was also involved with another vehicle on the bend below us and got stuck. We helped by allowing the driver to use our phone to summon assistance.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the proposed plan of dw3. There is a heavily wooded are to the side of tulloch square which os home to lots of wildlife including woodpeckers owls and im also led to believe badgers. I have been in touch with the rspb and they tell me woodpeckers are protected whilst breeding and badgers are also protected. Therefore i am objecting on behalf of the animals. There is also an old historical wall surrounding the wood and i feel this would be a great shame if this was pulled down.

Representation

as before. Because of the threat to the local wildlife.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04414 Name Medco Ltd Organisation Medco Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) S White urnberry Consulting Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AR4 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

The Estate welcomes the allocation at Milton of Connage Farm. The site is appropriate for development, given its location adjacent to the existing settlement of Ardersier and will make a valuable contribution to delivering a mix of housing, employment space in the village.

Allocated to Ardersier AR4 Milton of Connage Farm

Customer Number 04414 Name Medco Ltd Organisation Medco Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) S White urnberry Consulting Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TG1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Area(ha): 259ha Requirements: Development to be brought forward in accordance with planning permission 09/00038/OUTIN and associated masterplan.

Representation

Planning Permission in Principle for Tornagrain has been issued since the Proposed Plan was drafted and therefore the text of the allocation needs to be updated to recognise the requirements of the permission as the key reference point for the detailed schemes, which will come forward on a phased basis. The Estate remains fully committed to the implementation of Tornagrain, and indeed, is currently in dialogue with delivery partners of the first phase of development which is currently in the detailed design process.

Allocated to Tornagrain TG1 Tornagrain

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The Estate supports the allocation of this site, which will enable consolidation and expansion of this prestigious regional leisure development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reduction in number of houses A more approbriate location of 2 storeyed dwellings... .distanced from existing low build properties (1 to 1 and half storey More space between Terraced buildings as the indicative plans illustrates as very concentrated terrace

Representation

Over development of site. For site IN44 IMFLDP gives an area of 6.7Ha, however a previous Planning permission appeal was refused on the grounds that the reporter's impression of 4.6Ha which suggests a discreptionary measurement of some 2.1 Ha. Over the past number of years planning permission has been applied for and the most recent for 131 was refused on the grounds it constituted an overdevelopment of the site . Inappropriate location of 2 storeyed buildings in close proximity to existing low density housing. This is a rural location and it would be desirabl if housing development in the area was mindful of the existing environmental credentials

Allocated to

Customer Number 04465 Name Michael Chell Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry Type Change

Comment Changes

No housing on this site unless sympathetic with the High Street

Representation

Within 100 yds of this site there are five listed properties on the High Street, one and three High Street dated from the early 1800s "Dunolly House" the old school house and the clachnaharry workshops, any housing on this site must fit in with the rest of the properties on the old high street so we do not loose the heritage of the clachnaharry village. Housing capacity of 16 would be over development of the old existing high street and would not fit in to the area

Allocated to West Inverness IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry

Customer Number 04465 Name Michael Chell Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry Type Change

Comment Changes

Safe guard of the woodland area at the rear of quarry

Representation

The wild life in the woodland area is quite diverse and should be protected, seen on a regular basis by myself and neighbours are red squirrels, roe deer, tawny owls and sparrow hawks. The other problem in this area of land is a possible outbreak of Japaniece Knot Weed

Allocated to West Inverness IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Visability for access onto A862

Representation

At the moment we do not know how this would be achieved for 16 propertioes but I believe is impossible on this very dangerous bend. The people on the high street and clachnaharry road have great difficulty getting one vehicle in and out in safety.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The site H49 as indicated in the Main Issues Report should be re-instated as a residential development site for the many positive reasons given by the Council when supporting it's allocation in the MIR. In addition site IN49 (formerly B7 in the Main Issues Report) should only be allocated on the basis that it provides for a "ransom free" connection to site H49 for future development.

Representation

On behalf of my client I strongly object to the exclusion of the site referenced in the Main Issues Report as H49. When considered within the context of the City of Inverness this site represents one of the most obvious places for the City to grow. The allocation of this site will, in addition to providing much needed support for local facilities at Milton of Leys, allow proper choice in style and scale of housing available in the new house sector, in a setting with superb views over the city and with excellent links to existing infrastructure. The Council have concluded that the objectors to this site have hugely exaggerated any issues relating to it's development and the positive aspects far outweigh any concerns raised. The issue of ransom strips with regard to roads that would be required to enable any development is a matter for the landowners and developers to sort out and is not justification to exclude any site from allocation. That said, it appears that by the allocation of IN49 (formerly B7 in the MIR) for housing land as opposed to a caravan site, the Council have potentially compounded the situation with regard to access to site H49 by not providing for a ransom free access H49 as part of the zoning of IN49. When considered against Planning Advice Note 2/2010 (Paragraph 55) - site H49 meets every criteria as was largely acknowledged by the Council in their support of the site within the Main Issues Report. The objections do not in my view provide anywhere close to sufficient reason for the sites exclusion and I would again request that the Council confirm their own original opinion by including the site within the adopted local plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04015 Name Michael Gillespie Organisation Slioch Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN41 Thistle Road Type Change

Comment Changes

The proposed plan allocates site IN41 Thistle Road as appropriate for a Housing Capacity of 5. There is however a current detailed planning consent (08/00255/FULIN) covering this site which was issued on 28th July 2009 for 13 new houses (including 4 affordable for which a Section 75 is in place). The local plan should reflect this existing planning consent. Demolition of an old steading has already been completed under this consent.

Representation

I am seeking this change because the proposed local plan is inaccurate.

Allocated to South Inverness IN41 Thistle Road

Customer Number 04354 Name Michael Green Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.37 Nairn Bypass

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

The proposed Bypass is the number one priority for Nairn

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Regeneration of the Nairn Town Centre is essential and is the second priority for Nairn after the Bypass. I would put adherence to the Town Centre First policy as the guiding mantra for all development around about and in Nairn.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

I wish to see mixed use development prioritized and development around Sandown and Delnies, with Sandown being the first priority.

Representation

Sandown will provide the best opportunity for mixed use which is what is required in Nairn. It is also owned by the Nairn Common Good Fund, which will assist the development of any proposed mixed use. Development at Nairn South will threaten the viability of our largest employer, Gordons Sawmill , plus the current traffic infrastructure will not be able to cope with any large scale development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I speak for myself and the many other residents who will probably not voice their concerns on this matter. Having been a resident in Conon Bridge for over 20 years I grew up with a number of other locals who are still living here, spending most of our time in the football pitch or at the nearby park. This whole area is the only place for children and adults alike to play a variety of sports all year round without having to pay (pitch at the new school). The pitch is in an ideal location and as far as I can see there are no sensible areas to relocate it, as the rest of the land in the village seems to be used for houses also. Losing this area to housing would have a significant impact on the physical health of local children who would end up hanging around streets causing a nuisance as they have literally nothing else to do, this is speaking from my own experience in the not so distant past. I won't even begin to mention the spectacular views and sense of community that would be spoilt by placing houses in the area, or the fact that my parents have already stated their intentions to move away if the plans go ahead. Decent and established members of the village community will be lost and I'm sure they won't be the only ones. Please use a bit of common sense and at least consider the other areas in the plan rather than this one.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I note also that recently your department "plan" to erect a housing area in Conon Bridge which is on a currently used sports area. Both proposals reek of incompetence. I think both proposals should be dropped immediately as they indicate a lack of current knowledge and understanding of planning issues. Good planning is for people.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site DW6 from the plan

Representation

As a former solicitor in private practice I have represented the former County of Ross and Cromarty and in particular the planning department at various local planning enquiries. I am therefore not anti planning and had a very good relationship with your former local planning officer, James Farquhar, was able to work in tandem with him on local issues. I believe in good planning for the benefit of the local population. I object strongly to the proposal of your department to issue a development order affecting the Ferry Road Dingwall, where I live. The proposal is the have a housing development. This is bad planning. First of all it impinges on private garden ground belonging to Mr Powrie. The inclusion of this area shows an ignorance of current events, and in any event is in an area subject to serious flooding.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to change the proposed plan with reference to Proposed site IN44 as i believe there has been a mistake in plot size.

Representation

The plot was recognised by the previously oppointed government reporter to be in the region of 4.6ha, which if you check from subsequent planning applications was accepted by the developing agent as its agreed size. The mistake now makes plot over 6ha in size which is clearly incorrect.If not corrected the developer will use incorrect size to over populate area with a level of housing that far exceeds the guidelines. The plot is also on a slope so housing levels when worked out on original size are more managable. The suggestion to build affordable housing at bottom of plot will produce when other schemes built nearby are considered, a dense population of affordables, not an integrated one with homes of all types spread through out area.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04151 Name Michael Meehan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.97

Reference CR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Change number of houses from 180 to 50 No houses to be built on site CR1 50 houses to be built on site CR2

Representation

180 houses is too many for Croy to remain a small village, it would become a small town. There will be a town very close by at Tornagrain, so there is no need for such a large development at Croy. Site CR1 should remain as green field, preserving the pleasant rural aspect of the village. There are currently two sites already under development, CR2 and at Torran Beag, this is enough expansion for Croy. CR2 should be developed further with a maximum of 50 houses to link the village with the existing development at Ardgowan.

Allocated to Croy CR1 East of B9006

Customer Number 04152 Name Michael Meehan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.97

Reference CR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

No houses to be built on site CR1

Representation

There are Badger setts in the area. Badgers forage in the field of CR1. An appropriate survey be undertaken to ensure all aspects, setts, paths and foraging areas are taken in to account.

Allocated to Croy CR1 East of B9006

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

The site occupies the only buffer zone of the built environment of Munloch village, and Munloch Mains Steading and Sewerage Pumping Station. The noise emanating from Munloch Mains Steading from ventilation and crop drying equipment, throughout the year is considerable, and continues day and night, intermittently. The Munloch Sewerage Pumping Station is effectively an open tank of raw sewage that is pumped at varying intervals to Avoch Treatment Plant. The noise of pump(s) start-up is appreciable and the resulting smell of effluent is considerable. Development of this field would mean a loss of grazing and potentially damage the viability of Munloch Mains Farm. A buffer zone (tree belt) is desirable and suggest a 100 meters strip from the Munloch Big Burn.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amend housing density and stated requirements.

Representation

The density proposed can not be achieved without damage to the existing trees and the amenity of the area. Any development in the vicinity of a listed building should be sympathetically done so that the character and nature of the listed building is not adversely affected. A low density development, together with a flatted residential development of the listed building, should ensure a development in keeping with the area and ensure that no trees are felled. A low density development would also ensure that traffic to and from Stratherrick Road would not create danger, since this is a very busy road at times and traffic speed is at the maximum permitted and the road bend does not permit adequate sight lines. In addition the land is in a Conservation area and Tree Preservation orders are in force. This demands a low level development rather than cramming a high density development on the site in order to maximise profits. Low density development would also ensure that the roots of the existing trees were not damaged. Noted that a Development Brief is proposed but would recommend the inclusion of the Community Council and Robert Patton, the Councils Forestry Official as parties to this. Otherwise the Community Council would have to object to any site development. Not opposed to development of the site in principle but would propose new build should not exceed 13 houses. Previous plans for site development were opposed by the Community Council and the local community in 2006. The Community Council is also very much aware of the liberties that developers can take as in the case of the adjacent TPO area where a Reporter granted outline consent for two modest houses in the Scottish Tradition and the local Planning Office granted full consent for two enormous houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00304 Name Michael W Gimson Organisation Lochardil And Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Land at Gaelic Primary School

Reference IN58 Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove zoning from plan as inappropriate. Development on this site would be opposed by the Community Council and local community.

Representation

Land is part of Culduthel Park and covered by a Section 75 Agreement for public park. As such there is no need for a development zoning. If Highland Council wishes to form sports pitches or recreational areas on the land this would meet its obligations under the Section 75 Agreement and meet the needs of both the Community and the school, provided that the Community was given free access when not needed by school activities. As such there is no need for any development zoning. Any proposal for any building development on the site would be opposed by the Community and Community Council

Allocated to South Inverness IN58 Land at Gaelic Primary School

Customer Number 00304 Name Michael W Gimson Organisation Lochardil And Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Cameron Barracks

Reference IN7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduction in development proposals.

Representation

The Cameron Barracks was built between 1880and 1886 and has a significant history in the eyes of the public. Any development on this site should not remove the parade square, now laid in grass. This sets the scene for the Listed Barracks buildings, and development of the site would harm the buildings and remove a tourist attraction.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN7 Cameron Barracks

Customer Number 04201 Name Mike Atkinson Organisation Muir Of Ord Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.75

Reference M03 Type Change

Comment Changes

Removal of site M03 or addition of reference to requirement for drainage mitigation measures as appropriate.

Representation

The Site referenced M03 is new to this version of the IMFLDP - this is our first chance to comment on this particular site. This site is the lowest point in the surrounding area and acts as drainage for a significant volume of water from the catchment above. This then runs through/adjacent to the Golf Course - who have had to invest significant amounts of money in recent years in additional drainage following recent other developments affecting drainage from this area. If development of this site were to go ahead the community wishes to raise it's concerns as to the capacity of the existing drainage to cope with increased volumes of water. We would wish to see this investigated fully before this site was considered for inclusion in the Inner Moray Firth Local Plan. If this site were to be included then appropriate mitigation/additional drainage may be required as a planning condition on any development

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO3 Ardnagrask, Corrie Road

Customer Number 04036 Name Mike Waites Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.101, 4.102

Reference D03, D04 Type Change

Comment Changes

We do not want any development on these two sites which completely surround our house.

Representation

1. Have had no consultation previously. Would not have bought Drumashie Lodge 2 years ago if we had known of any development plans affecting it. Nothing indicated on Search at time of purchase. 2.Drumashie Lodge, Steading and Church are only listed buildings in village and are protected by curtilages which would impact on any development around them. 3.Any development on this steep hillside would severely affect light levels at the rear of Drumashie Lodge which lies directly below proposed development. 4. Any development on hillside would look straight down into 2 bedrooms at rear of property as well as kitchen, compromising our privacy. 5.There are already issues with levels of water in leat in wet conditions as well as water draining from hillside through Drumashie Lodge grounds. Developing the site will only exacerbate these problems with run off causing flooding in the leat and the likelihood of damp in our house. 6.Drumashie Lodge is for sale and any proposed development around it will severely impact on its sale value and make it extremely difficult to find a buyer who would willingly tolerate a prolonged period of development immediately surrounding their property. 7.The proposed new playing field DO4. The village already has a perfectly adequate playing field which is neatly screened from view - why is another thought necessary particularly when this would immediately impact on one of the most iconic views in Scotland for any visitor coming down the hill into the village.

Allocated to Dores DO3 Land south of Parish Church

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Support Extension of hinterland boundary to include Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Inverness-shire We have lived in Bunloit for over twenty one years and fully support the inclusion of the entire Bunloit area into the Hinterland for the following reasons: 1. Bunloit is an extremely rare and fragile area of outstanding natural value and has been fully included into the Great Glen Way project by Highland Council, SNH, The Forestry Commission, hiking groups and associations and other statutory and non-statutory groups and bodies. 2. The area has already suffered significant damage from uncontrolled "scatter development" wherein the record clearly shows that the planners have apparently rubber stamped anything and everything placed before them by speculative developers - without so much as a glance over the impact upon the area or the proper and thorough appraisal of the cumulative impact of uncontrolled development. In short, the sudden explosion of development over a few short years has the appearance of (at best) a careless attitude to development at Bunloit or (at worst) wilful commercial exploitation for a few developers at huge cost to the rest of the community and the natural landscape and environment. Recent Planning Applications in Bunloit have been for "top of the price range", very large family homes - not "affordable housing" for local people. All of these planning applications appear to have been nodded through by Highland Council planning officers - despite repeated, vociferous, highly detailed and considered objections from the local Community Council and neighbours (including fully qualified biologists with the necessary specialisations that make their submissions particularly worthy of proper respect and consideration), other local residents and interested third parties. All are agreed Bunloit requires Hinterland inclusion and protection. The long serving and popular local Councillor, Margaret Davidson, is repeatedly on record stating that there should be no further development at Bunloit. In an email to me dated 29th January 2012 Councillor Davidson wrote: "I have asked that the "hinterland" boundary is moved to include all of Bunloit. That will mean there is a presumption against housing unless it fits with the "revised housing in the countryside policy" You will recall we had the discussion about the hinterland boundary about 3 years ago". On 27th April 2012, Councillor Davidson wrote: "As I have said before getting Bunloit into the restricted Hinterland area is the best thing we can do just now". On 15th May 2012, Councillor Davidson wrote: "on the local plan I was at the Community Council on Monday and they will be supporting the whole of the Bunloit Hill being in the restricted Hinterland and I am sure the local plan officers will listen to that. If Not I will pursue it to the end, Bunloit needs some protection. On 13th September 2013, Councillor Davidson wrote as follows: "I have made representations as I believe you have, and the Community council has, to the local plan asking that the hill is all zoned as Hinterland, when the presumption will be against development The proposed final plan goes to committee next week and then out to public consultation When that happens...maybe October, watch for the advertisements or the press releases ...then ensure you and others that feel like you agree with any changed zoning for Bunloit After that...I would say next year the chances of new house building on the hill will be greatly diminished My real regret is that this has taken so long." In 2006 I met with Councillor Davidson and (at that time) Chief Planning Officer, Mr. Jim Faulkner. He told both of us that he agreed (even back then) that "Bunloit had had more than its fair share of development already". In the short years since Mr. Faulkner made his comments the planners have seen fit to allow at almost a dozen new houses already – on top of the fourteen original homes. New planning applications seem to be submitted all the time now so Bunloit has seen the number of properties increase by over 50% in a few years (and the rate of growth is getting faster). Within a few years housing in Bunloit will have more than doubled (and the size of the houses is far larger than the original dwellings within the area). This fact would be alarming anywhere but in a delicate tiny rural area it is, quite frankly, extraordinary. The proposed Hinterland designation is absolutely vital to Bunloit to safeguard it into the future. Mr. Faulkner, was right to make his comments in 2006. The doubling of housing in Bunloit since then is nothing short of development storm. Speculative developers cannot complain that they have not already profited from concreting over Bunloit but this situation is not sustainable. To prevent complete transformation of this delicate rural settlement into an uncontrolled scatter development with all the consequential damage and harm that would be caused, Bunloit must be designated Hinterland. 3. Traffic and the single track "dead end" Bunloit Road: The mountainous public road is single track for its entire length of approximately five miles (from the village of Drumnadrochit). It climbs very steep gradients, includes many blind bends and few passing places. Traffic used to be light and sustainable on this tiny road but now includes many more residents with cars and delivery lorries, vans, school buses, agricultural vehicles (including tractors with trailers that cannot reverse). It is regularly smashed and gouged by heavy building construction traffic. Great Glen Way serves as an access for hill walkers wishing to climb the Mealfourvounie mountain at road end. Great Glen Way is a government project that has been marketed around the world and encourages thousands of hikers, cyclists, horse riders and others onto the route from Fort William to Inverness (including Bunloit Road). The road has not managed well under the existing usage. When it has been closed to vehicles like

ambulances, fire engines etc. safety is put in danger. One of many examples: A double trailer lorry carrying construction oak came off the road on the first steep incline at a blind bend and the entire road serving all the homes was completely closed to traffic for a very lengthy time causing serious road damage. Increased traffic caused by new houses, construction, existing residents and the use of the tiny Bunloit Road by the Great Glen Way has already pushed it well beyond its maximum capacity and usage limit. Many recently built properties do not have proper bell mouth openings or visibility splays (the entire Bunloit Road has a 60 mph speed limit and previous official road speed sensors showed this is often exceeded at several locations). Approximately 12,500 walkers use Bunloit Road section of the Great Glen Way each year. Add in rising numbers of hill walkers visiting the mountain and forest, horse riders (including frequent and scheduled uses by the Borlum Farm Riding School) and cyclists. Many of these users are young children – all placed in jeopardy on the tiny but fast, damaged and worn Bunloit Road. Bunloit Road is so tiny, steep and full of blind bends and summits because it was originally built to service a handful of farm & croft properties. It was never designed (nor ever can) service the enormous number of new houses that property speculators have already built and the sites they are now lining up for even greater expansion. Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland to recognise its limitations as a development zone and to protect its vulnerable and already inadequate road.

4. Water: This is a scarce resource in Bunloit. Since over-development of the area, water levels have dropped to the point where we have had to use emergency measures to obtain water to live. At our home (the highest Bunloit habitation) our water ran dry this summer (it has only ever run dry since the big new family houses have been built within Bunloit and started using deeper and deeper boreholes to extract their water – thereby lowering the water table for everyone else). Again, homes along Bunloit Road ran out of water for drinking and washing this summer for a very considerable period of time. New properties are forced to use ever deeper boreholes – Bunloit is high above sea level. As boreholes plunge deeper, so the water table drops and supplies to everyone are now already running short for increasing periods. It is not sustainable development to permit more boreholes to be drilled ever deeper. The proven lack of potable water is a very pertinent and material planning concern. Livestock grazing, crofting and farming are traditional and established in Bunloit and those are also placed in peril by burns, aquifers and watercourses running dry – such problems are now frequently witnessed in Bunloit. Because water is already running out, Bunloit cannot support more development and to protect this resource, which is an essential amenity and essential to life Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland protection.

5. Drainage: There appears to have been scant regard paid to the proper provision of drainage to the new homes and buildings already permitted. The Bunloit Road is frequently flooded due to poor run off design and the water poses a great hazard to road users, residents and ever increasing numbers of visitors to the Great Glen Way (hikers, cyclists, horse riders & cars etc.) Road, land and property has also been flooded at frequent intervals. The lack of sites for proper and effective septic tank soakaways and the over use of the existing ones places the limited water supplies at great risk of pollution from human waste and other toxins. Proper safe drainage is a finite resource and has been exhausted at Bunloit. Further drainage of human waste and other toxins within the fragile small area of Bunloit is not sustainable and therefore Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland.

6. Natural Environment, Bio Diversity and Outstanding Natural Landscape Bunloit is part of a Special Landscape Area. When we moved into Bunloit over twenty one years ago, the protected species bats and frogs were numerous within the area. Due to the uncontrolled over development that has already been permitted, the bats and frogs have been decimated. There are almost none left at Ancarraig or Balbeg, Bunloit. These species are, as mentioned, internationally protected. Bunloit must be protected as Hinterland to preserve what is left otherwise the bats and frogs will be followed into oblivion by other species including Black Grouse, Capercaillies, Slavonian Grebe, Great Crested Newts, Badgers, pine Martens, Voles, Water Voles, Amphibians and Reptiles, Golden Eagles (already all decimated), Red Kite, Buzzards. Schedule 1 (protected at all times) species also include Brambling, Crossbill, Fieldfare, Hen Harrier and Redwing and Schedule 2 (part1) that includes Snipe and Red Grouse which are known to be in the area. In addition to the above species of birds and animals are many different Protected and rare plants – including, for example, juniper cloudberry and wild orchids. The demise of the species speaks for itself. The damage already done to the environment and wildlife is a calamity and therefore Bunloit must be included in the Hinterland to prevent a completely preventable and irreversible catastrophe. Land and habitat Loss: The Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 prioritises biodiversity conservation over development. Bunloit is clearly an area for which such protection – including Hinterland protection – is intended by the Community and Legislators. Not a single Protected Species Walkover Survey or assessment has been carried out by a member of the Chartered Institute of Ecologists and Environmental Management (CIEEM). Consequently, no planning applications have been properly considered for ecological and environmental impact and this sets a poor and unsustainable example for the future. Placing Bunloit into Hinterland will provide the level of protection its delicate and diverse ecology and landscape requires. For all of the above reasons we respectfully request that the entire Bunloit hill and area - including the Drumnadrochit end (Bunloit Road junction with the A82) along to the Mealfourvounie mountain end and its vicinity, is all included and protected in the Hinterland.

Allocated to				Hinterland boundary
--------------	--	--	--	---------------------

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Our client supports the allocation of the site CU1 for residential use. They are seeking a change in the allocation requirements. It is requested that the phasing restriction is removed from the requirement. It is also requested that the land to the south of the site, outwith our clients ownership and the boundary of the existing consent, is allocated as a separate site. Our client supports the allocation of site CU4 for community use.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Mrs Anthea Whitehead. Our client owns the land at Glascairn Road, Culbokie that is identified for residential and community use (Allocations CU1 and CU4). Our client fully supports the continued allocation of these sites for residential and community use. However, our client would like to make some comments in relation to the policy requirements associated with these allocations. Site CU1: South of Village Store The site boundary for CU1 extends beyond our client's ownership and beyond the boundary of the existing planning consent (application reference: 11/00972/FUL). The attached plan shows the extent of our client's ownership marked in red hatching. As the area to the south is in separate ownership we request that this site is allocated as a separate residential site. The requirements specify the phasing for the site as a whole and set a limit that development should not exceed 10 houses per year. We object to the inclusion of phasing as a planning policy requirements. The conditions attached to this planning consent are not prescriptive in the number of units to be developed per year. As this is not a requirement of the planning consent it will be difficult for the Council to enforce this policy requirement. Condition 3 attached to the original planning consent (application reference: 02/00779/OUT) details a requirement for: "A comprehensive phased plan of roads and services completion as well as details of house building – phased intentions." We consider that it would be more appropriate for phasing to be addressed when an application for the approval of matters specified in conditions is submitted. Furthermore, as stated above, allocation CU1 currently extends to land beyond our clients ownership and therefore not in their control to deliver the specified phasing. Site CU4: Community Use The allocation of site CU4 is in accordance with the planning consent obtained for this site (application reference: 10/03436/FUL). We therefore support the allocation of this site for community use.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change the proposal to allow the houses to be built on the higher area of the site and allow the amenity and expansion of school to take place in the lower area adjacent to Drummond Road

Representation

I have 3 reasons for this representation. 1. The current sewer serving houses on Drummond Road is behind the current houses on Drummond Road. It would be much easier for a sewer for the new housing to be taken from the top of the site in a line adjacent to the main road connecting with the existing main sewer at Drummond Arms. 2. Having houses adjacent to the main road will extend the 30mph limit out as far as the cross-roads at the road to the cemetery and Drummon Farm Road. This will be of great advantage in slowing cars down on the approach to the monument and river bridge where children walk to access school. 3. When we built our house on Drummond Road we had a planning restriction which allowed us to build a house of no more than 1.5 storeys. A recent 2 storey house has been allowed at Glenskiach and we are fearful that any new houses in the Drummond Farm field adjacent to Drummond Road could be allowed at the same height. The proposed development is on the uphill side of the existing houses and will block our outlook. Development on the higher part of the site will not affect our outlook

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reduce area to preserve the woodland and marshy area adjacent to the River Skiach.

Representation

The proposed area includes very valuable habitat. The small lochan is not included in the proposed development area but there is an adjoining area of scrubland and trees that forms part of the natural habitat and a nesting area for a number of birds. A kingfisher has been seen here and disturbance of the area would lead to the loss of valuable species.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Allocate land for recreational purposes

Representation

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to build houses on this important green area in the centre of our village. The area of the playing field and the car park at the church was gifted to the village in the 1950s. To consider re-locating the playing field to an obscure location at the back of the proposed houses is ill-conceived and furthermore, would totally marginalise this strategically positioned amenity. Not only would this alter the character of the village, but would also take away the car park from its close proximity to the church which is of major concern to many elderly residents with mobility problems. It would be of great benefit for both the young and the old of Co non Bridge if the Highland Council was to agree to zone this entire area for recreational purposes and to assist and support the local community in developing additional and appropriate amenities for the growing population of our village. Improving outdoor play opportunities for children and young people would tie into The National Play Strategy (Scottish Government) published in June, 2013, which highlights the importance of children playing outdoors in parks, playgrounds, green spaces and valuing the outdoor space provided by the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site allocated for recreational purposes

Representation

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to build houses on this important green area in the centre of our village. The area of the playing field and the car park at the church was gifted to the village in the 1950s. To consider re-locating the playing field to an obscure location at the back of the proposed houses is ill-conceived and furthermore, would totally marginalise this strategically positioned amenity. Not only would this alter the character of the village, but would also take away the car park from its close proximity to the church which is of vital concern to many elderly residents with mobility problems. It would be of great benefit for both young and old of the old Conon Bridge if the Highland Council was to agree to zone this entire area for recreational purposes and to assist and support the local community in developing additional and appropriate amenities for the growing population of our village. Improving outdoor play opportunities for children and young people would tie into The National Play Strategy (Scottish Government) published in June 2013 which highlights the importance of children playing outdoors in parks, playgrounds, green spaces and valuing the outdoor space provided by the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Having now looked at the plan, and the letter received by my neighbours, I should like to express my surprise and dismay that Highland Council is considering altering the nature of Muir of Ord, and Corrie Road in particular, by such radical changes to the rural nature of this area. We are already suffering increased traffic noise from the lorries taking aggregate to build an access road for plant working on the part of the Beauly-Denny power line at Ord Hill, but that at least we can expect to be temporary. Should a planning application be made to create access from Corrie Road to new housing on this scale I should certainly wish to lodge an objection.

Representation

I cannot see a need for such a large housing development. The planned Broomhill development is far from complete, and building has stopped there for more than two years. The town centre has a number of properties which are neglected and empty. The field which is ear-marked for this site is frequently flooded and it would in any case create a significant alteration to the rural nature of this neighbourhood. It's difficult to see where the demand is for so many new proposed houses. Access from Corrie Road would increase traffic noise and disturbance from lights; it would destroy the open nature of this semi-rural area; it would be out of scale with the surrounding countryside and would, from my personal point of view, mean a considerable loss of peace and privacy. Clearly, when planning was granted for the Broomhill development it was accepted that there should be only pedestrian access from Corrie Road, because anything further would be unacceptable. There is no reason this should not continue to be the case.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Council Re:IN22 Local Development Plan Consultation I am writing to ask that within your future planning structure you give consideration to the allocation of land in area IN22, and indeed within any future land allocation plan, for the setting aside of a percentage of the said land for individual building plots for private purchase to the public. At present a 'gap' exists between the provision of homes by the large building providers, and the availability of small house plots for individual purchase, limiting the choice of employing a small builder, or self-builds. These plots need be no larger than the size that is set aside for the usual desirable council two apartment homes, or one/two bedroom retirement homes. Advantages 1) Private Affordable Housing Young, first time buyers or those who are struggling to move on from their minimal first time property purchase, could consider upgrading to a home that will address the needs of a young family, affording a moderate sized garden, and increased living area, at an affordable price, possibly even with their local area. 2) Private Retirement Housing - downsizing The provision of small building plots for private purchase would enable downsizing and release property designed for family needs to the wider community. These small building plots designed for retirement homes could meet the needs that are necessary for continued independent living within the community through old age, in some cases accommodating these needs within their local area close to family, friends, and familiar amenities • This 'gap' is detrimental to both - Affordable Housing, and Retirement Housing, needs The lack of provision of land for direct sale to individual members of the public may inadvertently protect the status quo situation of purchasing new homes from large building providers, resulting in a monopoly situation which restricts the public's measure of control over choice, standards, and financial boundaries. Further to this the limited availability of building plots for private purchase could also inadvertently contribute to a monopoly situation for the limited number of small land owners advertising building plots to the public, allowing room for the artificially inflated purchase price that some small private building plots are marketed for. Evidence of the effect of this 'gap' is detailed below:- ➤ In the present situation anyone considering purchasing a plot of land privately in the City area will be aware that a house plot may cost excess of £100,000, the construction cost of a basic two bedroom home is around £70/80k, with other necessary fees a possible total cost of = £180,000. ➤ Whilst most new basic two bedroom properties are valued between £120,000 and £140,000. Thank you for your consideration. Kind regards Monica MacDonald

Allocated to

Customer Number 04412 Name Moray Estates Development Company Ltd Organisation Moray Estates Development Company Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) S White urnberry Consulting Ltd

Section 1.Introduction

Paragraph Settlements- Map 1

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Update the map to show the proposed rail halt at Dalcross.

Representation

Dalcross rail halt is a key element of the planned infrastructure upgrades for the Inverness Nairn Growth Area, benefitting from full planning permission and a commitment from Government for its delivery during the plan period. For these reasons, it should be indicated on the spatial strategy plan.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 04412 Name Moray Estates Development Company Ltd Organisation Moray Estates Development Company Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) S White urnberry Consulting Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference MH1

Type Change

Comment Changes

Amend the spelling of 'industry' within the heading of the allocation.

Representation

The Estate supports the allocation of Morayhill on the basis of the excellent opportunity it offers for development. The only observation we make is a spelling error in the allocation.

Allocated to Morayhill MH1 Morayhill

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1) Amend the final sentence of paragraph 3.7 as follows: "A new rail halt at Dalcross will serve Tornagrain, the Airport and adjacent Business Park." 2) Amend Map 5 to indicate the permitted Park & Ride at Dalcross.

Representation

The LDP should also plan positively for the delivery of the infrastructure required to support development. The Dalcross rail halt is a vital element of the infrastructure provision required in the Inverness-Nairn corridor. The rail halt and park & ride already have planning permission and the plan should therefore recognize this status and reinforce the commitment to their delivery within the identified timeframe of 2014-2019.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Site Specific Representations

Site Ref Proposed Changes Representation

Merkinch

That an area to the North and West of Carnac Crescent, Inverness between Carnac Crescent and the Merkinch Nature Reserve is allocated for housing. The allocation is sought in order to provide additional opportunities to develop housing and contribute to regeneration of this area of the City. An allocation would also provide for a greater level of passive surveillance of the Nature Reserve.

Merkinch

That an area of former garden ground to the West of Craigton Avenue, Inverness is allocated for housing. The allocation is sought in order to provide additional opportunities to develop housing and contribute to the regeneration of this area of the City.

Merkinch

That an area of land between the River Ness and Anderson Street, Inverness; known locally as The Capel Inch is allocated for housing. The allocation is sought in order to provide additional opportunities to develop housing and contribute to the regeneration of this area of the City.

IN49 That the uses of allocation IN49 Bogbain (west) are supported.

The allocation of this site will provide a site which can be developed economically and that will, through the affordable housing policy, provide additional opportunities within the City.

IN50

That the uses of allocation IN50 Land South of ASDA includes up to 80 homes. The allocation of 24 homes does not reflect the number which would be required to economically develop the site.

IN73

That the housing capacity of allocation IN73, Easterfield Farm is increased to 40. The allocation of 21 homes does not reflect the number which would be required to economically develop the site.

IN74

That the housing capacity of allocation IN74, Caulfield Road is increased to 12. The housing allocation of 8 homes does not reflect the number which would be required to economically develop the site and that could be accommodated within a considered layout.

NA5

That the housing capacity of allocation NA5, Lochloy is increased.

It is believed that there may no longer be a reason to safeguard a site for a new School and therefore it is considered appropriate to increase the housing capacity.

AR3

That the housing capacity of allocation AR3, Station Road, Ardersier is increased to 18.

The housing allocation of 10 homes does not reflect the number which could be accommodated within a considered layout.

KT1 & KT3

That the housing capacity of allocation KT1 & KT3, Kiltarlity are maintained.

It is essential to maintain an effective land supply within the village.

TN3

Within allocation TN3, Kirksheaf Road, Tain, a flexible approach should be taken to road infrastructure.

This site could provide housing for a range of needs and tenures but may not be taken forward if there are overly onerous road improvement requirements.

DW 1 - 5

That the limitations on the development of housing in Dingwall housing, imposed by the non-completion of Kinnairdie Link Road, are relaxed.

It is essential to maintain an effective land supply within Dingwall which is an area of high housing need. The Dingwall North sites are key to this supply but heavily constrained by the Link Road conditions

MB1

That a flexible approach is taken to road access to MB1, Maryburgh allowing for development of a smaller phase of housing development with access from Donald Cameron Court.

There are limited opportunities to develop in Maryburgh with the MB1 a key/only available site.

MB3

That the housing capacity of allocation MB3, Maryburgh be increased to 30; whilst safeguarding the existing playing field and village hall.

The housing allocation of 10 homes does not reflect the number which could be accommodated within a considered layout should enhanced community uses not be taken forward.

IG1 - 4

That additional sites within Invergordon are identified and allocated.

Many of the existing allocations are unlikely to be taken forward within the early years of the plan resulting in a lack of opportunities in general, and for affordable housing in particular.

IN20

That limitations on development of IN20 Westergraigs, Inverness arising out of the need to complete the canal and river crossing are relaxed.

Many of the existing allocations in Inverness are unlikely to be taken forward within the early years of the plan leading to a lack of opportunities in general and for affordable housing in particular. It is considered appropriate to allow early development of the Westergraigs site given that progress is being made on the canal and river crossings.

MO2

That the rectangular area to the South of Lilyloch, with access through the existing development, is allocated for housing. Allocation would allow for early development of a village centre site, possibly as housing for the elderly.

DO1 That land to the East is allocated for housing, extending to the B862. A sensitive low density approach to development of the upper area will assist in addressing viability of DO1

[Redacted]

Allocated to [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number 00860 Name Mr and Mrs Robert Grant Organisation [Redacted]

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) [Redacted] [Redacted]

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.70 - 4.75

Reference [Redacted] Type Change

Comment Changes

More information on wider issues affecting Muir of Ord

Representation

TRANSPORT. Road, Rail and Bus. Roads - Poor surfacing in some areas, with Road Markings unclear and Speed limits especially in the North of the Village, totally ignored. Rail - What is the situation on the provision of a Halt at the Inverness Airport? Bus Provision. The morning Time Table, especially to Dingwall, means that appointments for Doctors, Dentists, Opticians and Chiropodists are not possible until after 10.15 am. INFRASTRUCTURE - FACILITIES Shops- A number are now not in use and others need repair. Housing - Empty Houses near to the pedestrian crossing also add to the "Run down" look of the village. Proposed new Bridge, Hopefully this will help, in Safety terms, to allow safe Pedestrian movement to School and Shops. Here I suggest you publish a Timetable of Start/Finish times for the Project. COMMUNITY ACTIONS The Refurbished Square is excellent and has improved the centre of the Village immensely. Muir Matters has gone from strength to strength and remains a popular read for Villagers and Visitors alike. The Village Hall is now under new Management. The Old School Building's Re-use is now a Large Project, which hopefully will get its Lottery Funding. SERVICES The Strathlene Surgery. This is providing an excellent Service at present. However will it be large enough for the next 10 or more years? Expansion on the present site would be difficult if a larger building and Car Park were necessary. Police Station/Service Point. If you are going to use the North side of the Village for expansion during the next 10-20 years both offices might not be in the correct position. Finally, with reference to the possible expansion North (ref. H4 and H9) 2012 Plan, Why have we had yet another Photographer, within the last 5 days, taking pictures of both Areas and when approached he drove off in his car which was parked on the drive of the Riding School.

Allocated to Muir of Ord General General [Redacted]

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of CD10 from the Plan

Representation

The proposed development of CD9 and CD10 was opposed several years ago; nothing has changed since. Newton Road is not suitable for development. We still have prime agricultural land currently used by a tenant farmer who does not wish to relinquish the fields to a soulless development of dormitory houses. There is no present or future prospect of employment in Cawdor; this will turn out to be just another commuter town, with endless rows of houses empty during the day and causing traffic chaos morning and evening. Allocation of use for housing is one thing, but business and retail? Have you done any research into how many business and retail failures there have been in the Cawdor area over the last 20 years? Do you really think in the real world that people will 'shop locally' in this day and age of retail parks and the internet? Unless you are planning another Tesco Park in Cawdor, retail and business use is a fairy story of the first order. Then there is the loss of habitat for fragile wildlife species; it would be incalculable - red squirrels are quite a common sight here for now, but how long would that last with the decimation of the woodlands that would result from development in area CD9? Plovers, lapwings and oyster catchers nest every year in the fields in zone CD10, although numbers are declining rapidly and would disappear altogether under this development plan. I understand that land is 'released' for development in consultation with local landowners; why are there no plans for development south of the B9090 apart from CD1 and CD2. There are huge tracts of open space further south. Could it be that that would be too close to the landowners back yard? Newton Road is a single track road, leading on to a B road with limited visibility in both directions. Current traffic levels are high due to the use of the B9090 as a 'rat run' for traffic trying to escape the traffic light abundance in Nairn; OK, so you could lop down a few hedges to improve the visibility - but what about the bridge; what about the actual width of the road with no pathway for all the new residents walking their children to school? There is no immediate prospect of a by-pass in Nairn through lack of finance, so what are the chances of road improvements to the B9090? Nil is my guess. I would ask that you reconsider removing areas CD9 and CD10 of the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan as unsuitable for use as housing, retail and business use.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Proposal for land shown as P1 on attached map at NH 548560 Recent history- When the recent Albyn housing development started on the adjacent plot they were offered this land by the Council as they thought that it was owned by them and could be a future project. The contractors brought in machines and removed some existing fences and erected high security fencing over part of the plot. I agreed to allow the fencing to remain for the duration of the project as they needed access to allow the construction of the SUDS. Full restoration has not been possible as Uist Builders have gone into liquidation. I believe that this land would provide an opportunity for affordable and rental accommodation which is in demand in this district. It is within easy walking distance of the Conon station, bus stops, shops, school, and playing fields and would be a logical asset to the village. The plot extends to 1.42 ha and the majority lies at over 8 m and well above any flood risks. A narrow bank along the North West side has a fine age mix of alders which should be retained and could be added to. The land is of medium quality and as the access from the rest of the farm is now poor due to the new A 835 road it contributes little to the farm and would be of greater value to the Con on Bridge community. Road access would be from an extension to the new road serving the Albyn development and all services are close by with the main sewer running through the plot. Proposal for land shown as P2 on attached map at NH 550555 I have had expressions of interest in this land for industrial use from businesses unable to find suitable sites in Dingwall or Inverness. At the moment it has a haulage parking lot and workshop, a tractor and goods vehicle dealership, and an electricity substation as neighbours. Access via the Old Leanaig Road will soon be improved as the Braes of Conon development progresses. It is well screened from the A 83 5 by a dense mix of trees but could benefit from further planting along the side of the B 9163. All services are close by and it sits at 28m clear of any flood risks. The total area is 1.27ha of medium quality land but access to it from the rest of the farm is difficult for agricultural machinery as it involves crossing the A 835. It would not be a significant loss to the farm but could help create local employment within a reasonable distance of the village.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I feel very strongly against the proposal to consider the Conon Playing Field for house building on principal. I have personal attachments to the Playing Field as my mother was on the Amenities Committee when it was levelled and sown with grass. My father provided a tractor for the grass cutting until the council took on the task. I just played on the swings and roundabouts. I have family in the area and we consider it should be it should remain as a green area for the benefit of the community. As you did ask me for land in Conon Bridge for housing I attach memos for areas P 1 and P2 with maps. I have been contacted by a haulage company looking to set up a garage and parking within walking distance of Conon Bridge where the drivers live. There is no secure parking for busses and goods vehicles in the village.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

These representations relate to previous representations on behalf of our clients, at the Call for Sites and MIR stages, regarding land at Kinellan Drive, Strathpeffer. The Council’s vision for a vibrant Inner Moray Firth depends on many factors. The LDP proposes Growth Areas from Inverness to Nairn and in Ross-shire. In the case of the Ross-shire Growth Area, there appears to be a discrepancy over the extent of the area covered. Map 3 suggests Strathpeffer is excluded but Map 6 suggests it is included in the Growth Area. Para 4.172 of the LDP suggests Strathpeffer lies beyond the Growth Area and as a result, expansion is restricted. Either way, Strathpeffer is an important settlement in accommodating some of the supporting services, facilities and homes to meet the needs of an expanding workforce and population in the Ross-shire Growth Area. It is a particularly attractive town and can contribute to the range of housing opportunities required to attract growth. In this respect, it is perhaps surprising that a only limited amount of housing land is proposed at Strathpeffer. Our clients support allocation of their land, which forms the southeastern part of the SP1 housing site. However, given the need to accommodate growth and the obvious attractions of living at Strathpeffer, it is suggested that the SP1 site should include additional land in our clients ownership to the south west of the allocated site. This expanded site area would provide a logical southern edge to Strathpeffer, rather than the somewhat random boundary formed by splitting our client’s field in half. The remaining land is of very limited agricultural value, given its acreage. Allocation of this additional land for housing development would have a very limited landscape impact and is likely to have less of an impact upon the Slavonian Grebe breeding site than other parts of the SP1 site (which may themselves have no detrimental impacts). It forms a natural extension to the SP1 site and would share the same vehicular access, services and drainage. It would enable enhancement of the adjacent TPO and a holistic approach to landscape design at the edge of the settlement. This could allow larger pockets of greenspace to accommodate distinctive specimen trees, reflecting the character of the outstanding Conservation Area at Strathpeffer. Detailed information submitted previously on the Site Form for the allocated area apply equally to this land, There appear to be no sound planning grounds to exclude this land from the allocated site. Para 4.174 of the LDP notes there are issues with surface water drainage at Strathpeffer. It is once again noted that these issues are the responsibility of Scottish Water and should be resolved at the earliest opportunity by Scottish Water. Development of our client’s land will in not exacerbate the surface water problem. On the contrary, it is likely that SUDS design can improve the historic problem of a system owned and operated by Scottish Water which is not fit for purpose and has not been of an acceptable standard for many years. It is noted that the LDP proposes 67 houses on the SP1 site. Para 2.12 of the LDP notes that Site Capacities are indicative. The LDP Requirements for the SP1 site state that a master plan or development brief should be prepared. It is suggested that this document should provide detailed information on the appropriate density and number of houses to be constructed on the site which may prove to be somewhat more or less than 67 houses. This is consistent with other development plan policies, notably Policy 28 ‘Sustainable Design’, and Policy 29 ‘Design Quality and Placemaking’ in the Highland-wide LDP. These policies could be cross referenced through an additional note in the SP1 Requirements.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

“ The reinstatement of the site to the ‘South East of Evanton Bridge’, as an allocation for future residential development, this reflecting the terms of the current Local Plan land allocation which relates to the site.”

Representation

The land, which forms the basis of this objection to the provisions of the Proposed Plan is, in terms of the currently adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (As Continued in April 2012), formally allocated for residential development purposes, under the terms of site reference 6 which appears in the table on page 69 of the Plan and as shown on Inset Map 16. In line with the provisions of Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, any application submitted at this time, seeking permission for the residential development of the site would be viewed favourably, unless any relevant material considerations indicated otherwise. Whilst it is acknowledged that the most recent Flood Risk maps published by SEPA indicate that a section of the site may be subject to flood risk, the actual extent of which would require to be confirmed by detailed modeling, it is submitted that this potential development constraint would not prevent development from taking place on those parts of the wider site which are not subject to any flood risk and that given the size of the site and the relatively small number of units allocated for development, the full allocation could be delivered irrespective of this potential flood risk. Given the set out above, it is submitted that on the basis of its formal allocation for residential development purposes and in light those material considerations which relate to the site, is most likely that planning permission would be granted for an application seeking permission for the residential development of this site. In light of these considerations, it is submitted that the Council have failed to provide a suitable or justifiable explanation as to why it proposes to “de-allocate” the site within the terms of the emerging Proposed Plan. The only indication as to the reasoning behind the Council’s actions in this regard, lie within the terms of the Main Issues Report (MIR), which was published in Spring 2012. The site is identified as Site Reference H4 within the MIR, as detailed respectively, within the Table on page 77 and the Plan on page 79 of the report. The Table on page 77 of the report, under the heading of “Significant Cons”, indicates that “Most of site in flood risk area”. As has been noted above, whilst it is accepted that in light of the information contained within the relevant SEPA flood risk map, a portion of the site may be subject to flood risk, the full extent of the this flood risk cannot be determined without further more detailed modeling. In light of the sites topography and given the size of the site in relation to the extent, in numerical terms, of the existing allocation which relates to the site, which represents an average development density of only 5.3 units per hectare, it is submitted that scope exists to deliver the full extent of the existing allocation whilst at the same time taking due cognisance of the need to address the flood risk issue. On this basis, it is not accepted that the flood risk issue alone provides sufficient cause or justification to set aside or seek to remove the development allocation, which presently relates to the site. The only other “Significant Con” which has been identified in relation to this site, is the fact that it’s development would result in the loss of an area of prime agricultural land. Whilst the terms of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) indicate, at paragraph 97, that prime agricultural land should not be developed, it also makes clear that an exception to this general presumption against development exists where the land in question forms an “essential component of the settlement strategy”. As the site is formally allocated for development within the adopted Local Plan covering the same, there can be no doubt that it forms part of the strategy for the future development of Evanton and that as such, the loss of the prime agricultural land that would result from its development can be fully justified against the provisions of SPP. It is also worth noting at this point that a number of the sites that have been supported by the Council both within the MIR and the Proposed Plan also involve the development and hence loss of prime agricultural land with it being specifically noted that the agricultural quality of Proposed Plan site references EV1 And EV2 exceeds that of the site which forms the basis of this objection. Given all of the matters outlined above, it is my respectful submission that the Council have failed to provide any reasoned justification as to why the development land allocation which relates to this site, as set down within the terms of the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, the provisions of which were continued in force in relation to, amongst other things, this specific land allocation in Spring 2012. The Council has also failed to demonstrate that there are any insurmountable physical or infrastructure constraints, which would prevent the site from delivering the scale of development for which it is formally allocated. Consequently, it is submitted that the current Local Plan allocation of this site for the development of 24 dwelling houses should be reinstated within the terms of the Proposed Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03864 Name Mr Allan Moore Organisation Allan Moore (Drummond) Ltd

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable) Andrew Bennie Bidwells

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Relating to Paragraphs 1.147 – 1.151

Reference Site Reference, Proposals Inset Map for Evanton Type Change

Comment Changes

“ The allocation of that area of land lying to the east side of site reference EV3, referred to as Site Evanton NS113, Land East of MU2 within the Council’s ‘Alternative Sites and Uses’ consultation document, for residential development purposes.”

Representation

Within their assessment of the relative merits of this site, the Council has acknowledged that it does not suffer from any flood risk issues and that it lies in comparatively close proximity to the village centre and the local primary school. In terms of those considerations, which weigh against the allocation of this site for residential development purposes, the Council has sighted impact upon prime agricultural land, landscape and visual impact and the need for drainage infrastructure improvement. When these various considerations are assessed against the merits of sites within the village, which the Council had allocated for development within the Proposed Plan, it is respectfully submitted that Council has failed to provide sufficient justification as to why the site has not been brought forward as an allocation. With regards first of all to the impact upon prime quality agricultural land it is accepted that the development of the site would result in the loss of such land. This having been said, the Council is supporting development of other much larger sites within the village, Sites EV1 and EV2, both of which will result in the loss of much larger areas of prime agricultural land, which, when more detailed consideration of their agricultural capacity is taken into account, can be deemed to be of higher agricultural value than the site which forms the basis of this objection. In terms of its agricultural potential, this site is tied and limited to permanent pasture land which does not have any more valuable cropping or growing potential. The same limitation does not however exist in respect of site EV1 and EV2. Consequently, the impact in terms of loss of agricultural land is much less significant than that which is associated with the development of the other two sites stated above. On the matter of landscape and visual impact, it is considered that the site is very well contained both physically and visually and that as a direct consequence of the elevated position of the railway line which runs to the east side of the site, it is largely screened from most distant views from the south and east, particularly those gained from the A9. Closer views of the site from the A9 must of necessity be considered within the context of the development of the adjacent Site EV3, with it being submitted that in landscape and visual terms, subject to the same general form of landscape treatment as will be required in respect of the development of sites EV1 and EV2, there is no reason to assume or claim that the site cannot be successfully integrated into the surrounding landscape. On the final matter of the need to provide additional drainage infrastructure to support the development of the site, it is respectfully submitted that this constitutes a “standard” development requirement that relates to most if not all new development sites and that as such, it is not a matter that would normally count against the allocation of the site unless there were any indication that the required infrastructure could not be implemented at reasonable cost, which is not the case in this instance. In view of the matters set out above, it is respectfully submitted that the Council has failed to provide a proper and reasoned justification as to why this site has not been allocated for residential development. Further to these considerations, it is submitted that as this site is free of any constraints, which would impede or otherwise hinder its immediate development potential, which is clearly not the case in respect of other sites within the village that are included as allocations within the Proposed Plan, the allocation of this site could make a positive and meaningful contribution towards meeting the Plans housing land requirements, especially in the short term.

Allocated to Evanton General General

Customer Number 03864 Name Mr Allan Moore Organisation Allan Moore (Drummond) Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Andrew Bennie Bidwells

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Paragraphs 1.147 – 1.151

Reference Site Reference, EV3 Drummond Farm Type Change

Comment Changes

“ The deletion of the requirement for the development of this site to be linked in terms of a joint master plan in relation to the development of Site Reference EV1 Teandallon East and the removal of any timing restriction on the delivery of this site linked to the provision of the new bridge crossing which is required in order to properly access the Teandallon East site.”

Representation

The changes to the Proposed Plan, which are sought under the terms of this representation, relate to separate albeit linked issues, these being the relationship that exists between the development of this site and the site at Teandallon East. These two sites are physically separated from each other by quite some distance, with the nature, form and scale of the development proposed for each being distinctly different. Whilst the scale of the development which is envisaged for the Teandallon East site, and the infrastructure upgrades that will be required as an integral part thereof, is such that it will require a properly constituted master plan to guide and inform its delivery, the same is not true of Site EV3, where the scale and extent of the proposed development is significantly smaller and of much less strategic importance. Of most significance is the fact that the successful delivery of Site EV3 is not dependent upon the construction of the new bridge crossing which is required to open up the Teandallon East site, and as such, it is considered to be wholly unreasonable and unjustifiable to seek to link the development of Site EV3 to the provision of this new bridge crossing. The area covered by Site EV3 is such that it will be able to physically accommodate all of the “requirements” that are noted in respect thereof. This having been said, that fact that the site can accommodate the same does not impart any responsibility on the part of the eventual developer thereof to provide any items of infrastructure which are not required as a direct consequence of the development of the site or to make any master planning provision for their implementation. The general rules governing the matters, which can be addressed via planning obligations are clear to the extent that all such obligations must be reasonably related in scale and kind to the nature of the development to which they relate. In this case, as the new bridge crossing is not required to allow for the delivery of Site EV3, this site should not be required to make any “contribution” towards its provision. This having been said, the sponsor of Site EV3 is prepared to assist in the preparation of a master plan relative to the Teandallon East site, by way of making land available to assist in the detailed design of the new bridge crossing and for the construction of the other community upgrades which the Council has indicated will require to be provided, some of which Site EV3 may reasonably be expected to contribute towards. This offer is made on the clear understanding that as the delivery of Site EV3 is not dependent upon any of the major road infrastructure upgrades that will be required in order to allow for the development of the Teandallon East site, that the development of the site can be taken forward on a “stand alone” basis and in advance of the delivery of the new bridge crossing. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Changes to the Proposed Plan, as set out above, should be accepted by the Council.

Allocated to Evanton EV3 Drummond Farm

Customer Number 00769 Name Mr and Mrs Brian Grant Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Kerri McGuire Graham And Sibbald

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Pages 29 - 47 Inverness City

Reference Main Issues Report Site Reference H49 Type Change

Comment Changes

Our client requests that the land at Druid Temple (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H49) is allocated for residential use.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Mr and Mrs Grant, who own the land at Druid Temple (Main Issues Report H49). Our client wishes to strongly object to the exclusion of this site as a residential development allocation in the Proposed Plan. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Our client previously promoted this site for residential use at the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The Council identified this site as a preferred residential development site and we consider that the Council has not provided sufficient justification for the change in position at the Proposed Plan stage. At the Main Issues Report stage the Council identified this as a preferred site and noted that the site has an attractive outlook and was relatively close to the Milton of Leys Neighbourhood Centre. We fully agree with the Council's assessment. This allocation of this site for residential use would reinforce the role of the south eastern part of Inverness City as a residential area which is well served by local amenities and can create a high quality residential amenity. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site H49 the Council states that: "There is no quantitative housing requirement for an additional housing allocation of this scale in any part of the City or Plan area as a whole. It was preferred at MIR stage because it does not suffer from any insurmountable constraints and because the MIR was a site options draft of the Plan. Respondents' concerns about landscape character, heritage, flood risk, microclimate and road capacity are exaggerated. The allocation could have underpinned the commercial viability of the Milton of Leys neighbourhood centre and therefore made more facilities more likely. The landowners' willingness to release the land and increase the allocation's size is noted and the good outlook from the site is acceptable as a positive. However, there are some doubts as to whether suitable, random-free distributor road access can be formed into the area and there is no quantitative deficiency in terms of housing site provision within the City given the capacity of already allocated, permitted and/or serviced sites. The adjoining developer's concerns about phasing should not be retained." The Council has not offered any supporting quantitative evidence on housing land requirements to justify such a change in position from the MIR stage. We consider that the allocation of this site would ensure that The Highland Council has a sufficient housing land supply. This is an effective housing site that can be delivered during the plan period. We fully support the Council's comments that the objections submitted exaggerate the site constraints. We also support the Council's comments that the development will support existing commercial facilities in the area. The site is capable of being physically accessed and development. Any issues associated with ransom a strip is for the developer to negotiate. Our client and the adjoining landowner are in discussions with the owner of the land required for site access. Planning Justification for the Allocation of the Site The site was allocated for residential development at the MIR stage and the Council recognises the positive attributes of the site and the positive contribution the development of this land would have to supporting the existing commercial uses. The Chief Planner issued a letter to all the Heads of Planning on the 29th October 2010 in relation to providing an effective supply of land for housing. This letter details that: "Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) states that a supply of effective land for at least 5 years should be maintained at all times to ensure a continuing generous supply of land for housing. Planning authorities should monitor land supply through the annual housing land audit, prepared in conjunction with housing and infrastructure providers. Development plans should identify triggers for the release of future phases of effective sites where a 5 year effective supply is not being maintained." The residential market in Inverness has remained relatively buoyant and demand is likely to increase and the residential market continues to improve. The allocation of this effective housing site will ensure that The Highland Council can maintain an effective housing land supply. Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Supply outlines the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of a site. Paragraph 55 of this PAN sets out the criteria as follows: "Ownership: the site is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development. Where a site is in the ownership of a local authority or other public body, it should be included only where it is part of a programme of land disposal; Physical: the site, or relevant part of it, is free from constraints related to slope, aspect, flood risk, ground stability or vehicular access which would preclude its development. Where there is a solid commitment to removing the constraints in time to allow development in the period under consideration, or the market is strong enough to fund the remedial work required, the site should be included in the effective land supply; Contamination: previous use has not resulted in contamination of the site or, if it has, commitments have been made which would allow it to be developed to provide marketable housing; Deficit Funding: any public funding required to make residential development economically viable is committed by the public bodies concerned;

Marketability: the site, or a relevant part of it, can be developed in the period under consideration; Infrastructure: the site is either free of infrastructure constraints, or any required infrastructure can be provided realistically by the developer or another party to allow development; and Land use: housing is the sole preferred use of the land in planning terms, or if housing is one of a range of possible uses other factors such as ownership and marketability point to housing being a realistic option.” Assessing each of the above criteria in turn, we consider that this site is an effective residential site and should be allocated in the emerging Local Development Plan. Ownership – The site is owned by our client who intends to release the site for residential development. Physical – The site is free from physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed for residential use. This was recognised by the Council at the Main Issues Report stage. Contamination – the site is currently greenfield and free from any known contamination. Deficit Funding – no public funding is required to deliver this site for housing. Marketability – The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. It is our client’s intention to bring this land forward for development in the short to medium term. Infrastructure – the required infrastructure to service this site can be provided to allow this site to be developed. Land Use – residential use is the most appropriate use for this site. This use would complement the surrounding land uses and assist in ensuring the commercial viability of Milton of Leys Neighbourhood Centre. We consider that we have demonstrated above that the site is an effective housing site that will assist The Highland Council in delivering an effective housing land supply.

Allocated to	South Inverness	General	General	
--------------	-----------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Our client supports the allocation of the northern section of their site for business use (allocation IN65). Our client requests that this business use allocation is extended as far as the existing open space land at Sir Walter Scott Drive

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Mr and Mrs Grant, who own the land at Sir Walter Scott Drive, Inshes, Inverness which is partially zoned for business use (Proposed Plan Site IN65). Our client fully supports the allocation of the northern section of this site for business use. However, we object to the allocation of the southern section of the site as open space. We request that the business allocation is extended as far as the existing open space land at Sir Walter Scott Drive. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Our client previously promoted this site for commercial use at the Call for Sites and Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The site was not identified at the MIR as a preferred site for commercial use. At the Main Issues Report the Council suggested this site was put forward for retail purposes. The site was promoted at this stage for a range of commercial uses rather than purely retail use. The Council recognised that the site is flat and developable. The Council also stated that the site was commercially visible. The concerns raised against the allocation of the site included the loss of greenspace, loss of Policy HQ expansion safeguard and restricted capacity of the local roads network. Our client fully supported the allocation of the northern part of the site for the expansion of the Police HQ and did not seek the removal of this safeguarding allocation. The Council has recognised that the open space at this location provides no amenity value. In terms of the capacity of the local roads network, this site is located in a highly accessible location that can be reached on foot, cycling and public transport. Furthermore, the Council has allocated the northern section of the site for business use and has not raised any concerns in relation to roads capacity for this part of the site. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site R7 the Council states that: "Land to south of the Drakies Police HQ has been safeguarded for its expansion for several years. Police Scotland advised that this land is still required at least as an option for expansion of justice and/or other public services at this location. The land may also be required in connection with the reconfiguration of Inshes roundabout and use taking access off it. The land presently performs an amenity function and buffer to the distributor road but is not high quality useable public space. An expanded Policy HQ could provide sound and visual barrier between Drakies houses and the distributor road. There is adequate retail land provision in and adjoining existing centres. Extending Inshes Retail Park across a principal distributor road would not be appropriate. It is therefore appropriate to retain the status quo in terms of the site's planning status." We fully support the allocation of the northern section of this site for expansion of the Police HQ or other public services. We also fully agree with the Council's assessment that the existing open space is not high quality useable public space. To clarify, our client is not suggesting that the Inshes Retail Park is extended across the distributor road. We consider that this site should be allocated for business use as an extension to the allocation for the Police HQ expansion. The Council states that this land may be required in connection with the reconfiguration of Inshes roundabout. If this land is required for this purpose we request that the Council enters into early discussions and negotiations with our client. If the Council continues to allocate this as open space to ensure it can be used for potential roundabout improvements in the future, this is blighting any possible commercial use of the site. The northern section of the site is allocated for business use under Site Reference: IN65 Land at Raigmore/Beechwood. The requirements associated with this allocation state that: "The Council will produce a masterplan/development brief which it will adopt as Supplementary Guidance. This will address: the need for completion of and/or land safeguards for, improvements to the trunk road and local road networks prior to development: land safeguard for drainage improvements/safeguards; Flood Risk Assessment (may affect developable area); transport assessment." We request that our client, as landowner, is consulted during the preparation of the masterplan/development brief. Planning Justification for the Allocation of the Site The southern section of this site remains allocated as open space. The site currently offers no amenity value and is not utilised by local residents. The Council has recognised in their response to the Main Issues Report consultation, that this land is not high quality useable public open space. The land is therefore not serving a function as open space. We therefore request that the site boundary of the allocated business site is extended as far as the existing open space land at Sir Walter Scott Drive. This will provide flexibility for the expansion of the Policy HQ and for the provision of other public services. It will also provide flexibility in the business land supply for Inverness should Police Scotland determine that they no longer require the site. We trust that the above comments will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the Local Development Plan and that the Council will extend the business allocation at this location. As the landowner, we

request that our client is fully consulted and involved in any Development Brief prepared for this site. If the Council requires this land for enhancements to Inshes Roundabout we request that they enter into early discussions and negotiations with our client.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I write as an individual although I am a member of the Old Tarradale School development group committee. Although I find the possibility of a further 330 homes being built in the village over the next 16 years daunting, changing Muir of Ord into a small town, I do take note of the phasing suggestions in the plan, of housing construction not exceeding between 20/25 units in any calendar year. I sincerely hope that this gradual development can be adhered to. It will give time for the necessary improvements to the village centre to be developed. There are several committees and individuals in the village devoting considerable time, effort and thought to various projects to improve the community and services to it. It would be good if a completion date for the new bridge could be identified as it is long overdue and would give the locals hope that something other than houses was being built. I would urge care in balancing business opportunity as opposed to housing need in and around Muir of Ord. Certainly you need developers but simply being wealthy enough to own or buy land around Muir of Ord, several of whom are unknown in the village and all of whom have never contributed to the village, is not a good enough reason to keep building houses. Need not greed! Generally the balance and tone of the plan as it pertains to Muir of Ord is appreciated and those of us who are concerned about the future of Muir of Ord and try to work for its improvement look to you the planning authority, to help us improve Muir of Ord for the benefit of the whole community

Allocated to

Customer Number 01202 Name Mr And Mrs Nicolson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Administrator Yvonne Macdonald G H Johnston Building Consultants

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.36, 4.37

Reference NA8, NA10 Type Change

Comment Changes

(1) Modify paragraph 4.36 to reflect the longer term development potential of the Househill Mains option. (2) Modify paragraph 4.37 to reflect the prospect that an interchange junction for the A96(T) and A939 would provide vehicular access to the Nairn bypass. (3) Possibly modify the text in NA8 to indicate the requirement to connect to the proposed A96 (T) bypass. (4) Include a new Mixed Use allocation NA10 (long term) to cover the main part of Househill Farm, the cemetery extension site (currently NA10) and land for playing fields/open space adjacent to the river. Refer to attached plan. List requirements in line with other allocations. (5) Extend the SDA boundary to include the requested land allocation and the Grigorhill Industrial Estate.

Representation

Our clients, Mr & Mrs Nicolson, own and work Househill Mains Farm on the south east side of Nairn. In recent years they have diversified through the development of business uses in the traditional farm steading which could potentially act as a focal point for further related activities and a neighbourhood centre for new housing. Other parts of the farm are limited by the risk from flooding from the River Nairn, at least one of the potential routes of the Nairn bypass/A96 dualling and the demand for additional cemetery space. Other land at Newmill, south west of Auldearn, is part of the farm business unit and is shown in the latest Transport Scotland consultation to be affected by a few of the many bypass/dualling options and potentially carve a significant route through that area. These factors would see the workable area of the farm diminished and with it the farm viability. Our clients therefore see a limited future for the continuation of farming at Househill Mains and are willing to make most of the land available for development. The future development potential of a large part of the farm, the land above the flood plain, was indicated in the Main Issues Report (MIR) as Mixed Use development site MU6 together with land for Community uses C1 and C3. Sites MU6 and C1 were "preferred" and as such, our clients supported their prospective allocation in the Proposed Plan. They were therefore disappointed to learn that most of this land, with the exception of the cemetery extension land, was not subsequently included in the Proposed Plan. It is felt that in doing so the Council has not considered their submission consistently with others for sites in Nairn and across other settlements in the Plan area. As such, we now object to the exclusion of the land previously outlined in the MIR and in our relevant submission. Our clients appreciate that there a number of other large scale Mixed Uses site options around the fringes of Nairn, many of which have been included. However, the potential development of the Househill Mains land seems less constrained than most of these options. We refer to the attributes of the land we indicated in the submission made at both the Call for Sites and MIR stages and we again ask that these be taken into account. Of greater significance in this regard the Househill Mains land is better connected to the existing main road, public transport and path networks to the north than the Nairn South allocations H8 and H9. It also seems to have the best prospect of achieving an access from the future Nairn bypass at the intersection of the A939 road, wherever that junction might be in future. In this regard representations continue to be made to Transport Scotland seeking clarification on the route options and impact on the Househill Mains land. The Proposed Plan now only includes the following parts of the farm within the Settlement Development Area (SDA): - (1) Land for a cemetery extension south west of Granny Barbour's Road at Grigorhill, under NA10. (2) The lower north western fields between the river and the A939 road, but with no designated use. The latter area was previously "preferred" for community use (park/playing fields) in the MIR. The field to the east of the road is now treated in the same way as the land to the west, having previously been open space in the MIR. Surprisingly, the Plan now includes land and woodland to the south of Househill in a different ownership, which was not previously included in the SDA. In responding to our previous MIR submission the Council state that "MU6 would require major road improvements to the access to the site with any development, including that prior to the development of the by-pass," and "will require a Transport Assessment to support the principle of development in this location." This seems acceptable and reasonable but we note that a similar response and requirement is not made for the allocated land at Nairn South. This is despite poor access to the main road network, which was one of the main concerns of the local community that subsequently led to refusal of the planning application for 319 houses etc. If this refusal is sustained it will take a significant number of houses out of the supply equation until the Nairn bypass is completed and can provide access to the land. In this respect we consider that Househill Mains would be well placed to deliver housing and "also has potential to deliver a range of other uses". The response to MU6 continues: "This site may have potential for development to serve the growing needs of Nairn in the longer term but this would be beyond the timescale of the Plan. Therefore it is considered that this site should not be brought forward to the Plan as an allocation." However, this conclusion does not transfer through to the text of the Proposed Plan, unlike for similarly considered land at Tain and Tore. This and the fact that site NA9 Nairn South (long term) does appear as an allocation in the Proposed Plan smacks of inconsistency not just between settlements but

within Nairn itself. In view of the above matters and the previous indication of the Househill Mains land as a “preferred” site in the MIR, at the very least we request that it is included within the Proposed Plan in the same way as most of the land at Tornagrain, Tore and Nairn South NA9 are represented, i.e. for longer term development. Development on the east side of the river will also give more balance to the distribution of land allocations and be closer to existing sources of employment at Balmakeith and Grigorhill. The Househill Mains land had previously been excluded from the Highland wide LDP debate because the Council considered that potential allocations to the west and south west of the town would be more accessible to the main A96 Growth Corridor. However, accessibility between Househill Mains, the strategic road network and across the whole of Nairn, both pre- and post- bypass construction, will potentially give it an advantage over Nairn South. Inclusion of land at Househill Mains will also help deliver playing fields and other community uses in association with development on the east side of the River Nairn. The land for expansion of Tore is identified for development post 2021 subject to a developer preparing a master plan in advance of this date to support its inclusion in the next Local Development Plan review. This outlines an extensive list of criteria which the developer/landowner needs to consider in the preparation of a master plan. We feel that this approach could equally apply to the Househill Mains land giving the opportunity for prior development of allocated land at Sandown, Lochloy and Delnies. Hopefully in the interim Transport Scotland will confirm the route of the Nairn bypass and access to it, which together with an allocation for Mixed Uses will help our clients plan ahead with more certainty for the future management of the farm until such time as it is developed. This includes accounting for the possible early loss of the existing solitary allocation of the cemetery extension land (NA10 Grigorhill). In the setting out the requirements to be included in a master plan the Council should also clarify whether there is a need for a new primary school in the Househill Mains area. To help illustrate the above we attach the following: - (1) Proposed Plan Inset Map with extent of land outlined. (2) Househill Mains Framework Plan as amended.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The 7th bullet point under developer requirements refers to 'Moray Firth Special Protection Area'. This should read Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation because it goes on to refer to disturbance effects of increased marine traffic in combination with other proposals, with reference to the 'Dolphins and Development' model. Bottlenose dolphins are a qualifying interest of the Moray Firth SAC. This is as per the Draft HRA Record.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The 7th bullet point under developer requirements refers to 'Moray Firth Special Protection Area'. This should read Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation because it goes on to refer to disturbance effects of increased marine traffic in combination with other proposals, with reference to the 'Dolphins and Development' model. Bottlenose dolphins are a qualifying interest of the Moray Firth SAC. This is as per the Draft HRA Record.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Split 7th bullet point into two separate bullet points –
•Demonstration of account being taken of the Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation Management Scheme
•Compliance with JNCC piling guidance

Representation

The 7th bullet point for Evantion EV5 includes two factors which we consider would be clearer if they were separate bullet points (as has been done for Invergordon IG11 and IG12), so we would like to see 'Compliance with JNCC piling guidance' as a separate bullet point.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amend text in 6th bullet point from Special Protection Area to Special Area of Conservation

Representation

The 6th bullet point under developer requirements refers to 'Moray Firth Special Protection Area'. This should read Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation because it goes on to refer to disturbance effects of increased marine traffic in combination with other proposals, with reference to the 'Dolphins and Development' model. Bottlenose dolphins are a qualifying interest of the Moray Firth SAC. This is as per the Draft HRA Record.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Allocation of a further 24 ha of land for residential and mixed use adjoining Maryburgh to the West and belonging to Brahan Estate.

Representation

The draft plan on which the consultation was based included an area on either side of the Dunglass Road to the south west of Maryburgh. The proposal to include this in the IMFLDP was welcomed by the Community Council and there were very few negative comments from anyone else. Plans for developing this area would commence as soon as it is zoned for housing development because it is in the single ownership of my family. The 2004 Ross & Cromarty East local development plan zoned an area to the north and west of Maryburgh for housing development subject to it being developed under a single master plan. Strenuous and lengthy negotiations have taken place to endeavour to agree on the drafting of a master plan. The 4 owners together with their advisors, the Highland Council, the Highland Small Communities Housing Trust, Albyn Housing and the Highland Housing Alliance were all involved and put in a huge amount of time and effort which ultimately failed. There seems no likelihood of reaching agreement in the future and the result is that only very a limited number of houses will be constructed until other land is zoned. Maryburgh has been starved of new housing for many years. There is a substantial desire within the community to expand and the only opportunity for a reasonable size of development with a healthy mix of different types of housing is now the area to the south west of the village. This area, which was generally approved of in the local consultation, should be reinstated in the IMFLDP in order to satisfy the demand within the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The hinterland boundary should pass through Mains of Flichity (grid NH674293), then follow the track NNE to join the B851, then follow the B851 south west to the road junction at NH668295, then NNE to cross the river Nairn and follow the NW bank of the river Nairn to join the existing boundary line.

Representation

I am the landowner of land at NH665293 on the southeast bank of the river Nairn. Currently the hinterland boundary cuts across land to the south and east of this point and crosses it following a line between the top of the hill at NH667291 and the top of Brin rock at NH662295. This is an arbitrary line which cuts across fields thus creating an arbitrary definition of the Hinterland at this point. The proposed change follows existing boundaries in the form of a farm track , the B851, the road past Brin House and the river Nairn. In this way fields are left entire, either within, or outside the hinterland area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The plan should recognise that measures to limit and calm the increase in motor traffic in the town centre will be required. Otherwise the town's planned growth will have the effect of destroying the present character and attractiveness of its centre and High Street for business, shopping and social life.

Representation

Motor traffic in Alness High Street has grown very substantially in the past decade. At certain times of day it has already become congested and unpleasant for pedestrians to visit businesses or shop on foot. The plan provides for a massive increase in population (some 1200 additional houses) and for additional employment. The plan acknowledges the implications of growth for local amenities and refers to local access issues in relation to new housing developments. But there is no reference at all to the wider question of how the High Street and adjacent areas are to handle much more traffic without its destroying what the draft plan calls the vibrancy of the town centre. It is not just a question of retaining perhaps the last commercially successful High Street north of Inverness, but of keeping a public space that is a meeting place for local people and a focus for social life.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

INNER MORAY FIRTH PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN NOTICE OF PUBLICATION Customer reference 00974 I refer to the above and your response to my representation. Having read and fully digested your response, I do not think Highland Council has properly considered my representations regarding the Site MU3 in Invergordon which I will explain under the following separate points:- 1. It appears Highland Council is confused on this point when promoting the site for inclusion. The purpose of my raising the issue of the "Seabank Tank farm" description is that if one considers the actual description of what has happened on that site (which you have apparently accepted as being correct) then there is a disconnect between the name that you have used to label the site, and the actual use to which that land was previously put to. As a layman, it is my understanding that planning regime (created after this site was put to the use presently under discussion) is concerned with land use. That being the case, the average person could, quite conceivably, read over the proposed plan you have prepared and if they did not know anything about that site and accepted the "tank farm" description they could miss entirely the opportunity to contribute to the process. This is important because the redevelopment of that site could affect a great number of people who may presently be unaware what a "tank farm" actually is and what redevelopment of that site actually amounts to. Therefore considerable uncertainty is introduced into your consultation process as a result. 2. On the issue of the site being heavily contaminated - my point of concern was that you have failed to explain what the contamination amounts to? If the contamination and job of remediation is undefined then what you are doing is suggesting planning of something is possible and on merit worthy of inclusion in your development plan, which actually may be an ineffective allocation. Your point about planning conditions is based on a presumption for development. When actually, the exact feasibility of the allocation is not properly known, thereby the use of conditions would be illegal in such circumstances as these would be covering any eventuality - it would not be known at the point of allocation if the site is actually suitable for inclusion. 3. I made the point that the infrastructure connected to the land actually extends into the town of Invergordon itself. Therefore, the extent/outline of the curtilage as represented in your development plan is misleading; to develop the site as you suggest will involve ripping up public roads and infrastructure, as well as the site itself. For the avoidance of doubt, these installations are located across the town, and particularly below the road access to our property. Therefore, your explanation the site is "close to the town centre" is misleading – it is in the town centre. The infrastructure of the land in question is inextricably intertwined with the Town under discussion – you have not consulted with the broader community on that point, and the promotion and allocation is incompetent. 4. Regarding the point about pluvial flood risk - you have failed to address that as well: There is presently no conceivable risk of pluvial flooding from the site in question. However, the land fall on the site is such that significant soil sealing and impermeable surfaces will be required to facilitate the development you think is possible, thereby directing surface water run off toward our property and others. Your presumption of a flood risk assessment following any successful allocation is inappropriate because the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 and the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 place a duty (notably not a power) on local authorities to act so as to reduce overall flood risk. You are presently failing on that count. Moreover, the new Scottish Planning Policy adopted in January 2010 was changed to minimise areas of impermeable surface and promote natural flood risk management. This cannot happen under the regime you suggest because in the absence of any natural watercourses presently attributed to the site, there must (by definition and logic) be an increase in flood risk as a result of the allocation you propose. In such circumstances, a flood risk assessment is pointless, as the present situation cannot be achieved/replicated. Furthermore, your reference to SEPA being part of any development management process is misleading: SEPA are not the decision maker in such matters. The decision to either increase the risk to people arising from such an allocation is a strategic decision to be taken by Highland Council, whereas if the site is simply allocated as you suggest with a presumption for development and down the road consultation with SEPA, you are simply propagating the 'planning by appeal' merry go round placing further unnecessary burden on the Scottish Government reporter, wasting public funds and introducing unnecessary dubiety and litigation into the planning system. Conclusion I accept that Highland Council is under an obligation to promote land it thinks may be suitable for development. However your approach is firstly misleading, and fails to understand the fundamental problems. I suggest the site should not be promoted, until these issues are bottomed out and a proper appraisal of the situation has taken place. I feel that is the sort of reasonable and logical approach Scottish Ministers envisaged would take place when they constructed the Planning legislation. Yours sincerely Mr & Mrs AF Bova

Allocated to Invergordon IG6 Seabank Tank Farm

Customer Number 00067 Name Mr Brian Ashman Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN55 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I refer to the current farmland stretch of land from the Inshes retail park to the A9 (IN55) at the Dell of Inshes. The first question to be asked here is, has the correct procedure been followed from the changes of the Inverness Local Plan to the latest Inner Moray Firth Development Plan as I am aware that residents in the local area bordering the plan changes in Woodgrove Crescent, within 20/80 metres, have not been informed in writing from the council planning department as to the change from Green Wedge to mixed use. Firstly, there appears to be a planning application for development on the aforementioned stretch of previous green wedge land. As I am aware the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan has not yet been put into tablets of stone and therefore I suggest the council refuse permissions for any plan until such times the current development plan has been adopted due to procedural matters of protocol. Secondly, any development will have such an impact on the residents of Woodgrove Crescent and neighbouring houses that the amenity for local residents would vastly be damaged with respect to light pollution, noise at various times of the night and day and also have an impact on drainage as so protected by the planners own words with respect to the Inshes burn: 'there are flood problems associated with the Inshes burn. The farmland and afforested "buffers" towards the A9 must be secured. The current trees lining the burn act as a barrier for road and retail noise and that would be massively affected by any development mixed or other. The increase in traffic flow to and from any such proposed businesses in an already congested area , would add to child and general public safety, especially cyclists in an already established housing zone. There is preferential land available already for development, in front of currently, Harry Ramsdens which has no current development on the vacant land and would benefit from a community surgery perhaps. I would prefer the council to consider very carefully the land use area in question and remain mindful at all times of public safety and lack of amenity that any construction and development will have on the council tax payers in this particular area.

Allocated to South Inverness IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The site-area on the map (p 65) (which appears already to have a dotted blue line around but larger than the NA7 area) should be widened to embrace the High Street and Harbour Street, rivermouth and marina area. In the Requirements, amend to read "in accordance with a revised, updated and expanded brief which sets out a holistic vision for the central part of Nairn extending from the harbour to Leopold Street and from the river to Viewfield, and taking account of current and future Conservation Area prospects and the eventual re-routing of the A96. This will include uses that.... [continue as existing text]"

Representation

It makes no sense to have a development brief which considers only that limited part of the town centre of which a substantial part is currently dedicated to car-parking. An effective regeneration plan must take a comprehensive overview of the layout, functions and access arrangements for the entire heart of the town, in order to devise suitable proposals for enhancing the viability of the area, generating greater footfall, maintaining the visual appeal of the historic buildings and linking the retail zone of the High Street more dynamically to the recreational zone of the harbour, caravan park and Links. Part of this may involve revisiting the suggestion in the previous Local Plan of Conservation status for parts of the High Street. By definition this task cannot be left to "a developer", since not all of the site or properties will be (re)developed. Much of the plan will have to fit in with, and incorporate, current structures and functions. The planning authority should aim to mobilise and reflect the views of the local community in drawing up the regeneration strategy. The plans should comply with the principles set out in current planning guidance such as Designing Places, in PAN59, and in the Malcolm Fraser Review.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00365 Name Mr Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.32 to 4.41 and site listings pp 64-67

Reference Site NA1 - Farmers' Showfield Type Change

Comment Changes

Removal/deletion of Site NA1 from the list of sites allocated for Housing. (NB the title is the FARMERS' Showfield, not the "Former" Showfield); and more explicit provision in the narrative text and in Site NA4 (Sandown) for the option of an excambion (exchange) of this site for a sufficient part of the Sandown Common Good land to permit aestablishment of a new and adequate showfiled.

Representation

This is a supplementary representation additional to the agreed comments on various elements of the IMFLDP already submitted separately on behalf of the three Community Councils of Nairn. It reflects views expressed by local constituents/residents to Nairn West CC at a recent open meeting. The key points, and reasons for seeking removal of the allocation of part of this site for housing, are: 1) the whole site is important and valued green open space. It is part of the town's history, and one of the few major remaining green areas within the main part of town. It is extensively used for recreational purposes by local sports groups and individuals. It is an environmental asset - a "green lung" - for the surrounding residential area and for the town. 2) There are understood to be conditions or covenants associated with the title and related to the sale of the transfer of the land from the Newton Estate (Finlay) to the Nairn Farmers' Society. These conditions are said to forbid any "development" of the land for housing or similar purposes without the consent of the previous owners or their heirs and successors. 3) the past planning history of this site (there were previous development bids and a public inquiry), and previous planning debates and outcomes, are relevant to any proposal to zone the land for development in the future. 4) the site is considered unsuitable and inappropriate for housing development principally because of access issues and the adverse impact on adjacent streets. The A96 to the west is a busy trunk road. Access from the south (Fraser Park/Tulloch Drive) would be difficult. Waverley and Lodgehill Roads (to the N and E) are residential streets already seriously affected by traffic problems, the former a bus route and used for A&E access to the hospital, the latter carrying large volumes of vehicle traffic and pedestrians (children) going to and from the nearby school. An additional 30 houses is significantly higher density than the surrounding area. This could not fail to have an impact on the adjacent streets and junctions. 5) development of part of the site would deliver a very small gain in housing stock (up to 30 is a mere 1.2% of the stated requirement of 2500) for the sacrifice of a major part of one of the few significant areas of open green recreational space within the town. The loss of amenity to the whole community would be far greater than the gain in housing, and therefore disproportionate. Preservation and protection of this green space is prescribed by, and would be consistent with, SPP and the specific goverment guidance in "Designing Places", in PAN65 "Planning and Open Space", and the "Green Infrastructure" Design Guidance. If all parties can agree, the option of an exchange of this site (bringing it within the framework of Common Good) for a part of the Sandown lands sufficient for a new Farmers' Showfield would be an imaginative way of preserving the green spaces while still meeting the need for the Farmers' Society to have an an asset which provides an adequate site for their Show - which is itself a part of the Nairn community's heritage and recreation.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

in Requirements, insert "revised and updated" before 'Sandown Development Brief'. Also in first line, delete 'Developer' and insert "Common Good Trustees in consultation with developers and local community". insert after Flood Risk Assessment, "and preservation of wetlands". at the end add, "avoidance of adverse effect on landscape and coastal amenity"

Representation

The suggested changes are self-explanatory. The development brief needs to reflect in more positive terms and detail the excambion option with NA1. As this is Common Good Land the trustees, not developers, should take the lead in masterplanning. References to protection of wetlands and landscape are essential given the particular characteristics of the site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

[for explanation of redrafting proposals, see section below] para 2.10: Table 1 requires revision. para 2.15 and 2.23: [infrastructure] Redraft. para 2.16: [green spaces]. Redraft. para 2.17: [green networks]. This is misleading and inadequate. In final sentence, insert " a few" after 'safeguards'. para 2.17, 2.18, 2.21. new paragraph needed on Moray Firth Coastal Path (Nairn-Inverness). para 2.21: [bullet points]. indicate where Cycle Network 78 runs, and itemise the actions envisaged in the Active Travel masterplans. para 2.22: second sentence is incoherent. If Transport Appraisal is an integral part of the IMFLDP and itemises the objectives and projects, there should be a live link to it. para 2.24: elements of infrastructure fall between the national (NPF) proposals and the site-specific (developer-funded) requirements. The IMFLDP should recognise this, and the wording of para 2.24 be amended accordingly. para 2.25: insert after 'Masterplanning', "jointly by developer and local authority and subject to endorsement by the local community". Policy 2: insert "prior" or "timely" before "provision". Policy 3: in first bullet point, define "active travel range".

Representation

para 2.10 revision: Table 1 has figures which are composite adjusted totals. They do not indicate how the "adjustments" have been made and they do not correspond to the figures on Map 4. The figures in the table should make clear in respect of each Housing Market Area, (a) what the baseline figure is - ie the actual real housing need/demand; (b) the 25% allowance (how many houses?), (c) the 'windfall' figure for each area; and (d) what additional allowance has been added to each area figure in respect of the 3,200 backlog for affordable housing. para 2.15 redraft: At present para 2.15 refers only to the infrastructure "... required to support the developments allocated in the Plan...and ...delivered by private sector investment ...using conditions.. etc". Across the IMF area there are infrastructure requirements that cannot be directly linked to a specific individual development (the ref to public-sector funding for schools doesn't even begin to address the point). The IMFLDP should offer a clear overall blueprint for the enhancement of existing infrastructure and the provision of new infrastructure across the area (the new A96 bypass etc is the most obvious example - there are many others. Para 2.16 redraft: at present this is a statement of the bleedin' obvious and offers no planning guidance. There needs to be specific reference (a) to measures aimed at protecting and preserving existing green spaces and networks, and (b) to proposals and targets, with timescales, for delivery of new or expanded green spaces. Para 2.16 redraft: Paths and cycle routes are more than just "green networks" or recreational amenities. They are integral parts of the infrastructure, just like roads, and should be recognised and planned accordingly. The ref to "active travel networks in para 2.20 is cryptic and opaque. Specific locations/routes for walking and cycling should be identified across the IMF (not just Network 78 and East Inverness). para 2.17 (final sentence): The important areas of green open space in Nairn which have amenity value/benefit to the community are not identified elsewhere in the Plan. They should be. They include the Links, the beaches, Viewfield and the Riverside among others. Inclusion in the Green Networks SG and/or the Greenspace Audit - if they are included - is not an adequate alternative. Given that the Inverness to Nairn Coastal Path is part of a specific objective identified in NPF3, it should be covered explicitly and in detail within the IMFLDP infrastructure section. para 2.23. It would be useful to have an itemised list, or bullet points, which indicate the main local and strategic transport infrastructure projects (bypasses, road upgrades, new junctions, etc) which are already identified, or identifiable as requirements over the next 5-10 years. An obvious example is the A96 upgrade/Nairn bypass. para 2.25. Masterplanning is only useful if it reflects and takes account of the local community's views. A masterplan devised by a developer has no value unless it has local endorsement and support as well as complying with planning guidance. Policy 2 and 3: the criteria about avoiding a net loss of amenity etc, and about avoiding adverse impact on locally important heritage feature, vistas and open spaces apply to ALL developments, not just those in "Other Settlements". This should therefore be incorporated in Policy 2 by adding the criteria in the final two bullet points from Policy 3, with appropriate textual amendment.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

in the Site listing on p 66, under Uses, delete "Industrial" and insert "Leisure/recreation" Under Requirements, after 'open space provision' insert "leisure and recreational facilities"

Representation

The previous Local Plan, and the developer/landowners' masterplan, envisaged the development of this land primarily for leisure and recreation. There were references to nature park, equestrian facilities, a golf course and associated amenities, a hotel/leisure complex and tourism-related development. Housing was indicated as a minor element, and industrial development did not feature. If housing is to be built at an early stage, there must be clear conditions as to the delivery within a defined and reasonable timescale of the other components of the plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

para 3.1 amend 18,350 figure to give breakdown by location. para 3.1 delete fourth bullet. para 3.1 fifth bullet, delete "accessible", insert "an appropriate range of". para 3. second sentence, after 'assets,' delete "and by improving" and insert "preserving and promoting the unique natural environment and recreational amenities, and prioritising tourism as the key driver of the local economy. Appropriate development will improve residents...etc". para 3.2. Delete final sentence. para 3.5. Delete 'jobs', insert "investment" or "enterprises". In second bullet, insert "Limited" before "allocations". para 3.6. Add second bullet "Proactive policies to protect and preserve existing natural environmental assets including open spaces, coastline and beaches, recreational amenities, and viewpoints/vistas". para 3.7. Add new penultimate sentence: "A Nairn-Inverness Coastal path, and substantial expansion of the cycle route-network throughout the IMF area, is required to promote active travel, to encourage modal shift, and to offer improved amenities to residents and visitors". Para 3.8 delete "There are proposals for" and insert "Throughout the area, protection of wild land, coastal environments and beaches, and riversides will be given priority equal to, or greater than..."

Representation

para 3.1 The housing figures need to distinguish between Inverness, Tornagrain, and other locations in the A96 Corridor, and to clarify the adjustments (eg windfall, backlog etc). Para 3.1 bullet 4. Delete because the "engine" assumption, just like "trickle-down" theory, is dubious and unproven and an inappropriate basis for regional development planning. Para 3.2 The importance of tourism to the local economy is unquestionable, and likely to grow. Development must therefore take full account of this. Para 3.2 (final sentence). Delete because unproven, unprovable, unjustified and unnecessary. Para 3.5. [first bullet] allocating land does not 'create jobs'. Commercial investment and business expansion provide jobs. para 3.5 [second bullet] Extensive allocation for housing will degrade the "attractive environment" which is assumed to be the principal reason for housing demand. A balance thus has to be struck, and the scale of housing limited to ensure that the effect on that environment is not disproportionate or detrimental. para 3.6 The additional bullet proposed is self explanatory and reflects the need for development to be balanced with respect for the existing natural environment. Para 3.7 the proposed amendment is self-explanatory. para 3.8 also self-explanatory and designed to ensure an appropriate balance between development and environmental priorities.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Para 2.8 second sentence, delete "unless this plan identifies an exception". Para 2.8 fourth sentence, after 'Inverness City Centre' delete "in the first instance" and insert "or a local/sub-regional centre". Para 2.9 second sentence - delete entire sentence. Para 2.9 third sentence: add (here or elsewhere) some explanation of the criteria by which the "scale" of development relative to a site will be judged (ie how will proportionality or a suitable "match" be assessed. Policy 1: delete the word "Sequential" and the entire second paragraph, "Proposals..... centre(s)", for the reasons given above on proportionality and compatibility and - see below - on "sequential". Table 1: Delete Inverness District Centres and Inverness Neighbourhood Centres.

Representation

Re para 2.8 There is no point in citing a policy principle and then creating a loophole (by the ref to exceptions) which enables the principle to be ignored. The 'Town Centres First' principle -as stated - requires priority to be given to sites within city AND town centres. This is not a basis for directing regional shopping centres or public sector office HQs to Inverness (only). A balanced approach to regional development requires rather that regional shopping facilities and public service offices be located where they can best serve - and create employment for - local communities. In determining the location of development the hierarchy should therefore give appropriate priority to the various towns around the IMF area such as Dingwall, Tain, Cromarty and Nairn. Re para 2.9 and Policy 1. There is a logical contradiction in the reference to "maximising accessibility". If facilities and services are centralised in Inverness, then accessibility is reduced for those in the rest of the region. If maximum accessibility is the aim, then this argues for de-centralisation. The term "sequential" is unacceptable. As described in Policy 1, it implies centralisation, since the second para 1 appears to require that a development will not be permitted in a smaller settlement unless it can be proved that there is no suitable site (how is this to be defined?) in a higher-order (=larger) centre. This is neither sound planning nor balanced development. Re Table 1: the deletions sought in section 4 above are based on the fact that these locations are not "settlements" nor towns, and not capable of becoming such. Nor are they "centres" in planning hierarchy terms. There is no justification for listing retail parks separately, and certainly no basis for regarding them as equivalent to the established and diverse towns and communities in Tiers 2 and 3. A better way to ensure such areas are not excluded entirely is simply to delete the word "Centre" from the Inverness entry at Tier 1.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

This development is not required and not appropriate. There is sufficient capacity and choice in the other allocated sites (Lochloy, Delnies, Sandown and Nairn South, plus windfall). The land is a green space of amenity value to existing houses. A watercourse runs through it. 90 houses would be incompatible with the existing low-density surrounding Kingsteps houses. Access is a severe constraint: connecting through the existing Lochloy housing is inappropriate and would incite "ratrunning", and the minor road to Brodie is a single track with no A96 connection east and junction problems westwards. Development of this area - if ever permitted - should only be contemplated after the bypass is in place, the A96 dualled, and the area east of Nairn's current perimeter can be reviewed holistically in terms of the future expansion of the town. It should therefore not feature in LDP until after 2030.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

para 4.32 - add two more bullet points: * - preservation, protection and enhancement of the beaches, coastal environment, harbour facilities and Riverside of Nairn as key amenities for both residents and visitors. * - creation, development and expansion of a safe and integrated network of paths and cycleways within and beyond the town. para 4.33 - add "the impact of development on the quality of Nairn's historic and natural assets which are key to the tourism economy will be a material planning consideration". para 4.34 - add "This will be based on an integrated masterplan drawn up in consultation with (or by) the local community which will take account of the eventual re-routing of the A96 and the scope to extend the Conservation area". para 4.35 - insert at beginning - "The harbour, Links and beaches are vital features of the town." para 4.37 - insert new 2nd sentence. "Major developments will not be approved until a bypass route is agreed and delivery timetable confirmed". para 4.39 - insert after Audit "including the Coastal Trail and cycle path networks"

Representation

The textual changes are largely self-explanatory. The aim is to highlight more clearly the importance of safeguarding and enhancing Nairn's natural, environmental and heritage assets which are essential for the current and future growth of the local tourism economy (which is not just historic and Victorian!). The need for town centre regeneration to be locally-driven and to cover the whole of the centre, High Street and harbour area is self-evident but needs to be clearly stated. The new approach outlined in the draft Community Empowerment Bill, and the principles in the Malcolm Fraser Review, are directly relevant. The bypass is critical. It is in the interests of both local community and prospective developers that the route and the delivery-timing of the bypass is firmly fixed before developments are approved. The obvious reason is to ensure that access and transport capacity issues are fully addressed before development proceeds and that infrastructure keeps pace with development rather than having to catch up afterwards or be "retrofitted". Much greater priority, and explicit mention, needs to be given to the creation of safe cyclepaths and walkways, both as alternatives to the car (modal shift) which means dedicated and networked routes into and through the town; and for recreational purposes where the national policy commitment to accessing open spaces, the coast and the rural hinterland is very clear.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Add at beginning of Requirements "Delivery of all elements of infrastructure, amenities, and access identified as conditions for development of this site as a whole, including...." Add to list of requirements after 'wider area' " a suitable crossing of the railway for pedestrians, cycles and possibly vehicles to enable access to the current or re-routed A96.

Representation

It is not acceptable, nor good planning, to permit further development of the remainder of the Lochloy site without ensuring that ALL the associated infrastructure and other amenities and upgrades are being delivered. The requirement for a crossing (bridge/tunnel?) of the railway is incumbent upon the Lochloy developers. There is no justification for transferring the obligation on to the developers of the Balmakeith industrial area since this access option is for the use of Lochloy residents, rather than Balmakeith businesses.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

EITHER (a) removal/deletion of the site NA1 from the list of housing allocations entirely; OR (b) rewrite to identify the exchange (excambion) of the land for a portion of the Sandown Common Good Land sufficient for a new Showfield as the preferred option, with the existing Showfield being taken into the Common Good as a community asset and retained as green space for continued recreational and amenity use as at present.

Representation

The site is one of the few remaining significant green spaces within the town. It is extensively used for recreation, is an environmental asset and a "green lung" within a residential built-up area. It is not suitable for housing. Access is constrained by a trunk road and by adjacent residential streets which already have capacity and safety issues. The modest gain of up to 30 houses (only some 1% of the projected total required) does not justify the loss of a major part of one of only four or five urban green spaces left in the town(Viewfield, the Links, the Maggot/Riverside and Tradespark Wood being the others). The excambion proposal depends on the willingness of the parties concerned to negotiate constructively; but it does offer a way to a solution which could satisfy all concerned.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00365 Name Mr Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph paras 4.32 to 4.41 and site list

Reference NA8 and NA9 - Nairn South - and NA12 - Sawmill Type Change

Comment Changes

In NA8 Requirements, insert after Development "once bypass route, linkages and timing are firmly decided, " After Masterplan, insert "revised and amended to reflect updated appraisal of transport and other infrastructure constraints, the delivery of mixed business and other uses as well as housing from the initial phase, appropriate landscaping and layout considerations, and adequate scope to permit the continuing operation and future expansion of the sawmill". After 'transport assessment', add "including measures to resolve for the long term the railway-underpass bottleneck, create an cycle path network connecting into the town, and to provide an additional crossing over the railway during the first phase of development". Also delete 'identification' and insert "delivery", and after 'recreational' delete "access management plan" and insert "facilities and amenities". Corresponding amendments need to be made to the site entry for NA12 (by inserting "revised" before 'Nairn South Strategic Masterplan'.

Representation

The existing strategic masterplan is neither credible nor fit for purpose and requires re-writing to reflect more clearly the need to address the challenges which have now been identified and which led to refusal of a recent application. The delivery of a Nairn bypass (now an element of A96 dualling) has always been seen as a critical prerequisite for the development of the Nairn South site. The recent planning discussions have reinforced that judgment. The IMFLDP has to recognise and reflect that in the specific guidance on the NA8 and NA9 sites. The future expansion of the town and the evolution and shape of the whole area south of the railway line depends critically on the route chosen for the A96 dualled bypass and the location of junctions with it. The development currently indicated for the short-to-medium term cannot sensibly proceed without a clear blueprint for the wider area defined by the route which the bypass takes. There needs to be joined-up planning between Transport Scotland and Highland Council to optimise the configuration of both travel routes and urban expansion. At present the IMFLDP appears to ignore the influence, implications and impact of the bypass route choice.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 00365 Name Mr Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph paras 4.32 to 4.41 and site list

Reference NA3 Achareidh Type Change

Comment Changes

Generally supportive of the inclusion of this site for LIMITED additional housing - ie the 6 houses indicated. The two change would be in the Requirements, to insert "in consultation with the local community" after 'development brief' in the first line, and at the end "and be subject to explicit restriction or prohibition of any further housing development on the site".

Representation

The recommendation to include consultation with the community as an explicit requirement is both a reflection of the new policy approach of Community engagement and empowerment in the CERB; and also because this site is a significant area of green space with a historic listed building and so is of wider importance to the community of Nairn. Further more dense or extensive housing development would be unacceptable, and could sensibly be discouraged by conditions.

Allocated to Nairn NA3 Achareidh

Customer Number 00365 Name Mr Brian Stewart Organisation Nairn West Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph paras 3.7, 3.8 and also para 4.39

Reference Infrastructure and Recreation Type Change

Comment Changes

1) an additional paragraph between or after paras 3.7 and 3.8 which identifies the importance of, and the requirement for, creating and expanding a network of walking and cycling paths throughout the IMF area both as an integral part of transport infrastructure and as a recreational amenity. A priority within this is the delivery of the Coastal Path/Trail between Inverness and Nairn. 2) associated with this, a suitable additional para on p48 and similarly on p63 or 64 setting out the strategy for creating a Coastal Path integrated with active travel and recreational amenity policies.

Representation

The general requirements to promote modal shift (in transport) and access to the environment (for recreation/amenity) are identified at all levels of national and local planning. Walking and cycle path networks are a key component of this. The delivery/completion of the Inverness-Nairn Coastal Path is specifically highlighted in NPF3, linking the Loch Ness Way with the existing Moray Firth Coastal trail. It is included in the Highland Council's Green network plans associated with the A96 Corridor Framework (see attached document). The IMFLDP should therefore include explicit mention of, and contain appropriate links to, these existing policy plans, and set out the criteria and timescale for delivery. There is - or should be - no presumption that the delivery of this Coastal Path (or for that matter other coastal and rural paths and trails in the IMF region) is to be linked to, or delivered in association with, other housing or industrial development. The essence of such paths is that they give access to the coastal and rural landscapes. They are therefore not dependent on nor should they run through, built-up areas. It follows that in large part they have to be delivered by the local authority in consultation with landowners, separately from other development, and so planned as to preserve the natural environment. The point of such paths and trails - especially for cyclists - is to provide links away from vehicular roadways which connect to existing centres; and for recreation purposes, to run through countryside and coast. In neither case should they be an adjunct to new development and construction.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 00284 Name Mr Bruce Morrison Organisation Ferintosh Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.145

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Add a sentence: Priority must be given to non-housing developments supported by residents.

Representation

FCC is not content, however, with the current imbalance between housing stock (too high) and community and commercial facilities (too low). We welcome the new expanded designation of CU6 (North of Schoolcroft) to mixed use (including housing). We also welcome the retention of mixed use (including housing) for CU5 (South of Tir Aulinn) as well as the mixed use (with no housing) for CU4 (South of Village Store). However, we would request throughout this planning period a presumption to provide all possible support and priority to any plans for community/business/office developments that come forward with resident support.

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number 00284 Name Mr Bruce Morrison Organisation Ferintosh Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Mixed Use CU7

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Change to 'Uses': Delete '6 homes and' Change to 'Requirements': Community Use delivered as part of any scheme; however if the community use cannot be delivered within three years of resident involvement, then this site can be developed for business/retail and office.

Representation

FCC is not content with the new designation for CU7 (East of Old Primary School) that now includes 'housing' for the first time in any plan for this area. Following resident consultation, FCC does not consider this small area suitable for housing, nor is there need. There is already adequate provision for housing, and, with the 25% rule covering affordable housing, that also is well provided for. We would also just note that an application for affordable housing has already been rejected by the Scottish Government on this site. We do welcome, however, the expansion of use to include 'community' in this mixed use site and considerable time (at least three years) should be given for community projects/uses to come forward.

Allocated to Culbokie CU7 East of Old Primary School

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Request to define more amenity areas in the map of Culbokie, according to the details in the representation below.

Representation

Amenity areas (marked green). We request that the grey area at the end of the village (NE of Mount Eagle i.e. beyond CU3) be designated as amenity. We also request that the boundary of the grey area SW of Carn Mor be extended to include an amenity area to permit the planned structural tree planting/ gateway feature. Both those requests reinforce the commitment stated in 4.144 to 'consolidating the form of the village. We also note that the area around the west side of the burn just NE of CU5 is no longer designated as amenity and should be returned to that status. We also request that the grey area north of CU6 be designated amenity area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

FCC is content with the planned growth of 130 new homes in Culbokie over the 10 to 20 year planning period in support of the existing village assets, especially with projected falling school rolls. We also welcome the rejection of developments outside the boundary of Culbokie, and indeed the tightening of the boundary in some places, all of which restrains the increase in housing stock to manageable levels.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00284 Name Mr Bruce Morrison Organisation Ferintosh Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.146 Mixed Use CU7

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Under 'Uses' - Delete '6 homes and' Under 'Requirements' - change to " Community use delivered as part of any scheme; however, if a viable community project does not come forward after three years of resident involvement, then can revert to business/retail until reassessment at the next planning cycle.

Representation

FCC is not content with the new designation for CU7 (East of Old Primary School) that now includes 'housing' for the first time in any plan for this area. Following resident consultation, FCC does not consider this small area suitable for housing, nor is there need. There is already adequate provision for housing, and, with the 25% rule covering affordable housing, that also is well provided for. We would also just note that an application for affordable housing has already been rejected by the Scottish Government on this site. We do welcome, however, the expansion of use to include 'community' in this mixed use site and considerable time (at least three years) should be given for community projects/uses to come forward.

Allocated to Culbokie CU7 East of Old Primary School

Customer Number 00284 Name Mr Bruce Morrison Organisation Ferintosh Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph 2.7 Hinterland

Reference

Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

FCC welcomes the retention of 'Hinterland' designation with its restrictive development policies and the rejection of Green Belt designation outside the 'local centre' of Culbokie and the 'other settlements' of Easter Kinkell and Mulbuie.

Allocated to Hinterland boundary

Customer Number 00284 Name Mr Bruce Morrison Organisation Ferintosh Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph 2.26 Mulbuie as Other Settlement

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

1. FCC welcomes the change of status of Mulbuie into the designation of 'Other Settlements' as we believe this will provide the opportunity for appropriate development in support of the local facilities (school, hall) PROVIDED THAT THE SCHOOL REQUIRES EXTRA PUPILS AT THE TIME OF ANY DEVELOPMENT

Representation

This qualification is important since there is uncertainty whether Mulbuie School will suffer the decline of school rolls of a rural school or will continue to act as an overflow from the growth corridor.

Allocated to Policy 3 Other Settlements

Customer Number 00284 Name Mr Bruce Morrison Organisation Ferintosh Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.144

Reference Culbokie Map

Type Change

Comment Changes

Seeking changes to the allocation of amenity areas in the Culbokie Map

Representation

Amenity areas (marked green). We request that the grey area at the end of the village (NE of Mount Eagle i.e. beyond CU3) be designated as amenity. We also request that the boundary of the grey area SW of Carn Mor be extended to include an amenity area to permit the planned structural tree planting/ gateway feature. Both those requests reinforce the commitment stated in 4.144 to 'consolidating the form of the village. We also note that the area around the west side of the burn just NE of CU5 is no longer designated as amenity and should be returned to that status. We also request that the grey area north of CU6 be designated amenity area.

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Extra sentence: Priority must be given to non-housing developments (that are supported by residents and provide services and facilities) ahead of housing developments.

Representation

FCC is not content, however, with the current imbalance between housing stock (too high) and community and commercial facilities (too low). We welcome the new expanded designation of CU6 (North of Schoolcroft) to mixed use (including housing). We also welcome the retention of mixed use (including housing) for CU5 (South of Tir Aulinn) as well as the mixed use (with no housing) for CU4 (South of Village Store). However, we would request throughout this planning period a presumption to provide all possible support and priority to any plans for community/business/office developments that come forward with resident support.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

4.50 Alness and Sustainable School Estate Review. If a single school is to be built and located in Invergordon, the best and most obvious location would be the Seabank Tank Farm which is listed as a priority for regeneration. 4.63 Invergordon. The port facilities should be developed for freight, cruise liners and tourists, not industrial. The energy sector future requirements can be accommodated at Nigg, Deephaven and Ardersier where there is ample room for growth. The coastal side of Invergordon should benefit from scenic views without interruption over open water. Improve the visitor experience particularly for cruise passengers.

Representation

4.50. Alness and Sustainable School Estate Review. If a single school is to be built and located in Invergordon, the best and most obvious location would be the Seabank Tank Farm which is listed as a priority for regeneration. It would remove an eye sore, bring redundant land back to use, would benefit from scenic views of the Firth and could not be any closer to the existing school. Being off-site would mean no disruption to the present school activities, leaving playing fields untouched. The Seabank will need to be cleaned at some stage in any case, better to do it now and chose the best long term location for a new school rather than a short term fix to try and get plans in earlier than competing areas. 4.63 Invergordon. The port facilities should be developed for freight, cruise liners and tourists, not industrial. The energy sector future requirements can be accommodated at Nigg, Deephaven and Ardersier where there is ample room for growth. Improve the visitor experience particularly for cruise passengers - This is in direct conflict with current Port expansion plans. Rig repairs, fabrication, welding, painting and shot blasting will drive away visitors, not to mention the disturbance for local residents. The coastal side of Invergordon should benefit from scenic views without interruption over open water. Site: IG11 Cromarty Firth Port Authority. Ensure no adverse effects on the Cromarty Firth Special Protection Area/Ramsar. The Highland Council cannot ensure there will be no adverse effects when they continually grant Permitted Development Rights to the CFPA. How will the HC regulate the CFPA expansion proposals when no Planning Permission is required? The list of requirements provided would all normally be Planning Conditions but cannot be enforced when there is no Planning Permission required. Examples: 1. The CFPA announced proposals to build a large Fabrication shed, described as such in information sheets made public. When it was pointed out this would be an industrial development requiring planning permission, they changed the title to Assembly Hall and then built a giant shed that towers over the town, dominating the landscape and all done under Permitted Development by simply changing the title. It is not credible to say that is not an industrial building. 2. The CFPA said they need to remove Linear Park as it was part of a phased development and would adjoin and enable the next larger phase 3 proposal. Once the public amenity was removed, plans were changed and phase 3 will now not adjoin Linear Park. As a phased development an EIA and planning consent would be required so the CFPA now claim it is not a phased development, although described as such in their master plans, and the HC have accepted the proposed reclamation of land is not phased and outside the tidal area despite being unable to provide any tidal evidence to support this assumption. I have twice requested this information but it has not been forthcoming. A visit to the area at low tide will show the majority of the area to be within the tidal range although as the land will be adjoined it should still be within the jurisdiction of the HC regardless of the tide.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00391 Name Mr Carl Beck Organisation DSRL

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph 3.10 to 3.15

Reference IG11 Type Change

Comment Changes

The Inner Moray Firth is an area of outstanding biodiversity and amenity which must be sustained. It offers some striking opportunities for waterfront regeneration at Inverness (river, canal and sea frontages) and Invergordon (Firth and surplus ex-MOD holdings). Further Invergordon port developments requiring deepwater jetty extensions and reclamation of backup storage land should face stringent examination of regional alternatives and EC 'public interest' tests. Conflicts of amenity and increasing awareness of safety issues surrounding fuel and other hazardous materials make it best to avoid proximity of new facilities to existing built up areas.

Representation

The Plan for Invergordon is conflicting and lacks vision with regard to the CFPA Port. The basic principle of Planning is "Better Places to Live" and there needs to be good separation between centres of population and heavy industry. This is not the case in Invergordon and plans to expand the Port oil service base are not only detrimental to the health and welfare of the neighbours but conflict with plans to encourage tourism e.g. through arrival of cruise liners. The Port's plans were formalised before Nigg re-opened and have not been properly revisited to account for latest Planning Applications that include new quayside developments at both Nigg and Evanton and proposals for Ardersier. These sites have ample space and using public money to reclaim more land from the sea at Invergordon would not stand Planning scrutiny. Although the CFPA Plans clearly describe their proposals as multi-phased and will have significant future land implications as the area is being expanded, the HC have chosen to ignore this and grant PD rights against their own initial legal advice. The expansion plans make no provision for the lack of infrastructure in the Town, e.g. parking and the whole Planning system is brought in to disrepute by allowing large bad neighbour developments to proceed without the usual rigours of the planning system. The old port (east side) with a harbour, ships, cruise liners is a good port whereas the oil service base (west side) with rig repairs, fabrication, etc is a bad neighbour, wrongly located and hiding behind PD rights for ports when in actual fact it is an industrial site poorly located. Examples of bad neighbour developments poorly located and built without going through the normal planning system include: The construction of a fish meal shed that blocked the outstanding views from the High Street and created smells - and caused the closure of the nearby primary school when it went on fire and burned for several days; The construction of a giant Fabrication shed that dominates the landscape, towering over the town; and The removal of a valued public amenity at Linear Park, all examples of a broken planning system - they tick nearly every box of the PD Order 1992 Schedule 2 Bad Neighbour Developments and yet have been allowed without even seeking planning permission. Planning is about making choices and the proposed Local Plan does not chose but expands what is currently in place making things worse rather than having a vision for the direction development within the Town should go. The HC sponsored document "Inner Moray Firth Ports and Sites Strategy 2050" published by HC in 2006 gave such a vision describing development of the Port but the latest Local Plan ignores these findings. The 2006 report stated: "while opportunities to develop alternative uses can be progressed in the vicinity of the West Harbour and the Admiralty Pier. This would facilitate the opening up and redevelopment of the waterfront as a commercial and leisure centre close by the traditional High St retail/service area. Wider opportunity and greater flexibility would be presented by the opening up of Nigg allowing a mix of development uses around Invergordon. It would open up the waterfront to public access, extend the parkway from the west, bringing back sailing craft and marine leisure activities to the centre of the town. It would provide a proper reception point and facilities for visiting cruise ships. It would kick start regeneration to tackle the contamination and eyesore of the Seabank tanks with consequent provision of further housing, community facilities and open space. An Urban Regeneration Company or similar organisation should lead this process." In response to specific sections of the Plan: 3.10 Vision The further expansion of Invergordon Port as an industrial base conflicts with the aims of the Plan to strengthen shopping, transport, performance/arts, tourist and education facilities. There is insufficient separation between heavy industry and residential property which is having an injurious effect on the health and welfare of local residents who are kept awake all night and throughout weekends by noise, have air pollution and damage to property (my car has been damaged by paint overspray 6 times while parked in front of my own house) to contend. Strategic choices need to be made, not more of the same and those choices should account for new sites such as Nigg re-opening and a change in emphasis in Invergordon toward harbour regeneration and tourism with a gradual transfer of industrial activity toward more suitable locations such as Nigg. Strategy 3.11 Industrial heart of the Highlands. The location of the fabrication industry should be at Nigg and Highland Deephaven but not Invergordon Port which is too close to residential property and does not have the infrastructure such as parking. Plans to reclaim land from the sea are a clear indication that Invergordon is not the right location, the Highlands is not short of space. 3.13 Travel. Invergordon port should be developed along traditional lines as a freight interchange, place for cruise liners, yachting, tourism, etc rather than a place for heavy industry and expansion of rig repairs. The two are in conflict and Plans

should recognise that fact. Transportation of large turbines via Tomich junction is an accident waiting to happen. 3.15 Benefit from an outstanding location for natural and cultural heritage. Development should not impact on the habitats of the Cromarty Firth. Well it does in a very negative way. The removal of the public amenity at Linear Park is an obvious example. A sculpture was sited adjacent to the former Linear Park and at the time had uninterrupted views up the Cromarty Firth toward the mountains of the Wyvis range but it is now surrounded by fences and heavy industry, hardly an attraction. The expansion of the Port is destroying natural landscape that has outstanding scenic value.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reference to the sawmill expansion should include the words “principles of”... the Nairn South Masterplan to provide some flexibility and a more detailed stage in defining boundaries. Reference should also be made to the provision of the pedestrian and cycle bridge across the railway by including the words “(accommodating new bridge over railway)” are added in the reference of NA12. The wording of NA12 should therefore be amended to read as follows: Suggested wording: Site : NA12 Sawmill Expansion Area (ha): 5.1 Uses: Sawmill expansion (accommodating new bridge over railway) Requirements: Development in accordance with the principles of the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan.

Representation

The current area defined prejudices one of the key infrastructure requirements of the Nairn South Masterplan. Whilst the boundaries are not defined in detail, there is no recognition of the railway bridge and the current proposals map is prejudicial to its delivery. Wording of Policy NA12 should also include qualification that the piece boundary of the area to be defined otherwise the line as shown on the existing plan will become prescriptive by default. It has not been subject to detailed scrutiny and was initially defined by a Highland Council planning officer in the A96 Corridor study. The area was then measured to be 5.1ha. There was no operational justification for the precise boundary. It is therefore suggested that a more flexible approach is adopted which specifies that 5.1 ha or thereby is provided for potential sawmill expansion and new bridge over the railway.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site : NA8 Nairn South Area 9 (ha): 25.9 Uses: 520 homes (250 in Phase 1A); business, retail and community Requirements: Development to be in accordance with the phasing set out below to limit development in the first phase to 250 units and include local access and transport improvements to both Balblair Road and Cawdor Road; provision of a rail/cycle bridge across the railway; identification of green network and appropriate footpath/cyclepath connections; provision of link road between Balblair Road and Cawdor Road; open space provision; education developer contributions; landscaping; consideration of potential heritage impacts; provision of a recreational access management plan; avoidance of unacceptable adverse effect on the integrity of the inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar. ■ Phase 1a) 220 units and mixed uses ■ Phase 1b) 100 units and mixed uses ■ Phase 2a) 100 units ■ Phase 2b) 100 units

Representation

NA8 does not accord with the phasing set out by the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan nor set out the infrastructure requirements associated with development. It provides insufficient guidance or clarity and could lead to sporadic or isolated patterns of development that are not well linked physically or functionally to the existing urban structure of the town. The IMFLDP does not adequately define the phasing of development in line with allocations as required by Highland Wide Local Development Plan and the Nairn South Masterplan and does not respond to concerns expressed by the local community and Development Control decisions taken by Highland Council. The wording is too vague and should be more specific to avoid ambiguity or misinterpretation. We submit that the Nairn South Masterplan prepared by Highland Council does not adequately reflect the findings of the Reporter from HWLDP or the views of the local community and therefore suggest that aspects of the Nairn South Masterplan are clarified and reviewed as part of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan in particular in relation to: ■ Phasing of development; ■ Limit on the number of houses within the first phase of development; ■ Access and infrastructure improvements required during early phases of development; and, ■ Review of the extent of development of Nairn South. Mr Allenby's application for Planning Permission in Principle remains before Highland Council. The application site lies within and forms part of NA8. The application proposal is for a mixed use development of 250 homes, community uses, local/neighbourhood retail facilities and business and commercial uses. The application also includes a pedestrian & cycle bridge over the railway to serve Nairn Academy and the surrounding area and a west – east link road between Balblair Road and Cawdor Road as well as suggested improvements to Balblair Road. The application also includes a strong landscape buffer to contain development and avoid poorly sited development on the ridgeline to the south of the site and provides an area for potential expansion of existing commercial uses. The proposal is for 250 houses within the wider proposed allocation of NA8. The application site includes part of the Scotia Consortium site to provide a link through to Cawdor Road to the east. Mr Allenby's vision is for a more modest scale and form of development that finds solutions to the issues raised by the local community at the start of the development process or prior to commencement of development by means of suspensive planning conditions. See fig ALLE001 We consider that the exact boundary lines for phasing require further examination and should be consistent with government guidance and advice. We submit that the appropriate way forward to progress this allocation through the more detailed Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP) is to progress a masterplan based on further public consultation and feedback from the Community Councils. Mr Allenby has consistently promoted a plan led approach to development in Nairn South. This approach has been supported by Highland Council. The Scotia planning application was a detailed planning application including detailed house types and design – based on fairly standard house types of the main consortium members but did not include any mixed uses and the site is physically separate from the edge of Nairn. House numbers and phasing are not consistent with the Nairn South Masterplan. In addition, the detailed layout, alignment of development parcels and geometry of the Scotia application are not consistent with the phasing required by the Nairn South Masterplan. It would not be possible to deliver the phasing suggested by the Nairn South Masterplan through the detailed Scotia layout. Despite this, it was recommended for approval by planning officers subject to suggested conditions that required development of phases consistent with the Nairn South Masterplan and setting maximum numbers for each successive phase of development. The proposed conditions directly contradicted the detailed design and layout plans because what was submitted did not align or accord with the boundaries as set out in the Nairn South Masterplan. In contrast, Mr Allenby's proposal is consistent with the numbers and with the boundaries of the Nairn South Masterplan. The key point of difference is the suggestion as part of this submission that the phasing is revisited so that local roads and access issues, including the new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway to the academy, should be provided at an earlier phase of development. The masterplan should fully reflect the findings made by the Reporter from the HWLDP, key planning guidance and advice from Scottish Government and

examples of good practice from elsewhere as well as the views of the local community and consultation with the relevant Community Councils. Robert Maslin, Scottish Government Reporter to the HWLDP concluded that “The residential component of the first phase will be strictly limited to 250 houses,” and provides a clear limit of maximum site capacity which we fully support. This level of housing is considered sympathetic to the landscape and is consistent with the existing character of the area reflecting the edge of settlement location of the site linking the urban and rural environments. The Reporter also makes specific reference to the Transportation Assessments and analysis undertaken to date assessing the potential limit of development in the first phase of Nairn South before significant additional infrastructure improvements or a by-pass is required. The limit of 250 units is on the basis of potential improvements required (beyond that already completed) to the railway under-bridge which probably requires installing traffic signals. However, we also suggest that the following is required as an initial phase of development:

- Improving pedestrian footways and traffic calming along Balblair Road;
- Introducing a one way system with local access only along Balblair Road;
- Providing the footbridge/cycle bridge over the railway;
- Upgrading the Cawdor Road railway bridge with further safety measures;
- Providing a local distributor road between Cawdor Road and Balblair Road;
- Establishing structure planting to define and contain future development in Nairn South;
- Upgrading and relocating the sawmill access;
- Providing community allotments; and,
- Providing open space and footpath/cyclepath links to the surrounding areas.

Nairn South needs to be developed at an appropriate density to ensure a successful transition between rural and urban. Design should be specific to Nairn and Designing Streets should form a basis for good practice in calming traffic and creating a strong sense of place and well-designed public spaces. It should not be a high density reproduction of other more central parts of the town centre. The site is on the edge of the settlement and requires a sensitive approach to design. Lower density development is in keeping with the location and character of the area and will engender a successful town expansion and encapture a feeling of place and which will protect and enhance the setting of the town and its existing landscape features. See figure ALLE 0002

Our approach has always been centred upon the need for a comprehensive masterplan for Nairn South. Following the publication of the Reporter’s findings and the adoption of the HWLDP; the Nairn South Masterplan and the recent refusal of the Scotia Consortium planning application we have reviewed our masterplan. We submit that this is endorsed by the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as a further iteration of the Nairn South Masterplan to better reflect community views and to respond to local access and infrastructure issues. Our approach is preferred by the Community Councils as it delivers improvements to local infrastructure at the start of the development process and provides better linkages with the surrounding areas. The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should therefore provide more specific guidance and design principles for the masterplan and phasing of Nairn South as follows:

- A mixed but overall a low density of development that suits the edge of town and country setting of Nairn South;
- A limit of numbers within successive phases of development;
- Housing will be for a mix of family units including affordable provision for all sectors of the community provided throughout the development;
- A mixed development including a range of business, commercial, retail and community facilities, not just housing;
- A pedestrian and cycle link and bridge over the railway to the town centre as an early phase of development;
- A development that respects the landform, landscape features and setting to provide a strong and contained edge to the settlement;
- Local access and transport improvements to Balblair Road and Cawdor Road;
- To provide for reasonable expansion of existing commercial uses such as the sawmill; and,
- To provide a link between Cawdor Road and Balblair Road.

Context for IMFLDP is provided by the HWLDP. It states that “to meet the identified gross housing land requirement for the Nairn area, land allocations have been brought forward to offer choice and flexibility in the land supply. Taken together the land now identified in the Nairn area has the capacity to meet the following housing requirements across all sites.” Table 3: Potential distribution of development to meet Housing Land Requirement in the Nairn Housing Market Area allocates 330units between 2011 and 2021 and a further 600units between 2021 and 2031. In addition, the text accompanying NA8 is insufficient guidance in terms of basic infrastructure requirements, phasing, limits on numbers and appears to simply reflect previously submitted development proposals that have already been refused planning permission by Highland Council. Phase 1 of development should contain development within a strong landscape setting, provide for a bridge over the railway and expansion of the sawmill. This should be based on starting development at the edge of the urban area and working out rather than the alternative as suggested to develop early phases that are physically detached from the edge of the settlement. This is consistent with views previously expressed by Nairn West Community Council. Also, the southern extent of phase 1a) should be limited from that shown below in the Masterplan to respect and recognise the existing landscape features and to limit development unconnected with the town. We request that more detail is provided by IMFLDP to inform the successive phasing of development and specific infrastructure requirements. This should evolve from the Nairn South Masterplan to provide a better context for development of Phase 1 of Nairn South. See figure ALLE 0004; ALLE 0005 and ALLE 0006

It is essential that initial phases of development should include provision of the new pedestrian/cycle bridge across the railway, improvements to Balblair Road and the sawmill access and the link road between Balblair Road and Cawdor Road as well as enhancement of the railway underbridge on Cawdor Road. Such measures should be included as a direct response to community concerns expressed and the phasing of the Nairn South Masterplan should therefore be reviewed to reflect this. The illustrative masterplan demonstrates how this could fit within the wider context and how development could be shaped within the landscape. This is consistent with HWLDP but requires phasing to be amended to ensure the provision of key infrastructure as development proceeds. The phasing shown below is for Phases 1 (a & b) and 2 (a & b) with a strict limit of 250 within the initial phase of development (Phase 1a). The IMFLDP should include the phases and boundaries as suggested below. See figure ALLE 0007

The Allenby development framework completes the requirement for a masterplan approach for the initial phase of the Nairn South area that is consistent with government advice and the Reporter’s recommendations and conclusions. This includes a mixed use development including community uses, open space, local neighbourhood retail, business units, limited to a total of 220 houses (including affordable) within the first phase of development within NA8, pedestrian and cycle bridge across the railway, local distributor link road between Balblair Road and Cawdor Road and 5.1ha sawmill expansion with appropriate noise mitigation including bund to ramp

for bridge, landscaping, buildings and planting.

Allocated to

Nairn

NA8

Nairn South

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site : NA9 Nairn South (long term) Area 9 (ha): 17.6 Uses: 410 homes, business and community Requirements: No development will be permitted prior to completion of NA8. Development will be subject to a comprehensive development framework or strategic masterplan prepared in conjunction with Highland Council and subsequently adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. This should address phasing and the potential links to the proposed A96(T) by-pass; open space provision; education developer contributions; footpath/cycleway connections and linkages to wider area; structural landscaping; consideration of potential heritage impacts; provision of a recreational access management plan; Flood Risk Assessment; avoidance of unacceptable adverse effect on the integrity of the inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar.

Representation

NA9 does not accord with the phasing set out by the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan nor set out the infrastructure requirements associated with development. It provides insufficient guidance or clarity and could lead to sporadic or isolated patterns of development that are not well linked physically or functionally to the existing urban structure of the town. The IMFLDP does not adequately define the phasing of development in line with allocations as required by Highland Wide Local Development Plan and the Nairn South Masterplan and does not respond to concerns expressed by the local community and Development Control decisions taken by Highland Council. Specifically in terms of NA 9 Phase 2 (a) and 2 (b) should be revisited so that local roads and access issues, including the new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway to the academy, should be provided within the first phase of development. In addition, the retail/commercial/community facilities should be provided as an earlier phase of development. Local retail facilities should be provided, as initially suggested by Highland Council in the A96 Corridor Study and HWLDP in the northern sector of the allocation. See figure ALLE 000 5 Nairn South needs to be developed at an appropriate density to ensure a successful transition between rural and urban. Design should be specific to Nairn and Designing Streets should form a basis for good practice in calming traffic and creating a strong sense of place and well-designed public spaces. It should not be a high density reproduction of other more central parts of the town centre. The site is on the edge of the settlement and requires a sensitive approach to design. Lower density development is in keeping with the location and character of the area and will engender a successful town expansion and encapture a feeling of place and which will protect and enhance the setting of the town and its existing landscape features. The need to take account of the existing townscape and landscape in the planning of Nairn South is important. In addition, any development framework should recognise that Cawdor Road is the main route to the visitor and tourist attractions and an important point of entry to the town from the south. Designing Streets sets out good practice in designing places that meet the needs of new communities and designing for all modes of transport to provide safe places with local identity. See figure ALLE 0003 New development should be consistent with PAN 44 - Fitting New Housing Development into the Landscape, which states in paragraph 9 that "Lack of integration with the landscape is particularly noticeable on the edges of our small and medium sized towns. Many new housing developments have been planned and carried out without evident regard to existing urban form and the local landscape, or to their wider visual impact particularly when seen from road and rail approaches. Insensitive development can undermine the special environmental quality of towns and their setting in the countryside which have drawn people to live and invest in them in the first place". The development of Nairn South should also be consistent with PAN 72 - Housing in the Countryside, which provides the context to good design practice and seeing things in context and that development should respect landform and landscape. The planned release of large housing allocations should be guided by a better understanding of the characteristics of the landscape and its suitability for development. Careful attention should be paid to landscape fit, and the principles of good design should be applied consistently by authorities in their planning decisions. PAN 83 (Masterplanning) and PAN 68 (Design Statements) both also recognise context as a critical starting point. Development should be contained and should not be linear or sprawl or detached from the settlement edge. Good design is about providing shape and context and providing a good environment for all. Government guidance strongly supports this approach and provides that the landscape and topography should inform and contain the layout of any new development. PAN 72 reinforces this approach stating "... landscapes have different capacities to accommodate development. It is therefore crucial that the proposed location and siting of new housing considers the impact on the landscape, in terms of both immediate and wider surroundings..." The guidance goes on to state that "The importance of layout within a site cannot be over stated". We have adopted this approach through the process of submissions to HWLDP and the application for Planning Permission in Principle. However, this has been ignored or dismissed by Highland Council who has instead prepared the Nairn South Masterplan to align with the boundaries of the Scotia Consortium application leading to isolated development not well connected, indeed physically separate, from the surrounding area. This has not been supported by the local community,

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

Community Councils or indeed Highland Council Planning and Environment Committee who refused the planning application. Our approach has always been centred upon the need for a comprehensive masterplan for Nairn South. Following the publication of the Reporter’s findings and the adoption of the HWLDP; the Nairn South Masterplan and the recent refusal of the Scotia Consortium planning application we have reviewed our masterplan. We submit that this is endorsed by the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as a further iteration of the Nairn South Masterplan to better reflect community views and to respond to local access and infrastructure issues. Our approach is preferred by the Community Councils as it delivers improvements to local infrastructure at the start of the development process and provides better linkages with the surrounding areas. The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan should therefore provide more specific guidance and design principles for the masterplan and phasing of Nairn South as follows: ■ A mixed but overall a low density of development that suits the edge of town and country setting of Nairn South; ■ A limit of numbers within successive phases of development; ■ Housing will be for a mix of family units including affordable provision for all sectors of the community provided throughout the development; ■ A mixed development including a range of business, commercial, retail and community facilities, not just housing; ■ A pedestrian and cycle link and bridge over the railway to the town centre as an early phase of development; ■ A development that respects the landform, landscape features and setting to provide a strong and contained edge to the settlement; ■ Local access and transport improvements to Balblair Road and Cawdor Road; ■ To provide for reasonable expansion of existing commercial uses such as the sawmill; and, ■ To provide a link between Cawdor Road and Balblair Road. Context for IMFLDP is provided by the HWLDP. It states that “to meet the identified gross housing land requirement for the Nairn area, land allocations have been brought forward to offer choice and flexibility in the land supply. Taken together the land now identified in the Nairn area has the capacity to meet the following housing requirements across all sites.” Table 3: Potential distribution of development to meet Housing Land Requirement in the Nairn Housing Market Area allocates 330units bewet 2011 and 2021 and a further 600 units between 2021 and 2031. HWLDP states that a “limited release” of land in Nairn South would supplement the land supply in Nairn and that the pinch points associated with the existing railway bridge and the junctions on to the A96 can be sufficiently improved to enable this development. The allocation on NA8 in the IMFLDP is therefore contrary to the HWLDP in terms of phasing and housing numbers allocated. It does not provide enough specific reference or explanation of the requirements of the Nairn South Masterplan. It does not adequately or accurately reflect the more detailed phasing of the Nairn South Masterplan and it would set a dangerous precedent for unsympathetic development that was not well considered in the context of Nairn in terms of unit numbers, linkages, density or urban form. The allocation proposed is not an appropriate response to the Nairn South Masterplan and does not provide any phasing for development or numbers within successive phases. It falls short of a full consideration of the distinct phases as required by the Nairn South Masterplan. The IMFLDP as drafted is consistent with the approach adopted in the previous application made by the Scotia Consortium but that application has already been refused by Highland Council. See ALLE 0006 NA9 requires to provide for more logical phasing of development to ensure early delivery of improvements to local infrastructure. NA9 – Long Term has no explanation or context and allocates land sufficient for 410 housing units and retail facilities in the long term. The HWLDP process had previously identified a mixed use commercial area with local retail facilities at the northern edge of the area. The extract text from Policy 18 of the HWLDP (below) is more precise and relates to detailed issues that should enable the IMFLDP to be more specific in terms of guiding development rather than more general as it appears at present. Phase 1 of development should contain development within a strong landscape setting, provide for a bridge over the railway and expansion of the sawmill. This should be based on starting development at the edge of the urban area and working out rather than the alternative as suggested to develop early phases that are physically detached from the edge of the settlement. This is consistent with views previously expressed by Nairn West Community Council. Also, the southern extent of phase 1a) should be limited from that shown below in the Masterplan to respect and recognise the existing landscape features and to limit development unconnected with the town. We request that more detail is provided by IMFLDP to inform the successive phasing of development and specific infrastructure requirements. This should evolve from the Nairn South Masterplan to provide a better context for development of Phase 1 of Nairn South. Phase 2b) should be delivered in advance of 2a) not as shown in the Nairn South Masterplan, to enable early delivery of pedestrian and cycle bridge over railway. It is essential that initial phases of development should include provision of the new pedestrian/cycle bridge across the railway, improvements to Balblair Road and the sawmill access and the link road between Balblair Road and Cawdor Road as well as enhancement of the railway underbridge on Cawdor Road. Such measures should be included as a direct response to community concerns expressed and the phasing of the Nairn South Masterplan should therefore be reviewed to reflect this. The illustrative masterplan below demonstrates how this could fit within the wider context and how development could be shaped within the landscape. This is consistent with HWLDP but requires phasing to be amended to ensure the provision of key infrastructure as development proceeds. The phasing shown below is for Phases 1 (a & b) and 2 (a & b) with a strict limit of 250 within the initial phase of development (Phase 1a). The IMFLDP should include the phases and boundaries as suggested below. See ALLE 0007 The development framework presented above completes the requirement for a masterplan approach for the initial phase of the Nairn South area that is consistent with government advice and the Reporter’s recommendations and conclusions. This includes a mixed use development including community uses, open space, local neighbourhood retail, business units, limited to a total of 220 houses (including affordable) within the first phase of development within NA8, pedestrian and cycle bridge across the railway, local distributor link road between Balblair Road and Cawdor Road and 5.1ha sawmill expansion with appropriate noise mitigation including bund to ramp for bridge, landscaping, buildings and planting.

Allocated to	Nairn	NA9	Nairn South (long term)	
--------------	-------	-----	-------------------------	--

Customer Number 04051 Name Mr Charles Phills Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr John Wright Strutt and Parker

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CM3 Daffodil Field (Cromarty) Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove the allocation of this land for allotments but retain the site within the settlement boundary.

Representation

This site was identified in the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan as a housing site for up to 4 houses. Whilst this was not subject to a planning application during the lifetime of that plan, we did make a submission to the "call for sites" seeking the continuation of this allocation to the new plan for delivery within that period. Our reference number for the call for sites was RCE3. The Officers Committee draft of the Main Issues Report identified this site as H1 being a preferred housing site, providing an opportunity to round off the settlement and infill a logical gap. Unfortunately, when Councillors considered the draft Main Issues Report the preferred status was removed and replaced with a non-preferred status for housing, but retaining the land within the settlement boundary. There was no mention at that stage of considering this site as a potential allotment site. Whilst it was unfortunate to see the removal of the preferred status of the site we were comforted by the continuation of its inclusion of the settlement boundary and, on that basis, did not make a representation to the Main Issues Report. When the "additional sites consultation" was undertaken, we reviewed that document and noted no change in respect of land at Daffodil Field. In particular, there was no mention of any indication that this site was being considered as a potential allotment site and therefore no submission was made to this consultation. Whilst the landowner has previously considered an approach about the possibility of providing allotments on this land outwith the development plan process, this was declined. It therefore came as some surprise when reviewing the Proposed Plan to see this site identified as an allotment site. This is the first time this site has been identified in the plan, or discussed as part of the process as having potential, for allotments and has therefore not been subject to the necessary publicity, or consultation, that an allocation in the Proposed Plan should benefit from. The landowner intends to develop a small number of houses on this site, which does not require an allocation, but does require the land to be within the settlement boundary. No technical issue has been raised during the LDP process that would prevent development, or cannot be overcome in the detailed design. As a result, the allocation of this land for allotment uses is not effective, would be constrained by landownership, and should be removed from the plan (but retained in the settlement boundary) to avoid unnecessarily raising expectations with the Allotments Association/Growers Group. If there is a need for allotments, and provision needs to be identified in the LDP, then discussion should be held with relevant landowner to identify a location that is likely to be released for such a use during the Plan period.

Allocated to Cromarty CM3 Daffodils Field

Customer Number 04439 Name Mr Chris Mackenzie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alan Ogilvie G H Johnston Building Consultants

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG4 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We act for the MacKenzie family, owners of the substantial House of Rosskeen land and wooded grounds on the north west side of Invergordon. Our clients are pleased to note that their property is now allocated for development and we write to support the provisions as listed under IG4 in the Proposed Plan.

Allocated to Invergordon IG4 House of Rosskeen

Customer Number 00655 Name Mr Christopher Breslin Organisation Scottish Canals

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 39

Reference IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Scottish Canals supports the identification of the Clachnaharry Quarry site as a housing site. SC intends to take forward consideration of this site through a masterplan charrette which Sc and Highland Council wil undertake in Spring 2014 as part of a wider study focused on Muirtown Basin.

Allocated to West Inverness IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

For relevant canal-side sites (e.g. IN21, IN19, IN16 and IN24) refernece should be made to encourage developers to consider utilising the canal as a receptor for surface water discharge and as a potential heating / cooling source for adjoining developments. In addition there should also be a reference to the need for developments to contribute towards the upgrading of canal-side areas or facilities such as moorings which developments ultimately will take advantage of and gain benefit from in terms of amenity and value.

Representation

The Canal represents an alternative opportunity for drainage of development sites. Work is already underway in north Glasgow as part of the Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership which is pioneering unique and innovative methods for draining currently constrained sites in north Glasgow into the Forth and Clyde Canal via smart technology and SUDS. Sites beside the Caledonian Canal could also be drained into the Canal. SC would also wish for relevant canalside sites to include in their allocation the need for development sites to provide upgrades to adjoining canal-side areas or facilities such as moorings on the basis that developments often utilise the canalside for amenity and added value and often result in increased use (and necessary maintenance) of the canalside. SC would welcome the opportunity to work with Highland Council to prepare any necessary Supplementary Guidance on these issues if it would aid further understanding of the opportunities highlighted and potential delivery of realistic solutions.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Scottish Canals supports the identification of the Muirtown Basin area for development of business, community, tourism, leisure and residential use. SC is working in partnership with Highland Council on the regeneration of the Muirtown basin area and will undertake a design charrette in Spring 2014 to begin to prepare an outline masterplan and development brief for the area. The opportunity sites around Muirtown Basin include a number of sites, some in SC ownership, which could deliver more than 30 units as currently identified in the LDP. The charrette / masterplan and eventual Development Brief should clarify the appropriate nos of housing units on sites around the basin which will be fundamental to meeting the city's growth objectives and the overall viability of the regeneration of the Muirtown Basin gateway.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00655 Name Mr Christopher Breslin Organisation Scottish Canals

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Northern part) Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Scottish Canals has been involved in the preparation of the Development Brief for the Torvean & Ness-side area and will continue to lobby both Transport Scotland and Highland Council for the need to consider pedestrian / cycling / tourism and canal requirements at the interface of the new west-link road with the canal. SC also intends to look further into the detail of the potential new canal basin at this location which requires a 5 leg roundabout to be delivered in partnership with Transport Scotland and Highland Council. A detailed masterplan is required for this area which ensures high quality landscaping and pedestrian and cycling experiences along the canal and around this gateway / sports hub and which considers the present and future needs of the canal and its users and businesses. Crucially, the road users considerations should be balanced with the importance of the canal / pedestrian / cyclist users in this area, particularly if people are to be encouraged to walk between the sports hub, golf course, new housing areas and the canal. SC would also highlight that this area could be a Scenic Tourist Route location, which is another project SC, Highland Council and Trasport Scotland are working on along the route of the A9 and A82. The Torvean area could be a key gateway location and stopping off point for tourists if the existing landscape setting is enhanced through the road development.

Allocated to South Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Southern part)

Customer Number 00655 Name Mr Christopher Breslin Organisation Scottish Canals

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Fort Augustus Pg 111-113

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Text in para 4.109 should make reference to role of Scottish canals in working with Highland Council and others to prepare Conservation Appraisal / Management Plan / Supplementary Guidance for Fort Augustus to help bring forward sensitively designed, residential infill opportunities within the village. Text and / or FA5 should make reference to the proposed Camping Pods which SC has submitted for planning. In terms of FA7 - SC supports the identification of this site for business use / canal related tourism. We also support the Scenic Tourist Routes project and the potential to implement improvements at this location and this should include enhancements to the visitor experience and pedestrian movement and safety on the A82.

Representation

SC has a significant role and landholdings within Fort Augustus and will bring forward sensitive residential development proposals for infill sites within the settlement and other canal / tourism related uses along the canal. Sc involvement in the preparation of the Conservation Appraisal / Management Plan / Supplementary Guidance for Fort Augustus is therefore essential. FA5 makes no reference to the proposed camping pods which may impinge upon the proposed FA5 site allocation.

Allocated to Fort Augustus General General

Customer Number 00655 Name Mr Christopher Breslin Organisation Scottish Canals

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 40

Reference Site IN21 Muirtown Basin Type Change

Comment Changes

The residential allocation for Muirtown Basin should not be limited to 30 units given the extent of the sites included within IN21 around Muirtown Basin.

Representation

Scottish Canals supports the identification of the Muirtown Basin area for development of business, community, tourism, leisure and residential use but this should not be limited to 30 units. SC is working in partnership with Highland Council on the regeneration of the Muirtown basin area and will undertake a design charrette in Spring 2014 to begin to prepare an outline masterplan and development brief for the area. The opportunity sites around Muirtown Basin include a number of sites, some in SC ownership, which could deliver far more than 30 units as currently identified in the LDP. The charrette / masterplan and eventual Development Brief should clarify the appropriate nos of housing units on sites around the basin which will be fundamental to meeting the city's growth objectives and the overall viability of the regeneration of the Muirtown Basin gateway.

Allocated to West Inverness IN21 Muirtown Basin

Customer Number 00288 Name Mr David Fraser Organisation Glenurquhart Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Housing Type Change

Comment Changes

I wish to appeal the decision to leave the area known as H4 in the Drumnadrochit section of the Main Issues report out of the Proposed Plan and ask that it be included in the final version of the Local Plan. This is the triangle of land including the house Culcreuch, Pitkerrald Rd, Drumnadrochit.

Representation

• It was identified as a preferred site by Highland Council. •Although the proposed plan identifies land for around 140 new homes in Drumnadrochit 130 of these are in the hands of 2 developers. This severely restrains the options for small scale development by local builders. • The land is within the village envelope and settlement pattern. • The site was generally supported by those responding to the initial consultation • The site extends to over 1.1 hectares and can accommodate a small number of new houses (up to 5) on areas that currently have no trees or heavily coppiced sycamore. The semi mature oak trees and areas of birch / hazel planted by the current landowner would be retained. • There are no flooding issues and all mains services are in close proximity • In the event that development is permitted at Pitkerrald Farm then agreement can be reached regarding land for road improvements.

Allocated to Drumnadrochit General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I would like to raise three points of objection on the view stated in the plan suggesting the land at Greenside Farm continues to represent the ‘best option for growth’ to the village of Rosemarkie. Each point of objection poses a fundamental question on this land being developed in the manner and scale proposed and each of these I would respectively ask to be answered. If such answers reference decisions taken by committee which purport to justify the apparent disregard of planning policy (relevant extracts of which are shown below inset in italics), could I please ask for copies of the meeting minutes to be attached or included in your responses as should the issues raised be escalated, such background needs to be fully understood beyond the previous simple statements of decision released by the Council? My objections/questions are > 1. The proposed development area does not represent a logical extension of the village – it forms a very obvious protrusion on the existing village boundary. The logical development of housing and expansion of the village would be as shown below, continuing the lines of housing on the two areas and filling gaps between existing houses. a. The issue of flood risk in the area at the Western end of Courthill Road can be eliminated with the appropriate type of housing and land drainage. b. Development as shown contains the boundary of the village, constitutes the same area as proposed and spreads the housing more sympathetically to the existing lines of development. c. Importantly, development in these two areas respects and would be consistent with Planning Policy regarding Conservation Village Areas, SSSI’s and Greenfield sites. I would like to ask how the Planning Committee consider the proposed area of development land at Greenside Farm to be acceptable when it forms no logical extension to the village, directly adjoins the conservation area of the village and a listed Designed Landscape and SSSI and is high grade agricultural land? We will also judge proposals in terms of how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development and landscape character, how they conform with existing and approved adjacent land uses ...Essentially the purpose of the designations is to exert greater control over the siting and design of proposed development.planning authorities have a duty to bring forward proposals for the preservation or enhancement of Conservation Areas, Development within the designated Outstanding Conservation Area should be carried out in accordance with the established character of the area have regard for the Designed Landscape of the Fairy Glen Paragraph 6.37 safeguards good quality agricultural land and viable farm units on the periphery of the settlements, notably at Broomhill and Greenside, from development unrelated to the working of these areas fore agricultural purposes. 2. The suggested housing capacity of this area of land as stated at 50 units on 1.9 ha equates to an average 380 sq m per house. This density of housing is twice that of the proposed development FR2 Ness Gap, is unprecedented in both Rosemarkie and Fortrose, is at the level of inner urban development and does not comply with the Council’s stated expectations or national Planning Advice. Up to 2 hectares of land is allocated for 30 to 35 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings. As a guideline, the THC will normally expect a maximum plot ratio of 30% (i.e. no more than 30% of plot being covered by buildings) ... This is also consistent with the latest national advice contained in Planning Advice Note 67. The impact of development on the wider landscape needs to be considered and to ensure that the scale of new development in smaller towns and villages is appropriate. How has this housing capacity been decided and how has the number of houses increased from the originally stated level of 30 units to a number which within the footprint of the land in question results in housing density greatly exceeding Planning Advice? The fact that demolition of the farm buildings at Greenside Farm has commenced would appear to suggest the owners of the land have already sold an ‘option to buy’ subject to planning approval and the increase in housing density points to prior dialogue with the developer and the Planning Department on the commercial need for a higher level of housing capacity to make this development viable from the developer’s standpoint. 3. Development of the density proposed on the 1.9ha at Greenside Farm presents serious issues in respect to infrastructure both in the immediate proximity to the development on Courthill Road and for the village centres of Rosemarkie and Fortrose. First there is the issue of road access and traffic, Courthill Road being a single track, access only and partially one-way road with no possibility to be widened. Secondly, there is a pre-existing traffic problem on the main streets of both villages which can only be made worse with additional housing unless alleviated through appropriate measures in advance of further development. Finally, as confirmed in the IMFLDP itself, development on the scale proposed cannot be accommodated by the existing water supply. Proposed developments will be assessed on the extent to which they are compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools, electricity) ...Why does the Planning Authority not require infrastructure to be addressed in advance of considering further development in the area? One last point – and this is a fundamental matter. The Planning Department has the authority to manage and control development and there is, as with all development, the opportunity to exercise best practice in building ... Respecting the

landscape setting and the traditional building patterns of the locality and considering the immediate context and allowing specific site conditions to influence design – as stated by the Scottish Government. Whilst it is accepted the matter in discussion at this point is focused on options for housing development, please at the relevant stage can it be recognised there is a need to enhance and build community as opposed to simply build houses. Today there can be no excuse given on cost constraints – it is down to the resolve of the Planning Department to follow their own clear development directives and ensure outcomes deliver more than an increase in housing stock. It can be done as evidenced by developments such as Burnside in Plockton.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

1. Reduction in the area of land proposed for development. 2. Consideration of additional land area for development. 3. Reduction in the number of houses considered.

Representation

I would like to raise three points of objection on the view stated in the plan suggesting the land at Greenside Farm continues to represent the 'best option for growth' to the village of Rosemarkie. Each point of objection poses a fundamental question on this land being developed in the manner and scale proposed and each of these I would respectively ask to be answered. If such answers reference decisions taken by committee which purport to justify the apparent disregard of planning policy (relevant extracts of which are shown below inset in italics), could I please ask for copies of the meeting minutes to be attached or included in your responses as should the issues raised be escalated, such background needs to be fully understood beyond the previous simple statements of decision released by the Council? My objections/questions are > 1.The proposed development area does not represent a logical extension of the village – it forms a very obvious protrusion on the existing village boundary. The logical development of housing and expansion of the village would be as shown below, continuing the lines of housing on the two areas and filling gaps between existing houses. SEE ATTACHED PLAN a.The issue of flood risk in the area at the Western end of Courthill Road can be eliminated with the appropriate type of housing and land drainage. b.Development as shown contains the boundary of the village, constitutes the same area as proposed and spreads the housing more sympathetically to the existing lines of development. c.Importantly, development in these two areas respects and would be consistent with Planning Policy regarding Conservation Village Areas, SSSI's and Greenfield sites. I would like to ask how the Planning Committee consider the proposed area of development land at Greenside Farm to be acceptable when it forms no logical extension to the village, directly adjoins the conservation area of the village and a listed Designed Landscape and SSSI and is high grade agricultural land? We will also judge proposals in terms of how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development and landscape character, how they conform with existing and approved adjacent land uses ... Essentially the purpose of the designations is to exert greater control over the siting and design of proposed development.planning authorities have a duty to bring forward proposals for the preservation or enhancement of Conservation Areas, Development within the designated Outstanding Conservation Area should be carried out in accordance with the established character of the area have regard for the Designed Landscape of the Fairy Glen Paragraph 6.37 safeguards good quality agricultural land and viable farm units on the periphery of the settlements, notably at Broomhill and Greenside, from development unrelated to the working of these areas fore agricultural purposes. 2.The suggested housing capacity of this area of land as stated at 50 units on 1.9 ha equates to an average 380 sq m per house. This density of housing is twice that of the proposed development FR2 Ness Gap, is unprecedented in both Rosemarkie and Fortrose, is at the level of inner urban development and does not comply with the Council's stated expectations or national Planning Advice. Up to 2 hectares of land is allocated for 30 to 35 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings. As a guideline, the THC will normally expect a maximum plot ratio of 30% (i.e. no more than 30% of plot being covered by buildings) ... This is also consistent with the latest national advice contained in Planning Advice Note 67. The impact of development on the wider landscape needs to be considered and to ensure that the scale of new development in smaller towns and villages is appropriate. How has this housing capacity been decided and how has the number of houses increased from the originally stated level of 30 units to a number which within the footprint of the land in question results in housing density greatly exceeding Planning Advice? The fact that demolition of the farm buildings at Greenside Farm has commenced would appear to suggest the owners of the land have already sold an 'option to buy' subject to planning approval and the increase in housing density points to prior dialogue with the developer and the Planning Department on the commercial need for a higher level of housing capacity to make this development viable from the developer's standpoint. 3.Development of the density proposed on the 1.9ha at Greenside Farm presents serious issues in respect to infrastructure both in the immediate proximity to the development on Courthill Road and for the village centres of Rosemarkie and Fortrose. First there is the issue of road access and traffic, Courthill Road being a single track, access only and partially one-way road with no possibility to be widened. Secondly, there is a pre-existing traffic problem on the main streets of both villages which can only be made worse with additional housing unless alleviated through appropriate measures in advance of further development. Finally, as confirmed in the IMFLDP itself, development on the scale proposed cannot be accommodated by the existing water supply. Proposed developments will be assessed on the extent to which they are compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools, electricity) ... Why does the Planning Authority not require infrastructure to be addressed in advance of considering further development in the area? ----- One last point – and this is a fundamental matter. The Planning Department has the

authority to manage and control development and there is, as with all development, the opportunity to exercise best practice in building ... Respecting the landscape setting and the traditional building patterns of the locality and considering the immediate context and allowing specific site conditions to influence design – as stated by the Scottish Government. Whilst it is accepted the matter in discussion at this point is focused on options for housing development, please at the relevant stage can it be recognised there is a need to enhance and build community as opposed to simply build houses. Today there can be no excuse given on cost constraints – it is down to the resolve of the Planning Department to follow their own clear development directives and ensure outcomes deliver more than an increase in housing stock. It can be done as evidenced by developments such as Burnside in Plockton.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number 00678 Name Mr Dereck Mackenzie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Kerri McGuire Graham And Sibbald

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph Pages 29 -47 Inverness City

Reference Main Issues Report Site Reference H36

Type Change

Comment Changes

Our client requests that land at Druid Temple, Inverness (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H36) is allocated for residential development.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Dereck MacKenzie, who owns the land at Druid Temple (Main Issues Report H36). Our client wishes to object to the exclusion of this site as a residential development allocation in the Proposed Plan. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Our client previously promoted this site for residential use at the Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. This site was not identified as a preferred site at the MIR stage. The Council recognised that the site has an attractive outlook. However, the Council considered that the site had the following constraints that would prevent allocation: • Technical and economic feasibility of forming suitable road access • Potential loss of woodland and badger habitats • Watercourse runs through site As detailed in our submission at the MIR consultation stage, we consider that these constraints can be addressed and mitigated and should not prevent the allocation of the site. There are two access options for this site. Our client's preferred option is via the Tulloch site on the opposite side of Old Edinburgh Road. There is a retained vehicular access from the Tulloch site. This addresses the Council's access concerns and would link to the residential area to the immediate north/east. As an alternative, vehicular access along Old Edinburgh Road could be controlled to prevent excessive use. An alternative vehicular access option would be through Fairways site in the event that land is allocated on the golf course for residential development. Halliday Fraser Munro had previously made representation on behalf of Fairways seeking the allocation of 4 residential development areas around the gold course (with the existing golf course being reconfigured and retained). The south eastern development option includes a potential link road off Druid Temple Way which would link into this site and curve back into their suggested Development Option on the eastern corner of the golf course. It has been demonstrated that there are two potential access points and that there are no access constraints at this site. In terms of loss of woodland and impact on badger habitat, there are no environmental designations on this site and there is also no protected woodland at the site. This issue could be addressed by the requirement of a badger survey at the detailed design stage. A tree survey could also be undertaken to demonstrate that the proposal will not impact on the existing trees. The Council has also identified that there are two watercourses at this site. It should be noted that the SEPA floodmap does not identify this area as being at risk of flooding. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site H36 the Council states that: "As set out in the representations opposing the site's allocation, it suffers from woodland constraints and confirmed watercourse flood risk. However, its road access constraint can be overcome by a connection from the adjoining Parks Farm development which would allow a relatively short connection onto a higher capacity distributor road and improve active travel connections generally. This would realise a net improvement to traffic levels on the lower section of General Wade's Road. A low density housing development should be possible with improved road access and setbacks from both woodland and watercourses. However, because of the constraints and low capacity within City Boundary, non-safeguarded notation would be more appropriate that a specific, positive allocation for housing development." Our client has commissioned Waterman Group to undertake a desk top environmental report to assess any potential environmental constraints at the site. This report has been submitted in support of this representation. This report demonstrates that there are no environmental 'show stoppers' that would prevent residential development at this location. It has been identified that there are no environmental or landscape designations at the site. The site is also not identified at being of risk of flooding. The Council has confirmed that their initial concern about road access can be overcome. The Council also state that a housing development is possible if set back from the woodland and watercourses. We fully support this assessment of the site. The Council then states that because of constraints the site should not be allocated for housing development. This is contradictory to their previous statement that identifies the constraints can be addressed and that a housing development is possible. It is unclear what constraints the Council is referring to that would prevent this site being allocated. It is unclear what the Council means about a 'non safeguarded notation' as the Proposed Plan shows the site outwith the Inverness settlement boundary with no allocation. Planning Justification for the Allocation of the Site The Council has confirmed that this site is capable of being developed for residential use. The allocation of this site will assist in the maintenance of a sufficient housing land supply for Inverness. The Chief Planner issued a letter to all the Heads of Planning on the 29th October 2010 in relation to providing an effective supply of land for housing. This letter details that: "Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) states that a supply of effective land for at least 5 years should be maintained at all times to ensure a continuing generous supply of land for housing. Planning authorities should monitor land supply through the annual housing land audit, prepared in conjunction with

housing and infrastructure providers. Development plans should identify triggers for the release of future phases of effective sites where a 5 year effective supply is not being maintained.” The residential market in Inverness has remained relatively buoyant and demand is likely to increase and the residential market continues to improve. The allocation of this effective housing site will ensure that The Highland Council can maintain an effective housing land supply. Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Supply outlines the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of a site. Paragraph 55 of this PAN sets out the criteria as follows: “Ownership: the site is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development. Where a site is in the ownership of a local authority or other public body, it should be included only where it is part of a programme of land disposal; Physical: the site, or relevant part of it, is free from constraints related to slope, aspect, flood risk, ground stability or vehicular access which would preclude its development. Where there is a solid commitment to removing the constraints in time to allow development in the period under consideration, or the market is strong enough to fund the remedial work required, the site should be included in the effective land supply; Contamination: previous use has not resulted in contamination of the site or, if it has, commitments have been made which would allow it to be developed to provide marketable housing; Deficit Funding: any public funding required to make residential development economically viable is committed by the public bodies concerned; Marketability: the site, or a relevant part of it, can be developed in the period under consideration; Infrastructure: the site is either free of infrastructure constraints, or any required infrastructure can be provided realistically by the developer or another party to allow development; and Land use: housing is the sole preferred use of the land in planning terms, or if housing is one of a range of possible uses other factors such as ownership and marketability point to housing being a realistic option.” Assessing each of the above criteria in turn, we consider that this site is an effective residential site and should be allocated in the emerging Local Development Plan. Ownership – The site is owned by our client who intends to release the site for residential development. Physical – The site is free from physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed for residential use. This is demonstrated in the supporting desk top Environmental Report. This has also been confirmed by the Council in their comments in response to the MIR consultation. Contamination – the site is currently greenfield and free from any known contamination. This is confirmed in the supporting Environmental Report. Deficit Funding – no public funding is required to deliver this site for housing. Marketability – The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. It is our client’s intention to bring this land forward for development in the short to medium term. Infrastructure – the required infrastructure to service this site can be provided to allow this site to be developed. Land Use – residential use is the most appropriate use for this site. This use would complement the surrounding land uses. We consider that we have demonstrated above that the site is an effective housing site that will assist The Highland Council in delivering an effective housing land supply.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Dereck MacKenzie. Our client owns the land at Old Edinburgh Road, Inverness that is identified for retail use (Allocations IN71). Our client fully supports the continued allocation of this site for retail use. The site is allocated in the Proposed Plan as a 0.3 hectare site for Retail use. The policy requirements associated with this allocation state that the site is only suitable for neighbourhood catchment scale facility and that improved access off Old Edinburgh Road South is required. Our client fully supports the continued allocation of this site. Given the size of the site we agree with the Council’s requirement that this site is development for a neighbourhood catchment scale of retail development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The Plan has been well presented and published. You and your colleagues have put a lot of time and effort into gathering and interpreting information. 2. We feel strongly that the "call for sites" and their inclusion in the Plan should not be seen as a guarantee that Planning Permission 'in Principle' or 'in Full' will be granted. Each case will still have to go through the full process of consultation. Many people who have received letters from Highland Council because they are within 80m of a "call for sites" believe that a new Planning Application is imminent. 3. The statistics for numbers of houses required for Nairn, Auldearn, Cawdor, Croy, Tornagrain (Petty), Ardersier and possibly Whiteness Head (9,600 + ? 2,000) for the so called "growth corridor" are unrealistic and destined to destroy the whole character of the area. It is an area of outstanding beauty and scenic attraction with Marine, Environmental, Geological and Built Heritage designations. 4. Land use in the "growth corridor" is agricultural with a southern zone of woodland. The woodland zone has had a long history of well managed broadleaved species with blocks of well managed coniferous species. Obviously most of the woodland zone has been part of the Management Plans and investment of the Private Estates with State Forestry becoming involved post WW2. The IMFLDP must not detract from these important primary land uses which generate local retained wealth and employment as well as Community Structure and Stability. In World Heritage Terms, we have a unique environment which has to be carefully managed for posterity. Short scale development proposals have to be in scale, carefully considered and for the benefit of The Community. Most of the schemes proposed do not benefit the local communities in cultural or financial terms. Most of the finance invested and resulting from development will be drawn out of the area by national developers, supermarkets or companies with head offices in the south. Tourism is a major industry in the Moray Firth Area and there is a tremendous potential to concentrate on developing all aspects of visitor enjoyment. This depends on not spoiling the main assets which we have inherited. Decision taking for Planning and Development must return to local Community level where there are competent organisations and Councillors with a wealth of local knowledge and understanding. This is the basis of the new Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill and the recent COSLA Report. After many public meetings of the Nairnshire CCs including Highland Councillors and officials, we are committed to working in partnership to empower our community, develop locality capacity and improve our locality planning process. We are sending this letter to you to ask for a meeting to explore using Nairnshire as a model to help develop this process. We are keen to use this opportunity of changing government policy to develop a very efficient locality planning and delivery system for this or any locality. We are also sending this letter to Dr Stuart Black as our suggested best way forward in response to IMFLD P and if necessary the prioritisation of Nairnshire's Part of the IMFLDP deliberations in front of any reporter. We would like to suggest that we use the corporate memory and pool of expertise in Nairnshire to model a new way of ensuring Community engagement, and therefore responsibility and accountability for our next Nairnshire Plan. In these difficult financial times we must all have confidence and trust that the decisions are being made for "The Common Good" and in Nairnshire's best interests. We must also show value for money and the best possible local outcomes. In planning terms we again suggest that the plan is for 2015-2020. It must be pragmatic and realistic. Infrastructure must be in place and funded before any development is approved. Before the next plan for 2020-2025 there will be a review in the light of the financial situation. We will also review the population data, housing need data and housing completion data before that next 5 year plan. Our understanding is that HC through the PED committee will deliver best practice to ensure proper scrutiny of Transport Data. This policy will then be in place to restore public confidence on transport infrastructure. We think the HC corporate position on Nairn South necessitates that HC must also review its scrutinising role with the other departments and agencies involved in planning, again with a view to restoring public confidence and trust. These are our priorities for the next 5 year plan, ensuring that we deliver a sustainable future for Nairnshire in line with NPF3 and SPP proposals:- Priority 1 The Bypass Built This is fundamental to any realistic planning for Nairn and Nairnshire. We believe this is a shared priority and we should all be working together to achieve its reality. Many local people attended the road show at the Golf View showing how seriously Nairnshire is about planning and getting it right. Priority 2 Town Centre Regeneration We again would like to suggest a partnership approach to make this a reality. A lot of work and thinking has already been done but we must make it real. The CC, NICE, Association of Nairn Businesses, Tourist bodies, etc all think that we should have a dedicated Project Manager to give us the capacity to develop this exciting and essential development. It is obviously a complex task and the funding and recurrent revenue will all take a considerable amount of work. We would also like to involve Michael Fraser as a professional advisor to this project. We are clearly prioritising the Town Centre/High Street shopping/jobs and regeneration in this 5 year plan in line with "Place worth" thinking. Any further out of town centre development should be considered in the review and thinking about the 2020-2025 plan. Priority 3 Harbour Development/River/Beaches (the best beaches in Scotland) /Tourism /Leisure

and Recreation/Paths We want to take forward these exciting proposals and think again it will provide a significant sustainable boost to the Nairnshire economy. We again need a Project Manager dedicated to driving this forward. There will also be substantial professional fees around these major construction proposals in design and delivery , We have a local group dedicated to driving this forward which is a valuable resource that Nairnshire can contribute to make this work Priority 4 Sandown/Wetlands/Showfield/Common Good includin& best use of Common Good Assets/Housing- affordable/sheltered/self build/private This exciting project holds many of the keys to ensuring this fabulous future for Nairnshire. Again we have dedicated local groups who have done a lot of the preparatory work and thinking. There is year round tourist potential in Nairnshire's unique wetlands, including beaches, inter tidal flats and river environments with our winter bird populations. We think we can solve many of our local housing needs between Sandown, town centre and the existing farmers' field. Again we think the amount of work to be done needs a project manager to give us the professional capacity to maximise all the local knowledge and skills in this complex project. Priority 5 Nairn Housing Developments . We wish to ensure that we can meet Nairn's housing needs from 2015-2020. Our position is clearly that the infrastructure must be in place and affordable before any housing goes ahead. It should also be meeting real local need and conform with the SPP f NPF3 guidance that we hand over an attractive sustainable town to future generations. We think these housing needs can be met at Lochloy on existing zoned land, town centre, Sandown, farmer's field, Achareidh and Nairn infill sites. We wish to work with HC to make sure we balance housing needs with keeping Nairn an attractive place and supporting our major tourist industry. We also must not put one of our other major employers -Gordon's Sawmill at risk. We will review all other sites and need for sites for the 2020-2025 as agreed above. Priority 6 Nairnshire and its links to Nairn as its County Town Greater Nairnshire with Ardersier /Fort George/Castle Stuart/Croy /Kilravock CastlefCawdor /Cawdor castle I Auldearn and all its history fGlenfernessjDavaf LochindorbWolf of Badenoch's Castle(? already spoiled by wind farm)/Logie/ Findhorn and Culloden and Brodie/Brodie Castle just outside are fabulous tourist and local attractions. We must maximise the tourist and leisure and recreation opportunities that all these assets give us. In building the necessary bypass for Nairn we must carefully plan the local roads and routes including public transport to ensure the vital synergy between Nairn and its county. Any housing developments in Nairnshire must prioritise local need and not put at risk our beautiful and historic communities and their invaluable tourist assets. OUR JOINT CC PROPOSALS. We are therefore proposing that HC and the Scottish Government work in partnership with Nairnshire to develop this model for our sustainable and exciting future. The CC proposal is that we meet quarterly with the 4 Local councillors, Business/Tourist, Health and Social integrated team/social interprise company. This will ensure we are ahead of the loop and will maximise use of local knowledge and skills to bring forward best value for money proposals. The local scrutiny role will ensure that all agencies are delivering the whole range of quality local services we wish to see. In cost terms 3 Project Managers, at about £50,000 each total costs, will give us the capacity to start to develop and deliver these exciting plans. We will seek from multiple funding sources about £1 million a year for 3 years to fund these proposals and thereafter look to our "Fair Share" budget to recurrently fund Nairnshire.

Allocated to	Nairn	General	General	
--------------	-------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

With reference to the IMFLDP document Page 17, paragraph 2.26 – Other Settlements, and Page 18 – Policy 3: I would like to express my support for the aforementioned. Paying particular regard to the rural settlement of Mulbuie, on the Black Isle, which comprises a scattered rural community centered around two key local facilities - the Village Hall and Mulbuie Primary School. These facilities not only serve as the heart of rural life for the primary age & nursery children attending, but also sustain a wider community with meeting facilities for recreation and social gatherings. It is my belief that a degree of considered housing units would not only benefit and help to sustain this small community in its endeavors to succeed and improve, but could potentially provide a designated area of recreational ground close by the existing nucleus, for the benefit of both the local school and the wider community. To this end, I would like to propose the area of land to the north of the Memorial, between the residences of Suil Beinne and Allandown, bounded by fences on all sides, and amounting to approximately 5.5 acres. A small and appropriate development in this location would help to form a more cohesive settlement close to the existing hub, and would not be deemed to place any undue pressure on the existing infrastructure. Drainage and sewerage could be addressed by way of a carefully designed mounded system - as is typical in such a rural locale, and all other amenities are already in close proximity. I think that the criteria set out in 'Policy 3' is a positive step forward by the LDP, and has the potential to allow small rural settlements like 'Mulbuie' - the opportunity to improve their core services, promote a rural lifestyle and prevent vitality being lost to larger towns and cities.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Remove Ness Gap Site Area Marked FR2 Proposal for Housing and or Commercial Development. Re-instate Site as proposed on 2007 Local Plan for provision of Primary School Large scale development to the North of the Kessock Bridge should be limited.

Representation

The building of a further 80 houses in addition to the ongoing development of 150+ houses would result in what would appear more like a city suburb than a highland village. In addition the infrastructure would simply not cope with this additional volume. There is little evidence of the anticipated improvements promised when the current development at Ness Gap was given permission to build 25% more units than what ad been stated on the local plan. The suggestion that this site may be suitable for a supermarket development beggars belief. The traffic volume on Ness Road with the interst that Chanonry Point provides, the Golf Course, and Caravan and Camping Sites along with the increase that comes as the current development progresses, would suggest that this was an absolute non-starter. I believe this area should be put back on the plan as an area proposed for a Primary School and Playing Field as previously agreed. I can't understand why if some consultation and or assessments are to be undertaken why it was ever removed. As far back as June of this year you have been showing this particular area as an area for housing - as if this is a foregone conclusion. You have very clearly not taken the local residents opinions on board as the conclusion of consultation meeting that took place in Fortrose on 19th June 2013 was unanimous that the proposed Primary School Site should remain and Not be substituted for any other development. I believe large scale development which will put added pressure on traffic volumes using the Kessock Bridge should be limited. As the A96 and A9 South are to receive serious investment over the next 20 or so years I think these areas are/ will be better placed to cope with the subsequent increase in traffic volume that the proposed developments will generate.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Plan should include no references to the 'improvements to the mini-roundabout' as these have already been dealt with in the Planning Permission which asks for minor improvements to the approach road to the existing roundabaout

Representation

This representation is made to avoid confusion as to what the developer is required to provide

Allocated to

Customer Number 00419 Name Mr Donald Lockhart Organisation Albyn Housing Society Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference EV2 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

This is a key site which provides a range of opportunities and encouragement should be given to bring it forward

Allocated to Evanton EV2 Culcairn

Customer Number 00419 Name Mr Donald Lockhart Organisation Albyn Housing Society Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference EV1 Type Change

Comment Changes

The Plan should allow for modest development off Thomas McIver Street

Representation

A small development of amenity housing would be appropriate to complement the provision in the area

Allocated to Evanton EV1 Teandallon East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

An increase in housing unit numbers as per previous comment

Representation

The numbers proposed in the Plan are dependant upon public infrastructure which is likely to limit the delivery of the 18350 homes referred to particularly within the early years of the Plan The council identifying the need for and progressing a masterplanning process for key strategic sites is welcomed however there should be stricter timeframes applied and this approach could be extended to other sites following an appropriate process of decision-making

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

In order to deliver the housing required within the area of the development plan there needs to be an adequate supply of accessible developable land. This is a general issue for all tenure and a particular one for affordable housing. A review of opportunities on allocated land has raised a concern within Registered Social Landlords that there is a shortage of deliverable sites particularly, but not only, within with the City of Inverness. An example of this is sites to the East of Inverness which are non-effective before completion of the major infrastructure which is unlikely within the next 5 years and the Tornagrain site which may not be taken forward in the current economic climate. Experience has taught the affordable sector that a degree of over-programming is desirable to gaurantee delivery. Hence, it would not be unreasonable to increase the number of allocated housing units by 50%. This accords with the governments approach to shovel-ready sites. Delivery of sites is constrained by high cost; landowner intransigence; infrastructure availability and cost; and release of sites generally. The Plan needs to be robust enough to cope with these contraits over the Plan period.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00419 Name Mr Donald Lockhart Organisation Albyn Housing Society Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CM1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Extend the red line site boundary to include the Victoria Park but maintain the same outputs within the larger area and no net loss of amenity area

Representation

To provide the developer with maximum flexibility and deliverability of this key strategic site, consideration should be given to extending the site development boundary to include the Victoria Park.

Allocated to Cromarty CM1 Sandilands

Customer Number 00419 Name Mr Donald Lockhart Organisation Albyn Housing Society Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN5 Type Change

Comment Changes

To facilitate the earlier development of the Seaforth Rd section (in the ownership of an RSL) with access direct from Seaforth Road

Representation

This approach will allow some affordable housing to be developed in a controlled and responsible way which is not reliant on the timescale of the larger development

Allocated to Tain TN5 Knockbreck Road

Customer Number 00908 Name Mr Duncan Bryden Organisation Strathdearn Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph SLA

Reference Drynachen, lochindorb & Dava moors SLA

Type Change

Comment Changes

Extension to Drynachen, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA

Representation

Drynachen, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA We do NOT agree with the Highland Council’s proposal to exclude the area from Ruthven through Balvraid to the summit of Carn nam Baintigherna on the CNP boundary. Reason: We consider the landscape assessment to underestimate the connection this area has with the rest of the SLA, irrespective of the woodland at Glenkirk. It is not logical to exclude this section given it importance to setting of Strathdearn and views from the A9(T) as travellers move south towards the Cairngorms. Recommendation: Our proposal is to establish a new boundary roughly from Meall a Bhreacraibh NH799352 - south south east to Carn nam Baintigherna NH848252. This would include the eastern upper slopes of Carn a Choire Mhoir, 627m.

Allocated to Special Landscape Areas

Customer Number 00908 Name Mr Duncan Bryden Organisation Strathdearn Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.122

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Changes to 1 Types of wildlife surveys 2 Additional land allocation for road junctions 3 Requirement for developer masterplan to include detailed community consultation and duty to integrate with published community development plans

Representation

1. We wish to extend the requirements of developers to undertake ‘wildlife surveys – including reptile, red squirrel and bats, where appropriate’ Reason: Possible unknown wildlife value. 2. We wish to see appropriate recognition given to land allocation requirements at the north end of the village for junction improvements associated with the dualling of the A9 (T) road. Reason: We believe land take for the road will impact upon the effectiveness of the allocations TM11 and possibly TM 10. 3. We wish to see included in reference to developer preparing masterplan/development briefs that there is a requirement for the developer to consult with local communities bodies and address priorities set out in local community development plans. Reason: The community have invested huge time and effort in consulting and preparing community development plans. We believe developers should be required integrate their proposals with community needs and wishes in line with the fundamental purposes of planning legislation.

Allocated to Tomatin General General

Customer Number 00908 Name Mr Duncan Bryden Organisation Strathdearn Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph Hinterland boundary

Reference Inverness Hinterland

Type Change

Comment Changes

Extension to Inverness Hinterland boundary to Slochd Summit

Representation

Hinterland Boundary We welcome the Highland Council recognition of the possibility in the future of extending this boundary up to the Slochd summit. However, we believe this should be done NOW and included in this plan. Reason: Travel time on the A9 (T) south is much faster than on other roads west and north of Inverness where the boundary extends much further. It is not logical to restrict the southern boundary to Dalmagarry as demand for housing in the wider countryside to the south around Tomatin will increase. We wish to see development be encouraged to proceed in Tomatin as we have an acute shortage of affordable and mid-price houses and a need to improve infrastructure. Retaining this boundary north of Tomatin will not help. Recommendation: Extend the boundary down to the Slochd Summit in a corridor fashion similar to that used for the A9 (T) north of the Cromarty Bridge and south west along the A 82 past Drumnadrochit.

Allocated to Hinterland boundary

Customer Number 03858 Name Mr Duncan MacDonald Organisation Blueprint Architecture And Design Limited

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.117

Reference KT2

Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We have been appointed by Mr. & Mrs. Ferguson of Glebe Farm, Kiltarlity to write to you in support of the inclusion of an area of land identified in the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan, which is currently out for consultation. The area referred to is KT2 Glebe Farm South (1.6ha) and is identified to be allocated for housing as part of the future expansion of the Kiltarlity settlement. It was identified as being for future expansion in the previous Local Plan (item 12.6, At Glebe Farm, page 71, Sept 2002) The neighbouring area of land to the North (KT3), which is already allocated for Housing, is now under development. There have been a number of actions taken in anticipation of the allocation of area KT2; • Overhead power cables have been removed on both areas KT3 and KT2, and all the way to the school. • The footpath has now been built, again this takes in parts of both KT3 and KT2. • New service connections for Area KT3 have been designed to also accommodate new houses in Area KT2. The Glebe Farm South, Area KT2, will form a natural and progressive expansion of the settlement, with suitable access being available and the provision of service connections. It will also place new houses within walking distance of the local school, whilst still allowing the settlement to have a defined boundary, thus preventing scattered development. Our client is aware that the next stage would be to look at layouts for Area KT2, including junction improvement, landscaping and initial archaeological assessment. We have suggested this information could be prepared to aid Pre-application Consultation with The Highland Council. We trust that the above information is useful in supporting the inclusion of Area KT2 and it forming part of the new Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.

Allocated to Kiltarlity KT2 Glebe Farm South

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We understand that Kildary and 'Other Settlements' will not have a map showing areas identified for expansion or particular allocations. We request that a map be included within the Local Development Plan for Kildary. We note that the most recent map excluded an area from the settlement boundary to the North East of H1 (as per attachments). This area is owned by our client and they are keen to make it available for future development and we are concerned that its identification for future expansion should be made clear, and that it should be shown within the settlement boundary.

Representation

We have recently obtained 2 separate Planning Permissions (ref: 12/01130/FUL and 13/02587/FUL) for The Scott Family for 24no. house plots on the area identified as H1 (Kildary) on the attached maps. The Scott Family also own the area to the North East, which they want to make available for future expansion of Kildary. If the land with Planning Permission is developed then the area highlighted on Attachment A will provide an progressive expansion of the settlement. Attachment B shows a revised settlement boundary, which would include this area. We believe that not having it defined will make it difficult to secure Planning Permission as it will be deemed 'outwith the settlement boundary'.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Cromarty is the only settlement on the Black Isle which does not have future land allocated for housing which is suitable for self build. Site(s) suitable for self build to the west of the Manse have been put forward by us, and were accepted by the IMFLDP team under the Alternative sites process- but they have not materialised on the proposed plan! We have prepared a Vision document which clearly illustrates our proposals and address relevant issues.

Representation

1. Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by "rounding off" the currently approved boundary provides an easy win as a future proof rational for future growth within Cromarty. 2. Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by "rounding" off the currently approved boundary was supported under the Alternative Sites and Uses consultation put forward in summer 2013 by Highland Council IMFLDP planning and development team 3. If the town/settlement boundary is being amended as per the proposed plan (see items 1-8) our proposal for inclusion of sites H4/C6 to the west of the manse will be greatly disadvantaged, and if the proposed boundary change is approved it will adversely affect potential future growth. 4. The current proposed plan for Cromarty as published makes NO allowance for sites to be developed for self build purposes. The Sandilands site is not suitable for self-build, it is a town centre site where higher densities are expected and encouraged (i.e. no detached self build units) and is a developer led site. 5. The Sandilands site may accommodate 33 dwellings (mix not known), but all recent housing needs surveys suggest in excess of this is required, which is why sites H4/C6 should be included in the new IMFLDP to make provision for increased numbers. 6. Many of the sites identified for housing within the town have all been found to have had constraints in bringing them forward, which is yet another reason why site H4/C6 should be included in the new plan, as there are no issues holding back their zoning for self build plots. 7. There is a well-established self-build tradition in the Highlands and the Black Isle in particular for self build plots. While other settlements in the Black Isle make provision for housing (some of which could be self build) it is NOT reflected anywhere in the Cromarty proposed plan. This puts Cromarty at a great economic DISADVANTAGE compared with other Black Isle settlements. 8. The Sandilands developer offer, while it may offer a range of tenures and different unit types DOES NOT make provision for small self build plots which provide the route and stepping stone for many couples / families onto the property market. Where the conventional mortgage/owner occupier/ shared equity route is not an option, for these couples and families by providing the "sweat equity" into their new self build homes it makes the reality and prospect of a new home both achievable and affordable. 9. For Cromarty to thrive and prosper over the foreseeable future it requires a diverse offer in the future housing market. Our proposed sites H4/C6 to the west of the manse are a distinct offer which is different from, but can work along side the developer offer at Sandilands. 10. Cromarty's distinctive character would not be adversely affected by the inclusion of sites H4/C6. Cromarty's character is achieved via a combination of many elements; including a rich townscape, a fine grained fisher town, handsome former merchants house, more recent housing, civic buildings, historic buildings and landscapes, churches, ruins, harbour, wooded landscape and surrounding environs including the farmland up to the boundary. The addition of a further character area in sites H4/C6 to those already above the escarpment only adds to the diversity of the built and natural environment on offer in Cromarty as it seeks to secure its future in the 21st century. By careful and considered design (as illustrated in our supporting Vision document) sites H4/C6 can become yet another character area which contributes & enhances the uniqueness of Cromarty. 11. Our vision statement for sites H4/C6 gives a flavour of how any visual impact can be mitigated. It seeks to address and responds to concerns people may have about the impact of sites H4/C6. We strongly feel that any anti development sentiment cannot be allowed to go unchallenged and be allowed to unduly influence and dictate the future economic prosperity of Cromarty. Why remove a local opportunity for self builders to achieve home ownership, if any legitimate concerns about bringing a modest parcel of land to the west of the manse forward for development are respectfully addressed and dealt with? 12. There may be a visual perception of an attractive woodland background above the escarpment to the south west of Denny road, when viewed from Marine Terrace and elsewhere within the town, but it is a visual amenity only - there is no public access to it - it is all private woodland forming part of the manse and others gardens. 13. Our sites H4/C6 would contribute to the enhancement of the woodland background above the escarpment, by a tree-planting regime both around the individual plots and the public spaces within the wider site. It would also become ACCESSIBLE PUBLIC REALM unlike the current wooded backdrop adjacent to our proposed sites. 14. Our sites H4/C6 would become an additional ACCESSIBLE green space within Cromarty adding to and enhancing the existing mature tree-lined backdrop to the town. 15. Our sites H4/C6 to the south west of the manse would also contribute to the public realm of Cromarty by providing safe, attractive green routes, both by linking the town to the wider footpath network and creating additional public footpaths of which there is currently little in the SW environs of Cromarty. 16. Our proposal for inclusion of

sites to the west of the manse includes for the footpath network around Cromarty to be enhanced and extended. For example the access to Lady Walk to the south of the gatehouse to Cromarty House is currently via the A832. We could link up with Lady Walk by creating a new off road path running parallel to the A832. 17. Similarly we would explore the option of creating a new footpath to the centre via the escarpment, exiting onto the Denny road pavement 18. We will also consider & explore the feasibility of footpath widening improvements to Denny road. 19. Sites H4/C6 will provide for car usage but will not be dominated by it. We cannot dictate peoples habits re usage of the motor car. We can provide an alternative option to the car, by making safe, attractive, accessible pedestrian/cycle routes to the services in the centre of Cromarty. 20. Our proposed site H4/C6 is well within the current accepted norms & guidelines for walking to a shop and other services i.e. Site H4/C6 is within 400m of the centre. 21. Our proposal for inclusion of sites to the west of the manse with an advanced tree planting regime in place, would in the fullness of time, be visually similar to the current settlement boundary of mature trees running along side the manse boundary. Therefore the dominant characteristic on approach to Cromarty along the A832, would be the same as at present - a tree lined boundary abutting farmland 22. There would be some loss of prime agricultural land which we feel is neither a relevant factor nor a material consideration. The development site proposed is small and is in the ownership of a local farming family. If required (and if any objectors are really that concerned about the loss of agricultural land!) more intensive farming production methods could compensate for any loss of land. 23. Both sites H4 & C6 would be subject to current planning legislation with the requisite amount of land given over to affordable/social housing pro rata based on the number of units consented. 24. In response to some of the concerns raised: There is already both historical precedent (Manse/Rosenberg) and recent development precedent (Urquhart Court, Greenwood) for development beyond the escarpment, we cannot wind the clock back – but we can create a contextual response to the setting (see vision statement etc). 25. In response to some of the concerns raised: Sites H4/C6 have been put forward for inclusion ahead of other sites because they are remote from any important or listed building. (e.g. war memorial, Gaelic chapel) 26. In response to some of the concerns raised: Sites H4/C6 were put forward ahead of other sites because they are outside the Cromarty House Designed Landscape. Summary From the call for sites procedure in 2010, we have been open about our intention to make some of the land Mr McBean owns adjacent to Cromarty available for local families to self build their own houses. While we recognise that the planning system cannot legislate for who builds there once consent is given, it is and always has been Mr McBeans stated intention that locals have preference. Initially we put forward some 7 sites for consideration under the call for sites procedure with the intention that through due process of dialogue and consultation we would eventually settle on 1 or 2 sites most suitable for self build housing. In summer 2013 we were given the impression by the IMFLDP team that sites H4 /C6 were considered the most suitable sites, under the preferred Alternative sites route which is why on release of this Proposed plan there is both surprise and disappointment that neither of the sites were included. We have a strong vision for these sites, and with careful consideration of the constraints and opportunities these sites can enhance and complement the housing offer in Cromarty. (see separate supporting Vision document which we submit as part of this consultation process). We will therefore have on public record a document which is much more than a plan showing an area zoned for housing. Our vision shows a real commitment to addressing the issues that a development may have on the historic character of Cromarty. Many of these issues are about Visual Impact. While not prescriptive, our Vision gives a flavour of Mr McBeans commitment to bringing land forward for self-build to Cromarty: • Commitment to design quality in the public realm • The investment in advanced structural landscaping infrastructure • Boundary conditions sympathetic to the historic environment • Footpath connectivity, and improvement of existing footpaths. • How the development can be accessed and integrated in an attractive manner. • How there is minimal visual impact on the existing townscape of Cromarty. • How concerns re access/visual impact can be addressed. • How structural landscaping can assist integration with the existing mature boundary. • How the existing historic landscape & buildings are visually protected.

Allocated to	Cromarty	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reinstate boundary line of settlement to correct location and reinstate Cromarty site NS59 into proposed plan

Representation

why C6 is proposed to be removed when it was put forward by someone else in the Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses. In response to some of the statements in the Proposed Plan: - "Narrow footpath provision on Denny Road" The road is 6m wide and the footpath 940mm - there is enough room to widen the footpath if necessary. "Impact on tourism" The Congregational Board of the Church Of Scotland Parish Cromarty considers that houses west of the of the settlement boundary rather than in Cromarty inner green spaces will help to sustain tourism. "Concern about taking development beyond the escarpment" I think this comes from Mr. Tilbrook's comments on Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses:- "Cromarty is almost entirely contained within the lower level raised beach area and this natural boundary gives it much of its character. It would be a pity to breach this by identifying further development land on the top of the brae". Was this his opinion a few years ago before he built his house on top of the brae? Mr. Tilbrook has of course recently built his own house within Rosenberg garden at the top of the brae. If H4 were approved for housing we would ensure that any houses would be built back from the edge of the escarpment and not visible from the town, unlike Mr. Tilbrook's. Fortrose, Avoch and North Kessock have all been allowed to expand above the raised beach level in recent years – no explanation has been given as to why Cromarty should be the exception. "One respondent considers that there is a need to focus on the town itself and realise opportunities available within it (considering that some have been dismissed too readily) The various small gap sites and the larger area at High Street were the subject of rigorous examination through a previous Local Plan exercise. Almost all gap sites in Cromarty have been built upon during the previous local plan, and there is little scope for further development. The same respondent also states "Consideration should also be given to potential sea level sites to the East and West of Cromarty." There is almost no land near sea level to the West of the town. The land to the East is not currently in this plan, and there has been no indication that the landowner would be prepared to make it available. I don't think it would be a good idea to build near sea level with the risk of flooding! On 05/12/13 the Shore Road was closed with about 1.5m of sea water on it. "Access/remoteness to town" There are existing paths on the Council owned land behind Townlands Park which are frequently used and these could be enhanced or made into a pavement which would make the walkable distance to amenities less than that of some of the houses at the east end of Cromarty and encourage people not to use their car and improve the environmental footprint. Boundary alteration I cannot understand why the settlement boundary line can be proposed to be changed without any consultation or explanation. It was never mentioned in any documents made available to the public, or in the letter to local residents. Who asked for this change to take place? And who sanctioned it? Why has it been changed to not include the two houses at Rosenberg (one recently built), the Manse and the four houses under construction on Denny Road? Why is the graveyard not included in the proposed change? I would insist that a full explanation be given and the boundary line changed back to that of the original. The maps contained in Annex1 and 2 of this report show the differences between the original and altered boundary lines. I wish to work closely with the council and explore the possibility of making land available for a future graveyard and possibly for allotments, as the landowner, Major Phipps has told the Cromarty Allotments Society he is no longer prepared to allow allotments on CM3. There are access difficulties for Albyn Housing Association land at CM1. At present the vehicle access is intended to join the Denny at the top of the park, halfway down a steep hill. This is potentially dangerous and will require traffic calming measures to reduce the speed of downhill traffic. If H4 and C6 were to be given the go ahead, access could be via a new mini roundabout built to fit in with the Cromarty House gate lodge entrance. This would have the effect of slowing traffic on its approach to the Denny Road. Furthermore, I find it odd that 130 houses are going to be built in Fortrose & Rosemarkie with over 100 objectors and all I want to make available is about 10 sites to help Cromarty prosper for the future and it seems 2 objectors have managed to remove site C6 from The Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses. One objector has recently built a house on the hill near where I want to develop and the other objector thinks it's a good idea to build houses at sea level. The projected requirement indicated in the Draft Local Plan for all types of houses over the next 15 years is for 30 to 40 new dwellings link at- <http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/14391186-64AD-4ED2-A12F-A32EF1B159D1/0/SandilandsCromartyDevelopmentBrief.pdf>. The Albyn Housing development allows for 33 new dwellings (as described in recent correspondence between The Highland Council and Cromarty residents near the proposed Albyn development). My development proposal would fulfill the remainder of this requirement and allow for further development given that the requirements in the Draft Local Plan are now 10 years old and will need to be revised in 2018. Cromarty has continued to expand and prosper throughout the decades. As my land lies immediately adjacent to the town – it would seem only natural that further development would occur here to support a thriving town in need of expansion in conjunction with the current

Albyn development (CM1).

Allocated to Cromarty

General

General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We wish to see the inclusion of land zoned for self build housing to the west of the manse, previously referred to as Site H4 and site C6 in the Alternative sites plan and earlier IMFLDP plan iterations We wish to see the settlement boundary changed to reflect the true nature of Cromarty from that shown on page 134,as: a) it is not a true representation of the settlement b) this change has not been put forward in any earlier consultations and plan iterations

Representation

Cromarty / Settlement boundary/ Inclusion of sites H4/C6 Response to Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. December 2013 1.The boundary as shown on the current proposed plan(P134) has been changed out of all recognition from the previous local plan settlement boundary. 2.There is NO explanation anywhere in the documentation as to why this is being proposed. 3.The redrawn boundary if correct will greatly affect the prospects for the future economic vitality of this Historic town, as there is only limited available vacant space within the town for future growth. 4.We note that much of the built form above the escarpment has been taken out of the boundary shown on the proposed plan.(p134) There is no written reference to, or justification of this potential significant change in the proposed plan. 5.Urquhart Court in the current proposed plan document is now shown isolated in relation to the rest of Cromarty. This proposed plan change gives a totally FALSE impression of the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary already has a clear rational and includes the built forms of the Manse, Rosenberg, Greenwood and Urquhart Court within the boundary, as well as to the east; the Gaelic chapel /cemetery etc. 6. Urquhart Court as a lozenge shaped island on the partially wooded escarpment is inconsistent and alien to the previous settlement boundary. 7.Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by “rounding off” the currently approved boundary provides an easy win as a future proof rational for future growth within Cromarty. 8.Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by “rounding” off the currently approved boundary was supported under the Alternative Sites and Uses consultation put forward in summer 2013 by Highland Council IMFLDP planning and development team 9.If the town/settlement boundary is being amended as per the proposed plan (see items 1-8) our proposal for inclusion of sites H4/C6 to the west of the manse will be greatly disadvantaged, and if the proposed boundary change is approved it will adversely affect potential future growth. 10.The current proposed plan for Cromarty as published makes NO allowance for sites to be developed for self build purposes. The Sandilands site is not suitable for self-build, it is a town centre site where higher densities are expected and encouraged (i.e. no detached self build units) and is a developer led site. 11.The Sandilands site may accommodate 33 dwellings (mix not known), but all recent housing needs surveys suggest in excess of this is required, which is why sites H4/C6 should be included in the new IMFLDP to make provision for increased numbers. 12.Many of the sites identified for housing within the town have all been found to have had constraints in bringing them forward, which is yet another reason why site H4/C6 should be included in the new plan, as there are no issues holding back their zoning for self build plots. 13.There is a well-established self-build tradition in the Highlands and the Black Isle in particular for self build plots. While other settlements in the Black Isle make provision for housing (some of which could be self build) it is NOT reflected anywhere in the Cromarty proposed plan. This puts Cromarty at a great economic DISADVANTAGE compared with other Black Isle settlements. 14.The Sandilands developer offer, while it may offer a range of tenures and different unit types DOES NOT make provision for small self build plots which provide the route and stepping stone for many couples / families onto the property market. Where the conventional mortgage/owner occupier/ shared equity route is not an option, for these couples and families by providing the “sweat equity” into their new self build homes it makes the reality and prospect of a new home both achievable and affordable. 15.For Cromarty to thrive and prosper over the foreseeable future it requires a diverse offer in the future housing market. Our proposed sites H4/C6 to the west of the manse are a distinct offer which is different from, but can work along side the developer offer at Sandilands. 16.Cromarty’s distinctive character would not be adversely affected by the inclusion of sites H4/C6. Cromarty’s character is achieved via a combination of many elements; including a rich townscape, a fine grained fisher town, handsome former merchants house, more recent housing, civic buildings, historic buildings and landscapes, churches, ruins, harbour, wooded landscape and surrounding environs including the farmland up to the boundary. The addition of a further character area in sites H4/C6 to those already above the escarpment only adds to the diversity of the built and natural environment on offer in Cromarty as it seeks to secure its future in the 21st century. By careful and considered design (as illustrated in our supporting Vision document) sites H4/C6 can become yet another character area which contributes & enhances the uniqueness of Cromarty. 17.Our vision statement for sites H4/C6 gives a flavour of how any visual impact can be mitigated. It seeks to address and responds to concerns people may have about the impact of sites H4/C6. We strongly feel that any anti development sentiment cannot be allowed to go unchallenged and be allowed to unduly influence and dictate the future

economic prosperity of Cromarty. Why remove a local opportunity for self builders to achieve home ownership, if any legitimate concerns about bringing a modest parcel of land to the west of the manse forward for development are respectfully addressed and dealt with? 18. There may be a visual perception of an attractive woodland background above the escarpment to the south west of Denny road, when viewed from Marine Terrace and elsewhere within the town, but it is a visual amenity only - there is no public access to it - it is all private woodland forming part of the manse and others gardens. 19. Our sites H4/C6 would contribute to the enhancement of the woodland background above the escarpment, by a tree-planting regime both around the individual plots and the public spaces within the wider site. It would also become ACCESSIBLE PUBLIC REALM unlike the current wooded backdrop adjacent to our proposed sites. 20. Our sites H4/C6 would become an additional ACCESSIBLE green space within Cromarty adding to and enhancing the existing mature tree-lined backdrop to the town. 21. Our sites H4/C6 to the south west of the manse would also contribute to the public realm of Cromarty by providing safe, attractive green routes, both by linking the town to the wider footpath network and creating additional public footpaths of which there is currently little in the SW environs of Cromarty. 22. Our proposal for inclusion of sites to the west of the manse includes for the footpath network around Cromarty to be enhanced and extended. For example the access to Lady Walk to the south of the gatehouse to Cromarty House is currently via the A832. We could link up with Lady Walk by creating a new off road path running parallel to the A832. 23. Similarly we would explore the option of creating a new footpath to the centre via the escarpment, exiting onto the Denny road pavement. 24. We will also consider & explore the feasibility of footpath widening improvements to Denny road. 25. Sites H4/C6 will provide for car usage but will not be dominated by it. We cannot dictate peoples habits re usage of the motor car. We can provide an alternative option to the car, by making safe, attractive, accessible pedestrian/cycle routes to the services in the centre of Cromarty. 26. Our proposed site H4/C6 is well within the current accepted norms & guidelines for walking to a shop and other services i.e. Site H4/C6 is within 400m of the centre. 27. Our proposal for inclusion of sites to the west of the manse with an advanced tree planting regime in place, would in the fullness of time, be visually similar to the current settlement boundary of mature trees running along side the manse boundary. Therefore the dominant characteristic on approach to Cromarty along the A832, would be the same as at present - a tree lined boundary abutting farmland. 28. There would be some loss of prime agricultural land which we feel is neither a relevant factor nor a material consideration. The development site proposed is small and is in the ownership of a local farming family. If required (and if any objectors are really that concerned about the loss of agricultural land!) more intensive farming production methods could compensate for any loss of land. 29. Both sites H4 & C6 would be subject to current planning legislation with the requisite amount of land given over to affordable/social housing pro rata based on the number of units consented. 30. In response to some of the concerns raised: There is already both historical precedent (Manse/Rosenberg) and recent development precedent (Urquhart Court, Greenwood) for development beyond the escarpment, we cannot wind the clock back – but we can create a contextual response to the setting (see vision statement etc). 31. In response to some of the concerns raised: Sites H4/C6 have been put forward for inclusion ahead of other sites because they are remote from any important or listed building. (e.g. war memorial, Gaelic chapel) 32. In response to some of the concerns raised: Sites H4/C6 were put forward ahead of other sites because they are outside the Cromarty House Designed Landscape. Summary From the call for sites procedure in 2010, we have been open about our intention to make some of the land Mr McBean owns adjacent to Cromarty available for local families to self build their own houses. While we recognise that the planning system cannot legislate for who builds there once consent is given, it is and always has been Mr McBeans stated intention that locals have preference. Initially we put forward some 7 sites for consideration under the call for sites procedure with the intention that through due process of dialogue and consultation we would eventually settle on 1 or 2 sites most suitable for self build housing. In summer 2013 we were given the impression by the IMFLDP team that sites H4 /C6 were considered the most suitable sites, under the preferred Alternative sites route which is why on release of this Proposed plan there is both surprise and disappointment that neither of the sites were included. We have a strong vision for these sites, and with careful consideration of the constraints and opportunities these sites can enhance and complement the housing offer in Cromarty. (see separate supporting Vision document which we submit as part of this consultation process). We will therefore have on public record a document which is much more than a plan showing an area zoned for housing. Our vision shows a real commitment to addressing the issues that a development may have on the historic character of Cromarty. Many of these issues are about Visual Impact. While not prescriptive, our Vision gives a flavour of Mr McBeans commitment to bringing land forward for self-build to Cromarty: •Commitment to design quality in the public realm •The investment in advanced structural landscaping infrastructure • Boundary conditions sympathetic to the historic environment • Footpath connectivity, and improvement of existing footpaths. •How the development can be accessed and integrated in an attractive manner. •How there is minimal visual impact on the existing townscape of Cromarty. •How concerns re access/visual impact can be addressed. •How structural landscaping can assist integration with the existing mature boundary. •How the existing historic landscape & buildings are visually protected.

Allocated to	Cromarty	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

This objection is to the omission of the allocation of land south and east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose for mixed use including retail, business/community and tourist use. Add "Mixed Use Site: south/east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose Area 1.8 ha. Uses: Retail, Business/Community and Tourism Requirements: Masterplan" Proposals Map adjusted accordingly, as attached

Representation

The MIR identifies the site as mixed use non-preferred. The Proposed Plan should allocate the land for mixed uses ie. commercial, tourist and community uses for the following reasons.

Principles

Location

1. The site is limited to 1.8 ha. It is a small self contained discrete landholding that is not part of an agricultural unit or important to the viability of one. It presents no apparent physical or heritage constraints, is serviceable by existing infrastructure and outwith the Area of Great Landscape Value. The site lies within a building line consistent with existing development and infrastructure, and the allocations in the development plan for expansion of Fortrose.
2. The site is located at the east entry point to Fortrose. It sits well with the structure and shape of the village and with infrastructure and service networks. It is extremely accessible, positioned - in the context of the village - on the axis of two important routes, High Street and Ness Road and within comfortable walk-able distance of Fortrose (well within 400m to most of the community) and to Rosemarkie.
3. That position and accessibility gives a strong association and potential for interaction with local shops/businesses on the Main Street and leisure/recreation and heritage attractions located towards the waterfront, in particular the heritage interest of the inner Moray Firth. The site is therefore ideally placed - and there is no alternative location that is comparable - for the development of important community, business and tourism facilities.

Uses

4. Substantial local benefits will arise from the development of a mixed-use proposal incorporating a "package" of commercial, community and visitor facilities. A new village scale supermarket will offer scope to relocate the existing store, increase the capacity for local shopping, improve parking and servicing and help decongest the High Street enabling public safety improvements. An integrated car park will serve all uses, providing additional capacity close to the Main Street.
5. Further small shops, business/office units will be continue to help regenerate Fortrose as new local needs arise; offer potential for new community facilities or the option to relocate existing local services.
6. A visitor centre would enhance the Black Isle as a prestigious heritage resource (themed on the dolphin/Inner Moray Firth interest) and based on a state-of-the-art interpretive

information/education centre, enabling efficient management of seasonal congestion pressures - particularly in the Ness area and possibly incorporating a local park-n'-ride initiative - and an enhanced visitor experience.

7. The "package" will improve local prosperity, employment and the role and function of Fortrose as a service and tourist centre; and will respond positively to a strategic heritage opportunity with spin-off benefits to the local economy. The site is well located to the A832 - the main Black Isle distributor - and sufficiently close to the High Street to complement and strengthen the local business base.

8. The proposed commercial and community elements (retail, small shops/offices, businesses) will provide greater choice of work and amenities within walking distance. A greater capacity for local services would encourage greater patronage by local people and is more likely to improve (healthy) travel patterns.

Proposal

9. The proposal has three components: a convenience store to create a 6,000 sq ft shop, a suite of small commercial/business units (also 6,000 sq ft) and a visitor centre. The scale of buildings will be appropriate to the village; it will provide significant new parking also close enough to the High Street to contribute to relieving congestion. The following points support the proposal.

1. The existing store is too small, under-shopped and causes congestion on Main Street through parking and servicing. As a result spending locally is constrained and there is an opportunity to benefit other local businesses by discouraging shopping trips to Inverness (and the traffic implications for the village that associate with that pattern of custom). The proposal would double the size of the store, would carry a larger range of products and offer a service better related to the size of the catchment.

2. There is a lack of provision for economic development and jobs. This site presents an opportunity for economic development and local services for a compatible mix of uses. It could provide for local offices, businesses, health care or social facilities. These are all valuable components of a growing, sustainable service centre.

3. Fortrose is one of the primary Dolphin watching locations in the UK presently estimated to attract some 140,000 visitors per annum. Existing interpretive facilities are rudimentary; there are conflicts with visitors passing through the golf course. The opportunity exists to create a state-of-the-art visitor centre at an internationally important site, manage visitor pressures and enhance enjoyment of the heritage. That part of the local economy is directly related to its heritage.

10. The proposal responds to existing deficiencies and opportunities to enhance the role of Fortrose as a local service and tourist centre and create additional local jobs. It sits extremely well in that regard with the HwLDP priorities for sustainable communities namely, enhanced services, local jobs, support for the economy, promoting tourism and holding visitors, and managing the heritage.

Compatibility

11. Careful consideration of the following factors and the MIR "significant cons", would further confirm the case for allocation of the land as proposed.

1. it does not create any precedent for further development between Rosemarkie and Fortrose. The site is self contained by ownership, it could be designed to create a "stop" to the village, it does not facilitate further development east of Fortrose in any sense. The extent to which that requires to be discouraged is a matter for policy, the plan led system

and the Council's response to representations. The proposal is specifically for economic development/community uses. It creates no precedent for housing or any other development. The line of building that marks the extent of development east of Fortrose (in principal views north from the Chanonry direction) indicates - in visual and landscape impact terms - that the site would "read" with the village edge, that it would not breach the building line that marks the extent of Fortrose to the east and that it would not impose on the open character of that land towards Fortrose, nor the potential indicated in the existing local plan for recreational use of that land.

2. it would not adversely affect prime land. Scottish Planning Policy 2010 indicates that development of prime land is not discouraged as part of the settlement strategy. The site is not part of an existing farm unit. The locational prerequisites for retail and leisure development, the priority to be given to sustaining the role of Fortrose as a sustainable key centre and the very limited encroachment into that land are strong reasons to allow essential economic and community uses.

3. it would not have an adverse impact on existing shops. At the scale proposed a new convenience store could not support specialist butcher and bakery outlets. It would complement existing businesses and be sufficiently close to the High Street to encourage interaction. The same concerns were raised in Fortrose when the existing co-op opened. That retained custom within the village and has contributed to sustaining the present range of shops and businesses. The experience of Fortrose is that a sustainable convenience store is part of sustaining the Main Street. The development of a visitor centre may be an opportunity for local business investment.

4. it need not exacerbate traffic problems: it may improve local traffic circumstances. Any relocation of an existing store will relieve congestion and need not - at the scale proposed - create any significant increase in traffic. This would reasonably be the case also with any new local business accommodation to be created. The proposal may provide an alternative to Inverness to other Black Isle communities and reduce journeys through Fortrose to Inverness. It is within active travel distance of the local resident population. The heritage attractions of the Inner Moray Firth are understood to presently attract 140,000 visitors per annum to Fortrose and that is projected to increase whether or not a visitor centre is established. Related traffic is therefore already generated, irrespective of any proposal to develop a visitor centre. The impact of the proposal in traffic terms should not be overstated; it may essentially be neutral. Any proposal will require to demonstrate by Transport Assessment that the scale of any development is able to be serviced adequately in relation to the functioning of the village and its road network, including any mitigations that might be required, taking into account changes in customer behaviour and choice in transport modes. The capability of the transport network and the effects of the proposal on the village is not a policy matter; but for critical assessment and consideration of evidence by Transport Assessment. That would be a prerequisite of any planning application.

Consultation

12. The proponents of the proposal have carried out a non-statutory public engagement with local people to explain the proposal (May 2012). This is estimated to have been attended by more than 150 people; 150 questionnaire/comments leaflets were taken away, 26 were returned. In broad terms these represent a balance of support and opposing views. It is intended to continue to work closely with the community in developing the proposal.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Clarify the full extent of transport improvements required or cross reference to the HwLDP. Alternatively, clarify that these are matters that will be covered by the development brief/framework plan to be prepared in the Summer of 2014. 2. The Plan should explain: (a) how the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar can be determined; (b) what a recreation access management plan is; and (c) why mitigation works are required in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail particularly for land allocations more distant from the Coastal Trail.

Representation

Our client, Fraser Hutcheson, owns land at Cradlehall Farm forming part of IN82 and welcomes the continued support for development through the Proposed Plan. However, despite successive submissions to each stage of the IMFLDP we yet again have cause to raise concerns about the servicing and phasing of the development relative to the Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) provisions and the lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network in the area. The reference in the draft Schedule 4 response to our comments on the MIR about dependency upon others for transport improvements was all too easily dismissed as being “noted” and then by stating that this “is a reality given the site’s location and need for connectivity to local and strategic road networks.” The response goes on to say that “there is no quantitative need to accelerate the supply of housing land within or close to the City. Earlier phased proposals would have to be justified by developer funded transport assessment and not be prejudicial to sensible future transport improvement options.” We also note from the Action Plan that the Council “intends to prepare and subsequently adopt as Supplementary Guidance a development brief/framework plan to address land use and transport issues for the site” with an indicative timescale for this of Summer 2014. The first point we make about all of this is that by amalgamating our client’s land with additional areas and then referring to the intention to prepare a development brief/framework plan, possibly in the Summer of 2014, it is still not clear what the detailed infrastructure requirements are, how these will open up his land and what the timescale for development is. The HwLDP indicates our client’s land for residential in Phase 2 with a timescale of 2016 to 2021. Now it has been lumped together with a greater amount of other land at Ashton Farm and allocated for Mixed Use. The Ashton land is Phase 4 in the HwLDP and post 2031. With all the relevant requirements to be met and lack of clarity over access, for example, we see little prospect of its development within the next 20 years. This is not what our client expected from the outset of the A96 Corridor Framework Plan and then the HwLDP when he agreed that his land be included. The list of transport provisions in the HwLDP relating to the development of the East Inverness area is extensive and as previously asserted our client is concerned that most of these provisions/ requirements will depend on the action of others. The Proposed Plan does now confirm that the Council will “definitely” require a distributor road connection between the rear of the Inverness Retail Park and Barn Church Road. However, it is not clear if this land is still East Link dependent, as indicated in response to our Main Issues Report (MIR) submission, or if indeed Transport Scotland will commit to this. The HwLDP indicates that development of the later phases of East Inverness have to contribute towards the A9-A96 (East) Link road. This now suggests that with our client’s land (Phase 2 in the HwLDP) being amalgamated with Phase 4 land at Ashton Farm, it will now be East Link dependent. This undoubtedly adds to the confusion but also suggests the development timescale as being much further into the future. As we have stated in previous submissions it is vital that this opportunity is not land-locked or hindered by the uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. Reluctantly, it appears that we shall have to wait until the development brief/framework plan is prepared next summer for the Council to provide the clear development guidance, rather than through the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. This will mean further participation at the expense of our client to seek clarification he has been looking for since 2006 and represent his interests. Finally, we seek clarification about the meaning of the part of the “Requirements” listed under this allocation. In particular we ask the following: - (a) How can the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar be determined? (b) What is a “recreation access management plan”? (c) Why would mitigation works in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail be required for the development of this allocation?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

This objection is to the omission of the allocation of land south and east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose for mixed use including retail, business/community and tourist use. Add "Mixed Use Site: south/east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose Area 1.8 ha. Uses: Retail, Business/Community and Tourism Requirements: Masterplan" Proposals Map adjusted accordingly, as attached

Representation

This objection is to the omission of the allocation of land south and east of A832/Ness Road, Fortrose for mixed use including retail, business/community and tourist use. Location/Site 1.The site extends to 1.8 ha. It comprises a small self-contained landholding ie. the first field only east of Ness Road, it is not prime land, not an agricultural unit and not attached to any other land in the same ownership. The site is outwith the Conservation Area and Special Landscape Area with no apparent physical or heritage constraints, it sits well with the structure and shape of the "town" and with existing infrastructure including Ness Road. The precedent of development east of Ness Road is established. 2.The site is located at the intersection of the A832/Ness Road at the entry point to Fortrose; it therefore associates - and enjoys inter-visibility - with, the High Street and shops and businesses located there; and with the Inner Moray Firth one of the Highlands primary wildlife attractions. It is highly accessible, at the axis of two important routes and within comfortable walking distance, well within 400m of most of the community. The A832 is the main Black Isle distributor; Ness Road links established leisure/recreational facilities - golf, caravan/camping, wildlife viewing - out towards Chanonry Point, an important amenity. 3.The site - by its location, form and orientation - is therefore a natural and logical position in which to locate uses that - for policy, functional or viability reasons - depend on strength of association with strategic transport routes, the established commercial thoroughfare of the "town" and the areas natural heritage. These are both the purpose and prerequisites of the proposal; they are the factors that underpin the right placement of development and demonstrate a "sense of place". They are the underpinnings moreover, of sustainable development. 4.Fortrose is the Black Isle's primary service, employment and tourist centre, given status by the PLDP as the areas only "town". There is no other location in Fortrose or in the Black Isle that offers anything like comparable locational advantage or in any other respect is better suited to the retail, business-community and visitor uses proposed - whether individually or in any configuration/combination. The proposal would serve the local economy, local employment and local service needs. It is the right location for those activities in a strategic and site planning sense. Proposal 5.The proposal comprises: a convenience store (6,000 sq. ft./570m²) as an essential replacement of the existing Co-op store; small retail/business/community units, and a visitor centre; parking for approximately 100 cars and 4 coaches/mini-buses; service access from the A832 and public/customer access from Ness Road. 6.That composition is agreed in principle with the Council (TECS) for its layout, composition and capacity, notwithstanding Transport Assessment. The configuration of the site lends naturally to positioning a convenience store to the north, business-community use in the centre and visitor facilities towards the south. The proposal derives from the following: 7.The existing co-op store is too small, extremely busy and limited by its size in the service it is able to provide. Spending locally is constrained; other businesses could benefit by discouraging trips to Inverness, holding local custom and lessening through-traffic. The proposal would double the size of the store and offer a service better related to the size of the catchment. The Co-op wish to extend, relocate and continue to operate from Fortrose. 8.There is a lack of provision - in a forward plan (PLDP) - for reconfiguring/expanding the "town's" business and service base, and thus local jobs and economic investment. As part of a compatible mix of uses, potential exists for local offices, a craft business, a further shop, health-care/surgery or social facilities. Some existing services operate from restricted premises, others might establish if land/accommodation were available; these are all valuable services in a growing, sustainable service centre. 9.Fortrose is a honey-pot of visitor activity, one of the UK's pre-eminent dolphin-watching locations. This is estimated to draw some 140,000 visitors per annum to the Inner Moray Firth. Interpretive facilities are rudimentary. A state-of-the-art visitor centre would contribute to the regional economy, tap into one of its most intrinsic assets and interpret the heritage, consistent with the ethos of the national conservation agencies. It could help manage local conflict with established leisure activities. 10.The proposal responds to existing deficiencies and potential to enhance the role of Fortrose, would create jobs, bolster the economy, hold custom, enhance services and manage the heritage. Those are the hallmarks of sustainability, but they are only attainable if the development plan makes the right allocation of land, for the right uses in the right place. Public Response 11.A masterplan has been in preparation since May 2012. Non-statutory public engagement (exhibition/drop-in session) sought the involvement of local people at the outset. More than 150 people attended, 150 questionnaire/comments leaflets were taken away and 26 were returned, filled-in. Given subsequent pro-forma/petition-type responses to the MIR, the proponents are entitled to place that in perspective. 12.In view of the Schedule 4 and MIR responses,

this objection responds to the following. Fortrose Gap Allocation 13. Fundamentally, the planning authority has not grasped the potential for a mixed-use development of economic activities nor the economies of scale and community benefits that would derive from promoting such uses at one location. It does not (FR2) actually identify land at all - but leaves open to educational review - a faint possibility of either business, office, tourism or retail (accompanying housing) if land was to become available ie., one but not a wider combination of the type of economic development activities promoted at the objection site. 14. Notwithstanding that, in view of the urgency of the existing national convenience store operator for a new site for expansion of a vital public service, that is a completely unacceptable response and no way whatsoever, to forward plan, let alone in a 5-year timescale. In any event, responses to the MIR would indicate that there is no support for a convenience store at "Ness Gap". The fact is, for land (FR2) to be allocated for that purpose, it should be available; and it is not available. 15. Notwithstanding, Ness Gap is not favoured because of its proximity to existing and future residential occupiers; the potential for conflict from hours of operation, servicing and customer traffic, noise and other behavioural nuisance; and if development were to combine mixed community/business/visitor uses, public safety risk from bringing extraneous traffic, coaches and shuttle services within a residential area. Sequential Approach 16. The Co-op has lodged representations that indicate the Ness Gap allocation would not meet its expectations for expansion; and that the objection site would be a suitable site. The objection site is closer to the centre by more than two thirds distance; it is linked directly, would better offer additional parking capacity, is closer to public transport, would meet operational and viability prerequisites, and would satisfy national policy. That is the essence of the declared interest by the Co-op. No other location in Fortrose is better placed to the High Street/centre than the objection site. The planning authority ought to have acknowledged that in the interests of national policy and sustainable development. 17. As national policy the sequential approach should inform the PLDP. The Ness Gap allocation is not as the planning authority claim (MIR) "edge of centre" since it does not adjoin the centre, nor is it inter-visible with the centre, or offer any functional or visual link with the centre; it is comparatively remote from the centre. If the nearest commercial building is taken to be the centre, it is 510m and 590m distant by the two shortest routes; whereas the objection site is 225m; or put differently, the Ness Gap allocation exceeds the straight line walking distance (400m) benchmark for encouraging "active travel". 18. As regards proximity to public transport, the Ness Gap allocation is 310m from a bus stop, whereas the objection site is 100m from two. In any reasonable judgement the Ness Gap allocation would fall behind the objection site in the "sequential approach", but the objection site at a strategic and as a pivotal location, is far better suited - for any and all of the above reasons - to a wider range of compatible mixed uses. 19. It is established unequivocally by the response of the operator that there is spare capacity for retailing. Whatever concern the planning authority might have for viability and vitality, its response is to identify a site (FR2) that is further from the centre, unavailable and doubtful of being so, conflicting with residential amenity and that the public does not favour. That response is obstructing not facilitating of sustainable economic development. Land Excambion 20. Any development of the George V playing field would (1) remove an established amenity that is part of the history of Fortrose and its status as a Royal Burgh; and (2) not be compliant with the policy 75 of the Highland wide Local Development Plan (and the principles of the Green Network Supplementary Guidance) which seeks first and foremost to safeguard established open spaces. In a community that is moved by the value it places on open land, the planning authority's proposition is fanciful. 21. As regards the sequential approach, development of George V playing field would bring a convenience store no closer to the High Street, it would not be inter-visible with the High Street, it would be less visible from the A832; and each of these factors would make development less marketable and thus less viable; but in addition, it would bring relatively intensive uses closer to conflict with residential amenity. Notwithstanding these factors, there can be no reasonable expectation that a convenience store could underwrite the costs of relocating a playing field (with its parking and drainage infrastructure), but in any event the objection site would be too narrow to provide a comparable full-size pitch with reasonable surroundings. Coalescence 22. The objection site presents no risk to coalescence of Fortrose-Rosemarkie and would not confuse their identities. If the site were developed the distance to Rosemarkie would be 440m; and at present it is 375m in (other) places. That is not coalescence but the "clear visual and physical break" or "strategic gap" the PLDP seeks. Furthermore, it would not breach the line of building (north to south) that defines the existing limits of Fortrose to the east. Development of the site would bring the communities no closer than they presently are. Traffic 23. The objection site need not exacerbate traffic problems: it may improve local circumstances. Neither the relocation of the Co-op or new local business need create any significant increase in traffic. The proposal may provide an alternative to Inverness to other Black Isle communities and reduce journeys through Fortrose to Inverness. The visitor attractions generate significant traffic already, and it would not be unreasonable that numbers would increase whether or not a visitor centre is established. The impact of the proposal in traffic terms should not be overstated; that would be indicated in the Transport Statement by Waterman T&DLtd attached. Any proposal will require to demonstrate that the scale of development is consistent with the capacity of the road network and safety. This is for evidence by Transport Assessment and a prerequisite of any planning application. Conclusion 24. The objection site is a strategic, pivotal position for high profile uses dependent on a connection with the commercial axis, the Firth and the wider community; discrete from significant amenity conflicts. It would strengthen the local economy, services and visitor infrastructure; be first in the "sequential approach", substantially better placed than FR2; and comply with SPP2010 and sustainable development, by efficient use of infrastructure, notably Ness Road. There would be no breach of the building line or coalescence. The PLDP fails to deliver land to meet an immediate essential convenience store. The objection site (1.8 ha.) should, for overwhelming reasons, be allocated for retail, business/community and tourism uses.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We would wish to see the settlement boundary above the escarpment more accurately reflect both the previous settlement boundary which included both the structural landscaping around the Manse, Rosenberg et al & historical areas such as the Gaelic chapel, war memorial etc and Urquhart Court, and the extension of that settlement boundary to include both the "rounding off" as in site C6 (as referred to on your previous plan iterations) and the extending along a natural contour line to include site H4.

Representation

1.The boundary as shown on the current proposed plan in the document has been changed out of all recognition from the previous local plan settlement boundary. 2.There is NO explanation anywhere in the documentation as to why this is being proposed. Any potential change MUST be addressed in a transparent manner. 3.The redrawn boundary if correct will greatly affect the prospects for the future economic vitality of this Historic town, as there is only limited available vacant space within the town for future growth. 4.We note that much of the built form above the escarpment has been taken out of the boundary shown on the proposed plan (p134). There is no written reference to, or justification of this potential significant change in the proposed plan. Just by changing a line on a drawing does not mean it is the correct thing to do! It requires a full accountable explanation. 5.Urquhart Court in the current proposed plan document is now shown isolated and 'out on a limb' in relation to the rest of Cromarty. This proposed plan change gives a totally FALSE impression of the settlement boundary. Why propose a change to a settlement boundary which already has a clear rationale and includes the built forms of the Manse, Rosenberg, Greenwood and Urquhart Court within the boundary, as well as to the east; the Gaelic chapel /cemetery etc.? 6. Urquhart Court as a lozenge shaped island; if it is now the proposed boundary in the upper escarpment area it appears inconsistent and alien to the previous settlement boundary which included the adjacent built forms, including the Gaelic chapel, the Manse, Rosenberg, Greenwood et al. 7.Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by "rounding off" the currently approved boundary provides an easy win as a future proof rationale for future growth within Cromarty. 8.Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by "rounding" off the currently approved boundary was supported under the Alternative Sites and Uses consultation put forward in summer 2013 by Highland Council IMFLDP planning and development team 9.If the town/settlement boundary is being amended as per the proposed plan (see items 1-8) our proposal for inclusion of sites H4/C6 to the west of the manse would appear to be greatly disadvantaged, and if the proposed boundary change is approved it will adversely affect potential future growth. 10.The current proposed plan for Cromarty as published makes NO allowance for sites to be developed for self build purposes. The Sandilands site is not suitable for self-build, it is a town centre site where higher densities are expected and encouraged (i.e. no detached self build units) and is a developer led site. We attach extracts from our Vision document to show how both advance tree planting (or semi matures from day one) and structural planting can assist in preserving Cromarty's character while also accommodating future growth.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

We would wish to see the inclusion of both sites H4 and C6 (identified in previous draft plans) into land zoned for housing. There is a demand for self build housing in Cromarty which cannot be satisfied by the site CM1, which is a medium high density developer led proposal. Our alternative has local support, and we have carefully selected sites to have minimal visual impact on the town. Please refer to our attached vision document with Visual Impact Studies. The proposed settlement boundary on the current plan (p134) also appears to have "shrunk" without any justification, it should be expanded to include sites C6 and H4 as these would "round off" the existing settlement boundary.

Representation

Sites H4/C6 should be included for self build housing as there is insufficient capacity and type of housing on offer from site CM1. There is no opportunity for self build on site CM1. Sites H4/C6 will address that. All other Black Isle settlements have an opportunity for self build in the proposed plan, it is simply unjustified for Cromarty NOT to have that opportunity. Our proposal for the inclusion of sites H4/C6 was supported under the Alternative sites and uses consultation carried out by the IMFLDP team in Summer 2013. Cromarty's character above the escarpment would not be affected by the inclusion of sites H4&C6, the wooded area above the escarpment will be enhanced and added to by our proposals. Our attached Vision document has visual impact studies which address any concerns. Neighbouring concerns about any loss of privacy have all been addressed by our structural landscaping proposals. (See attached supporting Vision document) The Denny Road footpath could be widened as part of our proposals. Site H4/C6 are well within the accepted norms for walking to a shop and other services in the Centre of Cromarty. Our illustrative proposals (see attached supporting Vision document) also demonstrate how the existing footpath network can be enhanced and expanded. We feel strongly that the settlement boundary should not be as shown on p134, that is regressive and makes no allowance for any expansion of Cromarty. The boundary should be as our proposal for sites H4/C6 included on our attached Vision document of supporting information. The area above the escarpment is an integral part of Cromarty's character, which is why it must be included in the settlement boundary (as in previous plans), and must be expanded. Our Vision document seeks to demonstrate how, with a structural landscaping plan the existing wooded area can be carefully and sensitively added to whilst maintaining the character - of houses in woodland.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

In paragraph 4.140 there is acknowledgment that land west of the Manse might be included in a future LDP review, but we are firmly of the view that the land should be included NOW. Our vision proposal for sites west of the Manse (site H4/C6) include structural tree planting and privacy planting as part of any development proposed. We would like to see the area west of the Manse (site H4/C6) included, and the new settlement boundary amended to reflect this change. The settlement boundary on the escarpment as shown on P134 has changed beyond recognition from the previous boundary, and it must revert back to the original boundary amended to include the sites(s) H4/C6

Representation

Cromarty / Settlement boundary/ Inclusion of sites H4/C6 Response to Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. December 2013 1.The boundary as shown on the current proposed plan(P134) has been changed out of all recognition from the previous local plan settlement boundary. 2.There is NO explanation anywhere in the documentation as to why this is being proposed. 3.The redrawn boundary if correct will greatly affect the prospects for the future economic vitality of this Historic town, as there is only limited available vacant space within the town for future growth. 4.We note that much of the built form above the escarpment has been taken out of the boundary shown on the proposed plan.(p134) There is no written reference to, or justification of this potential significant change in the proposed plan. 5.Urquhart Court in the current proposed plan document is now shown isolated in relation to the rest of Cromarty. This proposed plan change gives a totally FALSE impression of the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary already has a clear rational and includes the built forms of the Manse, Rosenberg, Greenwood and Urquhart Court within the boundary, as well as to the east; the Gaelic chapel /cemetery etc. 6. Urquhart Court as a lozenge shaped island on the partially wooded escarpment is inconsistent and alien to the previous settlement boundary. 7.Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by “rounding off” the currently approved boundary provides an easy win as a future proof rational for future growth within Cromarty. 8.Our proposal for inclusion for development sites H4 & C6 to the west of the manse by “rounding“ off the currently approved boundary was supported under the Alternative Sites and Uses consultation put forward in summer 2013 by Highland Council IMFLDP planning and development team 9.If the town/settlement boundary is being amended as per the proposed plan (see items 1-8) our proposal for inclusion of sites H4/C6 to the west of the manse will be greatly disadvantaged, and if the proposed boundary change is approved it will adversely affect potential future growth. 10.The current proposed plan for Cromarty as published makes NO allowance for sites to be developed for self build purposes. The Sandilands site is not suitable for self-build, it is a town centre site where higher densities are expected and encouraged (i.e. no detached self build units) and is a developer led site. 11.The Sandilands site may accommodate 33 dwellings (mix not known), but all recent housing needs surveys suggest in excess of this is required, which is why sites H4/C6 should be included in the new IMFLDP to make provision for increased numbers. 12.Many of the sites identified for housing within the town have all been found to have had constraints in bringing them forward, which is yet another reason why site H4/C6 should be included in the new plan, as there are no issues holding back their zoning for self build plots. 13.There is a well-established self-build tradition in the Highlands and the Black Isle in particular for self build plots. While other settlements in the Black Isle make provision for housing (some of which could be self build) it is NOT reflected anywhere in the Cromarty proposed plan. This puts Cromarty at a great economic DISADVANTAGE compared with other Black Isle settlements. 14.The Sandilands developer offer, while it may offer a range of tenures and different unit types DOES NOT make provision for small self build plots which provide the route and stepping stone for many couples / families onto the property market. Where the conventional mortgage/owner occupier/ shared equity route is not an option, for these couples and families by providing the “sweat equity” into their new self build homes it makes the reality and prospect of a new home both achievable and affordable. 15.For Cromarty to thrive and prosper over the foreseeable future it requires a diverse offer in the future housing market. Our proposed sites H4/C6 to the west of the manse are a distinct offer which is different from, but can work along side the developer offer at Sandilands. 16.Cromarty’s distinctive character would not be adversely affected by the inclusion of sites H4/C6. Cromarty’s character is achieved via a combination of many elements; including a rich townscape, a fine grained fisher town, handsome former merchants house, more recent housing, civic buildings, historic buildings and landscapes, churches, ruins, harbour, wooded landscape and surrounding environs including the farmland up to the boundary. The addition of a further character area in sites H4/C6 to those already above the escarpment only adds to the diversity of the built and natural environment on offer in Cromarty as it seeks to secure its future in the 21st century. By careful and considered design (as illustrated in our supporting Vision document) sites H4/C6 can become yet another character area which contributes & enhances the

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

uniqueness of Cromarty. 17. Our vision statement for sites H4/C6 gives a flavour of how any visual impact can be mitigated. It seeks to address and responds to concerns people may have about the impact of sites H4/C6. We strongly feel that any anti development sentiment cannot be allowed to go unchallenged and be allowed to unduly influence and dictate the future economic prosperity of Cromarty. Why remove a local opportunity for self builders to achieve home ownership, if any legitimate concerns about bringing a modest parcel of land to the west of the manse forward for development are respectfully addressed and dealt with? 18. There may be a visual perception of an attractive woodland background above the escarpment to the south west of Denny road, when viewed from Marine Terrace and elsewhere within the town, but it is a visual amenity only - there is no public access to it - it is all private woodland forming part of the manse and others gardens. 19. Our sites H4/C6 would contribute to the enhancement of the woodland background above the escarpment, by a tree-planting regime both around the individual plots and the public spaces within the wider site. It would also become ACCESSIBLE PUBLIC REALM unlike the current wooded backdrop adjacent to our proposed sites. 20. Our sites H4/C6 would become an additional ACCESSIBLE green space within Cromarty adding to and enhancing the existing mature tree-lined backdrop to the town. 21. Our sites H4/C6 to the south west of the manse would also contribute to the public realm of Cromarty by providing safe, attractive green routes, both by linking the town to the wider footpath network and creating additional public footpaths of which there is currently little in the SW environs of Cromarty. 22. Our proposal for inclusion of sites to the west of the manse includes for the footpath network around Cromarty to be enhanced and extended. For example the access to Lady Walk to the south of the gatehouse to Cromarty House is currently via the A832. We could link up with Lady Walk by creating a new off road path running parallel to the A832. 23. Similarly we would explore the option of creating a new footpath to the centre via the escarpment, exiting onto the Denny road pavement 24. We will also consider & explore the feasibility of footpath widening improvements to Denny road. 25. Sites H4/C6 will provide for car usage but will not be dominated by it. We cannot dictate peoples habits re usage of the motor car. We can provide an alternative option to the car, by making safe, attractive, accessible pedestrian/cycle routes to the services in the centre of Cromarty. 26. Our proposed site H4/C6 is well within the current accepted norms & guidelines for walking to a shop and other services i.e. Site H4/C6 is within 400m of the centre. 27. Our proposal for inclusion of sites to the west of the manse with an advanced tree planting regime in place, would in the fullness of time, be visually similar to the current settlement boundary of mature trees running along side the manse boundary. Therefore the dominant characteristic on approach to Cromarty along the A832, would be the same as at present - a tree lined boundary abutting farmland 28. There would be some loss of prime agricultural land which we feel is neither a relevant factor nor a material consideration. The development site proposed is small and is in the ownership of a local farming family. If required (and if any objectors are really that concerned about the loss of agricultural land!) more intensive farming production methods could compensate for any loss of land. 29. Both sites H4 & C6 would be subject to current planning legislation with the requisite amount of land given over to affordable/social housing pro rata based on the number of units consented. 30. In response to some of the concerns raised: There is already both historical precedent (Manse/Rosenberg) and recent development precedent (Urquhart Court, Greenwood) for development beyond the escarpment, we cannot wind the clock back – but we can create a contextual response to the setting (see vision statement etc). 31. In response to some of the concerns raised: Sites H4/C6 have been put forward for inclusion ahead of other sites because they are remote from any important or listed building. (e.g. war memorial, Gaelic chapel) 32. In response to some of the concerns raised: Sites H4/C6 were put forward ahead of other sites because they are outside the Cromarty House Designed Landscape. Summary From the call for sites procedure in 2010, we have been open about our intention to make some of the land Mr McBean owns adjacent to Cromarty available for local families to self build their own houses. While we recognise that the planning system cannot legislate for who builds there once consent is given, it is and always has been Mr McBeans stated intention that locals have preference. Initially we put forward some 7 sites for consideration under the call for sites procedure with the intention that through due process of dialogue and consultation we would eventually settle on 1 or 2 sites most suitable for self build housing. In summer 2013 we were given the impression by the IMFLDP team that sites H4 /C6 were considered the most suitable sites, under the preferred Alternative sites route which is why on release of this Proposed plan there is both surprise and disappointment that neither of the sites were included. We have a strong vision for these sites, and with careful consideration of the constraints and opportunities these sites can enhance and complement the housing offer in Cromarty. (see separate supporting Vision document which we submit as part of this consultation process). We will therefore have on public record a document which is much more than a plan showing an area zoned for housing. Our vision shows a real commitment to addressing the issues that a development may have on the historic character of Cromarty. Many of these issues are about Visual Impact. While not prescriptive, our Vision gives a flavour of Mr McBeans commitment to bringing land forward for self-build to Cromarty: •Commitment to design quality in the public realm •The investment in advanced structural landscaping infrastructure • Boundary conditions sympathetic to the historic environment • Footpath connectivity, and improvement of existing footpaths. •How the development can be accessed and integrated in an attractive manner. •How there is minimal visual impact on the existing townscape of Cromarty. •How concerns re access/visual impact can be addressed. •How structural landscaping can assist integration with the existing mature boundary. •How the existing historic landscape & buildings are visually protected.

Allocated to	Cromarty	General	General	
--------------	----------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number 03847 Name Mr Fraser Stewart Organisation Fraser Stewart Architects

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.140

Reference CM1 Type Change

Comment Changes

We would seek to have the land west of the Manse included as part of the CURRENT plan

Representation

There is a demand for self build in Cromarty, and Cromarty is the only settlement in the plan which makes No allowance for self build properties. Site CM1 is a developer led medium /high density scheme- NOT self build. Our sites H4 and C6 for self build housing were included in the Alternative sites and uses consultation of summer 2013. We have prepared Visual Impact Studies and illustrative plans and landscape plans which demonstrate how both these sites or either can sit comfortably in their context, whilst addressing concerns re privacy, landscape character etc. Please see the comment 1 illustrations and also the supporting illustrative plans for both landscaping , and the combined sites illustrative master plan.

Allocated to Cromarty General General

Customer Number 04039 Name Mr G J and Mrs C H Innes Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN32 Type Change

Comment Changes

We ask that before official developers plans are agreed this is taken into consideration and adequate measures are made to avavoid any excess water problems affecting existing houses and land and ask also that assurances are given to that effect.

Representation

At the moment the field is acting as a soak away for any water running off the rise on the far side. As the field has a natural decline towards Holm Dell Drive we have concerns that a development of this nature would increase natural water flow towards the houses.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Sites H4 and/or C6 to be allocated for housing.

Representation

Housing numbers for towns in the Black Isle in this draft of the new plan are as follows: Avoch 120 Conon Bridge 450 Cromarty 30 Culbokie 130 Fortrose & Rosemarkie 130 Munloch 60 North Kessock 90 Tore 450 It is notable that Cromarty underwent less new development than any other Black Isle town during the period of the previous local plan. It's astonishing that despite this, under the new plan the land zoned for housing in Cromarty is not only less than that in any other town, there has actually been a reduction in land available compared to the previous plan. In considering the opportunities for new builds in Cromarty the previous plan included the following areas for housing: Barkly Street, Daffodil Field, Walled Garden and Nicol Terrace. It also discussed the land at Ferro cottage. All of these areas have either been developed or are no longer available. Additionally the previous plan advised development could be carried out by filling gap sites. Since then new houses have been built in the Big Vennel, off Church St, on Duke St, in Urquhart Court, in the Royal Hotel garden, in Nicol Terrace, in converting the Byre restaurant, at the Salmon Bothie, in Rosenberg's garden and there is a 4 house development currently being built on the Denny. In total over 30 homes have been created in this period, many of them occupied by local people. Demonstrably there has been and is demand from local people for new housing. The new plan makes no attempt to fulfil this demand. It does not seem to take into account the fact that there are no longer any gap sites to be filled. The one, single site the plan makes available for development (CM1) is owned by a developer leaving no opportunity for self-building within the town. The new plan has a redrawn boundary for the town which differs from that in the previous plan. It shows the town as being smaller now than it was previously, which does not seem to make any sense. By including Urquhart Court, but excluding the Manse, Rosenberg and the new house in Rosenberg's ground it looks as if the line has been intentionally chosen to make sites H4/C6 seem remote from the town, when in fact they were contiguous to it under the previous plan. An explanation of why this odd decision was made and who made it would be appreciated. The Highland Council's school roll projections for the next ten years show that Cromarty Primary School's total roll is expected to fall by almost 20%, despite an assumption of an additional 46 houses to be built in the catchment area. (See attached). It should be a main aim of the new local plan to counteract this by allowing for housing opportunities for families. By restricting housing in Cromarty to a maximum of 30 the plan fails in this aim. Given that many of the communities in the Black Isle are worried about over development in their cases, it seems perverse that the town with the least development over the last 30 years should be earmarked as the town to have the least development for the foreseeable future. PS For the errata: in the Cromarty section (4.1.40) the word 'suitor' is used when it should be 'Sutor'.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Allocate land at Balvaird Road for housing, previously as referred to as Site Option H7 in the Main Issues Report. Land area 5.5 ha and capacity of 90 and include requirements from the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan in respect of the need for a master plan, improved access and contributions to improving village facilities.

Representation

We write to object to the omission of land at Balvaird Road on the north eastern flank of Muir of Ord from the Proposed Plan. Our client, Mr James Sutherland, owns land forming part of Site Option H7 in the Main Issues Report (MIR). This land is also currently allocated for longer term development in the adopted Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan (R&CELP) with site reference 17. Mr Sutherland's land adjoins R&CELP site 8 which is owned by two other parties. One of the parties, the 3A Partnership, sought to obtain planning permission for a development of 13 houses on their part of the allocation in the last 6 months. This application (ref. no. 13/02423/FUL) was refused on the grounds that it did not provide a master plan developed in partnership with adjacent landowners together with the lack of a suitable safe access and a disproportionately high density relative to the remaining land. It was not possible for the 3A Partnership to prepare an overall master plan in partnership with the adjacent land owner of site 8. That owner is a local crofter, Mr Cameron, who presently does not wish to see his land developed. However, that is not to say that this situation will not change in future and therefore overcome the "difficulty" referred to by the Council. The preferred single access to this and Mr Sutherland's land is also indicated on that land holding. In response to the MIR submissions the Council advised of concerns about the capacity of the Balvaird/Seaforth/Great North Roads junction in the centre of the village at present if this development were to proceed. The Reporter to the 2005 R&CELP Inquiry stated that much of the road network is no better, or worse, than many local roads in the surrounding area. The Local Plan also made provision for the improvement of Balvaird Road as a requirement for sites 8 and 17, possibly including road widening, street lighting and traffic calming. Some improvements were also carried out in recent years in relation to the development of other land served by Balvaird Road. The MIR response also advised that there is some scope to bring forward improvements to the junction to increase its capacity, some of which are planned to proceed with the refurbishment of the railway bridge. These latter improvements suggest a slightly longer timescale for development at Balvaird Road. The alternative means of access to Mr Sutherland's land considered is through the adjacent local authority developed areas served by Chapelton Place and Balvaird Terrace to the south west. However, site level differences, tree cover ownership make that option expensive. It would also see traffic finding its way down to the Balvaird/Seaforth/Great North Roads junction. A development timescale to follow sites MO1 to 4 will allow further time to seek the co-operation of all the landowners involved to prepare the overall master plan and explore all access options. However, we are concerned that the present situation was given as the main reason for not allocating the land in the Proposed Plan. There are a number of other land allocations continued into the Plan where their effectiveness depends on more than one party to bring forward master plans in advance of development and where not all the parties are in agreement to participate. This includes, for example, land at Tain (TN5) and Maryburgh (MB1). In any case we challenge whether not having the co-operation of all land owners is a valid reason for removing the allocation from the development plan. It is more important to prepare an overall master plan and assemble enough land to allow a satisfactory permission to be granted and implemented. Nevertheless, Mr Sutherland is willing to work together with the other land owners to bring forward a master plan. We also note that although rejecting land such as at Balvaird Road from being included in the Proposed Plan there may be the prospect of development to the north of the settlement in the longer term, as paragraph 4.74. However, it is disappointing that this is not followed through with at least a "longer term" allocation similar to land at Nairn (NA9) and Tore (TR2), which suggests a lack of consistency across the Plan area. In rejecting the allocation of other land around the fringes of the village the Council stated that "there is sufficient housing land identified in Muir of Ord on sites which will have less of an environmental affect." However, we note that the introduction of site capacity figures has doubled the potential development for some of the sites carried forward from the adopted Local Plan, which could result in more environmental effects. Furthermore, the Plan seeks to add to the already high density cluster of housing at the Cairns, which is more distant from the main village facilities and services. The capacity of MO2 (Tore Road) has increased from 40-65 in the adopted Local Plan to 104 in the Proposed Plan. The former indicates the requirement for perimeter planting and amenity space, which are now missing from the Proposed Plan. These seem to have been sacrificed for more housing, which will have more of an environmental effect in terms of visual impact, increased traffic and surface water discharge. Similarly, the capacity of Mo3 (Ardnagrask, Corrie Road) has been increased by almost 132% from 22 in the adopted Local Plan to 51. This is a site with access limitations examined during the 2005 Public Local Inquiry for the adopted R&CE Local Plan. At the time the Council did not support an increase in the level of housing in the area due to the potential traffic impact on the single track road. We also question the contribution of allocations

MO4 and MO5 to the supply of effective housing land. By the time the LDP is adopted MO4 may be substantially completed and therefore not count towards this supply. We would also expect the sites Mo1, 2 and 3 to be substantially developed in advance of other land being opened up for development, particularly in view of their closer proximity to the village centre. MO5 is more distant than Balvaird Road from the centrally located village community and commercial facilities, including the primary school. It is more difficult to achieve safe active travel along the A862 road. Its development would also result coalescence with the large housing group of Windhill to the south. In view of the above we now seek the re-inclusion of land at Balvaird Road, previously indicated as H7 in the MIR. Even if it is the medium to longer term before the development can commence the land should at least be allocated in line with allocations at Nairn South (NA9) and Tore (TR2). We also suggest that the site capacities for MO2 and 3 be reviewed.

Allocated to	Muir of Ord	General	General	
--------------	-------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number 01843 Name Mr George Angus Macleod Organisation Neacreath Ltd

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable) Roy Stirrat FRTPI Stirrat Planning Consultancy

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.122-4.123

Reference Tomatin Wood as an additional housing site.ousing Type Change

Comment Changes

The objector to the IMFLDP seeks to change housing site proposals to include "Tomatin Wood", a brownfield land and former commercial conifer woodland site on the edge of Tomatin. It is presently accessed by a forestry road, and has potential to be re-developed for private and affordable housing served by an improved adoptable access road. There will be continuing community access to the woods for recreational purposes. There is agreement to acquire the land at front on "Tannay" for the purpose of realigning the junction of Old Mill Road and the forestry road as shown in drawings. This allows submission of an integrated and well landscaped housing and access proposal of high layout and design standard. The site has a planning history which highlights the significance of the current altered and reduced scale proposal. It is submitted that the proposal complies with development plan policies and will add a valuable additional housing site with benefit to the Tomatin community. It is thus submitted that the site should be designated as an additional housing site for the benefit of the community.

Representation

The Location Plan shows the close proximity of the site to housing along Old Mill Road and the centre of Tomatin which includes the primary school and the approved housing and retained village shop at the main road junction. The proposed site is, in fact, closer to these community facilities than much existing and other proposed housing in the extended Tomatin area. The site slopes down to the Alt Neacreath, with derelict water works buildings still existing on the upper part. The site was previously afforested but the trees have been felled recently under Forestry Commission licence. The site is accessed by the upgraded forestry access track, within the applicant's ownership and control, alongside the Alt Neacreath extending west from Old Mill Road. New coniferous and deciduous planting has now taken place and will integrate the site into the landscape, aided by existing woodland along the riverside and that containing Ard Park housing to the east. Planning History A proposal by the current Objector for 16 houses, including 10 affordable units, at Distillery Wood (now called "Tomatin Wood") was considered on 10 March 2009(08/00547/FULIN). The Area Planning and Building Standards Manager recommended granting detailed planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 75 Agreement in relation to affordable housing. His report included advice that: - the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Local Plan - development is also considered to comply with Policy G2 (Highland Structure Plan, relating to siting, layout, landscape and amenity) - there are no infrastructure issues, subject to a link with the public sewerage system - the need for affordable housing is a material consideration - it is considered that the material considerations of tree loss and 'urbanisation' are insufficient to outweigh compliance with the Development Plan The proposal was refused, however, on 14th April 2009 after a site visit and formal Hearing. Grounds were inconsistency with the development pattern, adverse impact on amenity, contrary to the Local Plan, outwith settlement boundary, negative impact on trees and access too restricted. The site was designated as Site H3 and discussed in the Main Issues Report (MIR), Spring 2012 but rejected again on grounds of woodland impact and disputed technical feasibility of forming a suitable road access. Current Proposal The current proposal - see Site Plan - is based on the same location but a reduced site extent and number of houses. The western extension of the former site is deleted, and the number of housing units reduced from 16 No to 13 No. The disused water works will be removed and the hill slope re-graded (see Cross Section A-A, Site Plan). The houses will have reduced visual impact from the earlier proposal by reason of reduced house scale and height, reducing visual impact by day and night. Landscape containment will be enhanced by the establishing hillside tree planting. It is thus submitted that the proposal: • is consistent with the very extended pattern of development at Tomatin • has little if any impact of amenity • improves community access to the woods • integrates with a newly planted woodland landscape; and • has a good standard of road access compliant with standards Previous Proposal Current Proposal Site 1.3ha plus access (total 2.2ha) 0.64ha plus access road (total 1.5 ha) Site Works Major Restricted Houses 6 large detached, 2 storey 3 medium detached, 1 & 1/2 storey 6 semi-detached, single storey 6 semi-detached, single storey 4 garden flats, two storey 4 garden flats, two storey Type Private sale & housing association Private sale and housing association Access Restricted width, passing places Improved junction with Old Mill Road Access Road The access road, extending west from Old Mill Road, utilises the forestry road extending through land owned by Tomatin Estates. It also provides access to the recently re-built Melford Cottage to the west. Melford House, presently being developed to the north of the proposed site, takes primary access to Station Road via the viaduct. The forestry road system will continue to offer Tomatin residents and visitors public recreational access along the Alt Neacreath burn and throughout the area of new and existing trees and woodlands. Public access on this hillside west of the proposed development site also offers good views south and east. Woodland visitor parking will be available just to the west of proposed housing (see Location Plan). The proposed access road adopts the same route but with important improvement to the junction with Old Mill Road. Along this route there will be limited

removal of trees to allow improved sightlines and passing places. The new owner of the house 'Tannay', located immediately west of No 16 Old Mill Road, have agreed for the applicant to acquire the land at front for access road realignment purposes. This will allow junction re-design and safety improvement where the exiting forestry access road meets the cul-de-sac end of Old Mill Road. Limited tree removal here will improve horizontal alignment, increase sightline visibility and allow better formation of road side parking for local residents. The proposed new road line will integrate with the established footpath kerb outside 16 Old Mill Road. This composite road access proposal is thus of significant benefit of both existing and future residents.

Woodland and Landscape The site is contained by a strong landscape framework, and has very limited visual impact for local residents, rail and A9 road travellers. Trees along the Alt Neacreath burn which runs alongside the site access road, together with established mainly conifer planting on adjoining land to the north of the site and west of the primary school, will substantially screen the site. Proposed houses will be designed with space standards for gardens and parking appropriate to the rural location, and built to high insulation standards including ground source heating.

Development Plan On IMFLDP approval, it is anticipated that the subsequent submission and approval of a planning application would also be subject to condition control including the following:

- provision of affordable housing
- provision of an adoptable road and footpath/footway from Old Mill Road to the turning head
- lighting scheme limiting urban glow and light spillage
- maintenance regime for open spaces, footways and verges
- landscaping scheme including long-term scheme for five year plant maintenance
- a tree protection plan throughout the construction period, and a related construction method statement

Designation would be described as follows: Site : TM6 Distillery Wood Area (ha): 1.5
Housing Capacity : 13
Requirements : Developer to prepare masterplan/development brief to be agreed with the Council who may adopt this as Supplementary Guidance. This should address public sewer connection; retention of woodland framework and woodland management; road improvement and connection of proposed access road with old Mill Road particularly with respect to public and private land ownership; improved and managed public recreational access to woodland and Alt Neacreath riverside.

Allocated to Tomatin General General

Customer Number 01626 Name Mr George Reynolds Organisation Reynolds Architecture

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.27 to 4.31

Reference BE1, BE2, BE3 and BE5 Type Change

Comment Changes

Consider changing link road junction with A862 from BE3 to BE5

Representation

The document suggests that the link road connects with the A862 beside area BE3 (lorry park junction) While this proposal satisfies the needs of the Local Plan as proposed it restricts any further development towards the north east of the village without creating a further junction with the A862 Creating another junction could be problematic because there is a TPO on the trees along the A862 Consideration should be given to moving the link road junction further to the east of the village to meet the A862 through BE5. the advantage of this proposal would be

1. the junction (which will be busy) is moved further from the centre of the village especially as it expands as proposed in the plan.
2. all the land included in the proposed local plan can still be fully serviced from the route shown dotted in red on the attached plan.
3. there is the opportunity in the future to considered zoning further land to the north east of the village by taking access from the relocated link road where it is either just outwith or adjacent to the proposed plan area (see attached plan)
- 4, This proposal would avoid the need for another junction with the A862 for some considerable number of years
5. This proposal could avoid removing trees in the future from the TPO area adjacent to the A862.

Allocated to Beauly General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The site zoned for a primary school should not be used for commercial development, if it is no longer required for a school.

Representation

Commercial development on this site will detract from the existing town center of Fortrose and adjacent villages. it will increase traffic from adjacent villages to use the development. it will not fit in with adjacent housing - the site is higher that its surroundings. If the land is not used for a School it should revert to agriculture or allotments for the benefit of the community. This should be a condition for allowing the other changes to the Ness Gap Masterplan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The Whole area bounded by the A832, Fortrose and Rosemarkie should be included in the Special Landscape area

Representation

All the land bounded in this area is similar in character - good quality arable farmland. to leave part of it out places is at risk of being proposed for development. The land between Fortrose and Rosemarkie should remain for agriculture - in accordance with Highland Council and Scottish Government Policy and to retain the separate identity of the two villages. It provides wildlife habitat and a natural wildlife corridor between the shoreline and the hills behind the villages.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 04447 Name Mr Hamish Leslie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alan Ogilvie G H Johnston Building Consultants

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.74

Reference MO2, 3, 4 & 5 Type Change

Comment Changes

1. Allocate land at Chapelton Farm as follows: - (a) To the west of the farm buildings and A862 road, for housing on 2.7. ha. with a capacity of 30-35 houses and an informal woodland park; (b) To the south of the farm buildings and east of the A862 road for a limited amount of housing on 0.5 ha with a capacity of 12 houses and open space for general amenity/informal recreation purposes. Requirements to include an overall master plan, woodland and protected species surveys/ safeguarding and paths; road access, bus lay-by and 'village gateway' feature; allowance for partial undergrounding of power line; Sustainable Urban Drainage plan. 2. Review the site capacities for MO2 and 3.

Representation

1. Introduction We write to object to the omission of land at Chapelton Farm on the northern edge of Muir of Ord from the Proposed Plan. Our client, Mr Hamish Leslie Melville, owns Site Options H4 (Chapelton East) and H9 (Chapelton West) in the Main Issues Report (MIR). The Council's response on Chapelton West following our submission on the MIR was generally positive and concludes that there is longer term development potential (paragraph 4.74 of the Proposed Plan refers). However, it is disappointing that this is not followed through with at least a "longer term" allocation similar to land at Nairn (NA9) and Tore (TR2). This suggests a lack of consistency across the Plan area. Some of the other comments made on the MIR against the allocation of land at Chapelton are over-stated and many of the Council's responses confirm this. In part response to these we provide further information in the form of general appraisals of drainage, flood risk, woodland and protected species as further justification for allocating land at Chapelton for housing in the Plan. Our responses also incorporate the Council's previously stated views where appropriate. In rejecting the allocation of land at Chapelton the Council stated that "there is sufficient housing land identified in Muir of Ord on sites which will have less of an environmental affect." However, we note that the introduction of site capacity figures has doubled the potential development for some of the sites carried forward from the adopted Local Plan, which could result in more environmental effects. Furthermore, the Plan seeks to add to the already high density cluster of housing at the Cairns, which is more distant from the main village facilities and services. 2. Responses for Chapelton East (H4) - south of the farm buildings (i) Geological Feature It is acknowledged that the geological drumlin type hillock features are of local importance but these are not covered by a designation. There was no mention of this feature in the Report of the 2005 Public Local Inquiry into objections to the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. At that time the Reporter and the Council rejected it for the principal reason that there was no shortage of housing land in Muir of Ord. However, The Council stated that, subject to suitable access from the A862 road, a "designation may be possible at some future stage under a subsequent local plan review". (ii) Gateway to the village The matter of this site forming a "green gateway" to the north approach to the village and whether development is likely to lead to a change in the visual amenity could equally apply to any land on any approach to any settlement. (iii) Connections to village centre It is closer than the existing and proposed housing at and to the south of the Cairns. A footpath connection to the village centre and safer routes to school can be provided. (iv) Flood Risk and Drainage No Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required by SEPA as it is not within the 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Nevertheless a Level 1 FRA has been carried out to examine the potential for pluvial flooding. This indicates ponding of water on this and nearby fields due to poor ground percolation. However, there is no evidence of this water finding its way across the A862 into The Meadows, Ord Road and Chestnut Drive. Proposals for development of the site will require flow routes off the site and storage of excess water on site as part of a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) Plan. A gravity connection can be made to the existing foul drainage network across the A862 to the west. (v) Road Safety and Access A suitable access solution including provision of appropriate levels of visibility would be addressed by a developer. A bus service passes the site and the requirement for bus layby/stop provision can be met on the site frontage to maximise opportunities for sustainable travel. (vi) Natural Heritage A general woodland appraisal and an assessment of the presence/absence of protected species was carried out by a forestry and ecological consultant. This area is comprised entirely of permanent pasture and there are no trees located within the boundaries. However, there are some shrub trees located along the northern boundary and mature individual trees along the south eastern and southern boundaries from which any development would have to be set back. The areas of steep slopes of the glacial deposits may be difficult to develop without major re-contouring of the land. Whereas there are some level areas adjacent to the railway on the east side and between the hillocks and the south boundary that could, following a Phase 2 ecological and woodland survey, support a limited form of residential development. 3. Responses for Chapelton West (H9) – west of the farm buildings and A862 road (i) Gateway to the village See response at 2(ii) above. (ii) Connections to village centre See response at 2(iii) above. (iii) Flood Risk and Drainage As this land is not within the 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area no FRA is required by SEPA. Nevertheless a Level 1 Assessment has been carried out to examine the potential for pluvial flooding. This included an examination of areas identified in a sketch provided in response to the MIR by a nearby

land owner of drainage routes and catchment areas together with calculations of the potential impact of surface water from future development upon existing water courses. In general no signs of flood risk were identified and the site is adequately drained. Some small low lying areas of the site may not be able to drain into the drainage ditches. This can give rise to localised damp areas during heavy rainfall periods which may account for the responses from residents on the MIR. Whilst any future housing development will increase the runoff from roads and roofs, the existing site drainage ditches will be able to cope with this. Foul sewage can be accommodated via a connection to the existing network but some pumping may be required from any lower western areas identified for development. (iv) Road Safety and Access A suitable access solution including provision of appropriate levels of visibility would be addressed by a developer. There is also potential to extend the 30mph zone and introduce village gateway traffic calming features. A bus service passes the site and requirement for bus layby/stop provision can be met on the site frontage to maximise opportunities for sustainable travel. (v) Impact on Private Interests To reiterate what the Council said, loss of or impacts upon a view from another property are not material planning considerations. Any planning application on the site will be assessed in terms of amenity impact on existing residents. The legal right of access to allow servicing of a soakaway and emptying of a septic tank and for maintenance of the Wards sewage pumping station will be maintained. (vi) Development of Settlement and Landscape and Visual Impact The potential for “coalescence with existing housing groups to the north” is questionable in view of physical features and the fact that two houses on the west side of the A862 road and the third on the east side of the road are relatively far apart. As a detailed layout or house designs are not currently proposed, concerns about the “relationship of layout and siting to adjoining buildings, spaces and views” and the “inconsistency of proposed houses with the existing building line” are not relevant. It is also speculation to suggest that the development is likely to be an ‘up market’ scheme of executive dwellings out of character with Victorian dwellings nearby. A minimum of 25% of the houses should be ‘affordable’. In any event, these are all matters of detail for a planning application. (vii) Natural Heritage A general woodland appraisal and an assessment of the presence/absence of protected species was carried out by a forestry and ecological consultant. This confirmed an Inventory (Semi-Natural and Ancient) Woodland designation over the south western half of the site and its potential for wildlife habitats. The presence of water voles in the drainage ditch along the north western margins of the land is the most significant issue. This low lying area also contains wetter areas that do not drain into the ditch, corresponding with the findings of the flooding and drainage assessments. There is also evidence of other habitats to the south west of the north eastern most watercourse. The greatest potential for development with little impact upon natural heritage interests is therefore to the north east and above the level of this main watercourse. There is also some scope for lower density development to the south west of this in association with retaining the woodland and observing adequate holdbacks from the trees informed by a detailed survey and tree protection/ mitigation measures. This will help integrate development into the landscape and maintain the local amenity of the area. The woodland also offers the opportunity for informal access to the area and path connections with developed areas to the south. (viii) Constraints An 11 kv (high voltage) overhead power line through the site requires a setback from buildings of 9 metres from the wires or 10 metres from the poles. Alternatively, Scottish and Southern Energy advise that part or full undergrounding or diversion of a line of this voltage is relatively straightforward to achieve (at a developer’s expense) and is not a significant constraint on the development of the site. (ix) Green Network As stated by the Council, the land is not formally identified as part of the green network around Muir of Ord. The land had been in tenancy and part of a working farm up until 2012 and therefore not generally available for wider public access. There is limited evidence of use by the public including footpaths. It is therefore wrong to say that the green network would be altered by development on this site. The retention of the Inventory woodland and pockets of open land together with the development of a path network connecting it to other areas would have wider benefits to the community through “enhancing opportunities to access the outdoors and coming into contact with nature and natural environments.”

Allocated to	Muir of Ord	General	General	
--------------	-------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

SEE COMMENT 1 ABOVE 1. Allocate land at Chapelton Farm as follows: - (a) To the west of the farm buildings and A862 road, for housing on 2.7. ha. with a capacity of 30-35 houses and an informal woodland park; (b) To the south of the farm buildings and east of the A862 road for a limited amount of housing on 0.5 ha with a capacity of 12 houses and open space for general amenity/informal recreation purposes. Requirements to include an overall master plan, woodland and protected species surveys/ safeguarding and paths; road access, bus lay-by and 'village gateway' feature; allowance for partial undergrounding of power line; Sustainable Urban Drainage plan. 2. Review the site capacities for MO2 and 3.

Representation

4. Sufficient housing land on other sites that have less of an environmental affect In concluding that the Chapelton West site is longer term in nature the Council states that there is "sufficient housing land identified in Muir of Ord on sites which will have less of an environmental affect." This claim is artificially supported by the significant increase in the development capacities of sites MO2 and MO3. There is no reference in relevant documents to consultation with the wider community or representations from land owners/developers, or any justification in the Proposed Plan for these increased capacities. The capacity of MO2 (Tore Road) has increased from 40-65 in the adopted Local Plan to 104 in the Proposed Plan. The former indicates the requirement for perimeter planting and amenity space, which are now missing from the Proposed Plan. These seem to have been sacrificed for more housing, which will have more of an environmental effect in terms of visual impact, increased traffic and surface water discharge. Similarly, the capacity of Mo3 (Ardnagrask, Corrie Road) has been increased by almost 132% from 22 in the adopted Local Plan to 51. This is a site with access limitations examined during the 2005 Public Local Inquiry for the adopted R&CE Local Plan. At the time the Council did not support an increase in the level of housing in the area due to the potential traffic impact on the single track road. We also question the contribution of allocations MO4 and MO5 to the supply of effective housing land. By the time the LDP is adopted MO4 may be substantially completed and therefore not count towards this supply. We would also expect the sites Mo1, 2 and 3 to be substantially developed in advance of other land being opened up for development, particularly in view of their closer proximity to the village centre. MO5 is more distant than Chapelton from the centrally located village community and commercial facilities, including the primary school. It is more difficult to achieve safe active travel along the A862 road. Its development would also result coalescence with the large housing group of Windhill to the south. However, it is a more appropriate location for expansion of business and light industrial development at the southern end of the village. 5. Conclusions While not a strong enough reason to warrant safeguarding from development and the lack of designation for this geological feature, the local amenity value of the hillocks on the land south of the Chapelton Farm buildings is recognised by our client. The previous suggestion of maintain this feature and limiting development to the fringes of the field is promoted again. The land comprising this feature could be made available for informal recreational use and ground percolation issues overcome in association with development adjacent to the south and east fringes. The general environmental appraisal and flood risk and drainage assessments of the land west of the farm buildings and the A862 confirm the potential for development on the north eastern half that respects the natural heritage interests. However, as with the other site, inclusion of the remainder of the area within the settlement boundary and its safeguarding for its natural heritage interest and amenity value would provide an opportunity for public access and enjoyment, possibly as community woodland in future. Safe access, active travel and suitable drainage solutions can also be achieved for both sites. The power line on the site west of the A862 is not a significant constraint. While the Council asserts that other less environmentally constrained sites should be brought forward prior to the development of land at Chapelton, by increasing the density of development on these other sites it does not account for the potential environmental impacts of such action. Nevertheless we would still expect development to be advanced on sites MO1, 2 and 3 prior to other land. If the adopted plan site capacities are maintained and the housing potential of the more peripheral new site MO5 is omitted, there would be potential for around 200 houses, well short of the "potential for over 330 homes by 2030." As such, we continue to seek the allocation of land at Chapelton for development after the substantial take up of existing effective land (i.e. MO1, 2 & 3). This land would also help provide a choice of future housing development opportunities and deliver contributions towards improving facilities within the settlement. We provide a copy of each of the supporting assessments as one attachment and site and development framework plans referred to above as the second attachment.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reinstatement for Housing/Mixed Use and enlargement of an area previously zoned for Housing either side of the Southern approach road to Evanton namely land bounded by the River Sgitheach, Network Rail, the single track road opposite the Kiltearn Burial Ground access road turning leading to Drummond Road past Drummond Farm and by Drummond Road.

Representation

Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan 4.147 Evanton – I wish to object most strongly with regard to the allocation of preferred status for housing within the settlement of Evanton and the inexplicable deletion of an area of land to the South West of the village zoned for housing in previous local development plans and included in The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as late as Spring 2012 (see H4 in attached Plan 1). Whilst it is perfectly understandable that The Highland Council should try to give preference to their own landholding. It is totally unrealistic to expect a developer to consider such a difficult site as EV1 Teandallon East, when not only are there far more suitable and accessible sites in the village but any potential developer in addition to purchasing the site has immediately to face a number of unique and inherent difficulties:- a) there is a sitting agricultural tenant on a full agricultural lease protected by the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Act 1991 with all the inherent rights that implies which will be subject to long and costly negotiations, ultimately ending with the tenant’s right to buy; b) the cost involved in providing a new bridge link between Drummond Road and Teandallon East will be prohibitively expensive; c) the development of the site is to be linked to land at Drummond Farm, the freehold of which is owned and controlled by the family of the very tenant occupying Teandallon. d) the landowner of Drummond Farm is only being offered very limited development for 15 homes in addition to being asked to provide land for access, greenspace and amenity areas, and for possible future expansion of the school. Hardly a recipe for a successful outcome and decision to develop. In contrast, the owners of H4 have stated that their site is readily available for development. It has in the past received outline planning for a housing scheme (lapsed) and but for the sudden onset of the current recession probably would have been developed (see attached Plan 2). H4 is immediately adjacent to the main approach to the village from the South, therefore requiring far less road infrastructure, and is close to both the School and to the centre of the village. Whilst access has been shown to be perfectly possible, extending the boundary of any housing to the South opens up far greater opportunities for not only improved external and internal road layouts but also for a well balanced design for the settlement of Evanton as a whole currently existentially developing far more to the East. The H4 land and it’s southern extension is not prime agricultural land, due to the nature of it’s topography and the size of fields it is unsuitable for modern agriculture. However, the whole area lends itself to innovative planning and landscape design, using the interesting natural land form and incorporating open space along the flood plain of the River Sgitheach and along the boundary with Network Rail If the plan is adopted in its current form The Highland Council will in effect be limiting any housing development in Evanton to one site and to high density housing at EV2 Culcairn. And they will in effect be placing a planning blight on all development to the South and West of the village. The Highland Council should accept that a previous administration, initially with good intention, bought Teandallon Farm to develop part of it, but then made the mistake of holding on to the remaining land with a view to future development, but by allowing private development to occur up the Swordale Road they inadvertently overloaded the infrastructure effectively blighting their own land. The previous administration compounded their mistake by granting a full agricultural tenancy back to the previous owner. EV1 Teandallon East has been in public ownership for in excess of thirty years during which time it has failed to be developed. The Highland Council should now accept that it is simply not going to happen, due to its inherent difficulties. There are much more suitable and accessible sites readily available for bringing the Council’s policy of providing effective and deliverable housing to fruition. To that effect I would request and recommend:- a)that preferred status be immediately reinstated to the land at H4 on Plan 1 & 2 submitted with this objection and the boundary limit of this area be extended Southwards to take in the whole of the field surrounding Sunfield. b)that some of the restrictions placed on EV3 be lifted so that this area too can be realistically considered for medium to low density housing by potential developers. I readily declare as I have in the past being a Land Agent acting for the owner of some 3.23 hectares of H4 land immediately adjacent to the River Sgitheach, but I am also a member of a family long resident in the Evanton Community with a wish to see this attractive small rural settlement thrive and develop in a sustainable way.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03122 Name Mr Howard Brindley Organisation Brindley Consulting

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.22

Reference Strategic Employment Sites Type Change

Comment Changes

In the Strategic Employment Sites section I would like to see a full reference to the other major industrial sites in the Ross-shire Growth Area in particular Highland Deephaven, currently at page 141 EV 5.

Representation

The proposed local development plan on page 57 refers to the Ross-shire growth area and the plan's support for the growth of employment generating uses at sites along the Cromarty Firth. This section of the plan then focuses on three sites at Fearn, Fendom and Nigg. It makes only passing reference to the other strategic employment sites in the growth area, for example Cromarty Firth Industrial Park and Delny, and in particular Highland Deephaven. The details of these sites are to be found later in the proposed plan in the general allocations for settlements. In the case of Highland Deephaven's this is to be found in a "Local Centre" This is not good presentationally, particularly as the Local Development Plan will become a key document in promoting the Inner Moray Firth area, and will be used by investors to identify major industrial opportunities.

Allocated to Evanton EV5 Highland Deephaven

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The proposal to build over 300 new homes in Cawdor Village is grossly excessive and requires to be scaled down.

Representation

A six-fold increase in numbers of houses will ruin what is a historic village and an important tourist attraction in the area. I question the validity of the aspirational population growth figures for the IMF area in light of recent economic changes and suggest they be revised as in 2012 the annual gain from migration into the Highland Council area was only 87 as opposed to the IMFLDP projected gain of 1650. Planning permission already granted between Inverness and Nairn is for around 10000 houses and this should more than satisfy demand for the next 18 years. The whole plan for the Inner Moray Firth Area now requires to be reviewed. Proposed plans for Cawdor will result in the loss of a considerable area of prime agricultural land and create yet another dormitory settlement in the Inverness hinterland. There are very few employment opportunities in the local area which will mean incomers will have to commute to other locations causing even more pressure on the B9090 and A96. Problems of congestion on the A96 have resulted in the B9090 becoming an unofficial Nairn By-pass and further traffic on this road will exacerbate this situation. Areas CD9&10 should be preserved as agricultural land as this land is tenanted by me and its loss will impact negatively on my farm business. As tenant I may well be faced with a costly legal confrontation with the landowner as I do not wish these strategic livestock areas to be removed from my tenancy. There is an area of trees with special historic significance between CD9 and Newton Road and these will be compromised by development of this area. CD8 should remain as largely open space in what may, if a reduced level of development takes place, become the village centre.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I am strongly opposed to an incinerator on the Longman Landfill Site

Representation

As a resident of the Black Isle I am deeply disturbed about the possibility of an incinerator being built on the Longman. There has been much debate and much scientific discussion on the pros and cons of an incinerator and I have followed events at the possible incinerator development at Invergordon very closely. The Black Isle is downwind from the proposed plant and there are genuine concerns about air quality and various forms of pollution from an incinerator. Presumably, there are as yet no details of the proposed project, but in any case one would hope that there will be detailed consultation and an inquiry before the building of an incinerator is allowed.

Allocated to

Customer Number 02037 Name Mr Ian Carus Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 82

Reference FR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduce Housing Density

Representation

In the original proposals for housing at this site, a figure of 30 – 35 houses was mentioned. Now “up to 50” are included in the IMFLDP. This is an unacceptable increase of around 40% in density for this site. I am also worried about the impact of the new development on Courthill Road.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number 02037 Name Mr Ian Carus Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 82

Reference FR2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Proposed Primary School should be re-inserted in the masterplan. Proposed Swimming Pool should be inserted in the masterplan The A832 must be upgraded before any more development. If this is not possible, developments should not take place

Representation

Site FR2 Proposed Primary School The Primary School was a major part of the development of FR2 in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 Quote: 11. A site of 1.8 ha. shall be safeguarded adjacent to the Deans and Ness Roads for the provision of a primary school with playing field, serving the Fortrose and Rosemarkie area In the new IMFLDP it states “No development of site identified for a primary school on masterplan prior to the Sustainable Schools Estates Review” Surely the site has to be identified prior to the Review and then if the review finds there is no demand for a new school only then should it be removed from the masterplan. Indeed, with all the planned new extra housing and the ageing primary school in Avoch there might well be a demand for a primary school in Fortrose. Site FR2 Black Isle Swimming Pool Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states 10. Land is reserved for expansion of Black Isle Leisure Centre to provide a swimming pool, a project being led by the community. An area of approximately 0.6 ha. is reserved for this purpose and for additional community/leisure facilities to meet local needs. Remarkably and disgracefully, especially to those of us who have campaigned for a new Pool for many years, the swimming pool does not even get a mention in the new plan. Road Infrastructure relating to FR1 and FR2 Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states “The need to reconstruct the dangerous A832 route between Fortrose and Avoch is a major concern.” Many people in Fortrose and Rosemarkie believe that the infrastructure for the proposed developments, particularly the A832 between the Fairy Glen in Rosemarkie and Avoch is totally unsuitable and before any further development is approved something must be done about it. Having attended various meetings organised by the Council to discuss improvements to Fortrose High Street, it has become clear that any changes made can only be minor and cosmetic.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Protection of Golf Club from increased influx of surface water resulting from development. Mitigation measures re. civil liability of GC members.

Representation

I am a member and past captain of GC and concerned about implications for the course of housing development adjacent to 11th. fairway which lies below MO3. Surface water can only drain downwards and the club would have to be assured and satisfied that any SUDS would permanently protect the course from the effects of excess water penetration. This has been an ongoing problem anyway in this area and in 2011/12 we spent a lot in successfully installing a new drainage arrangement which, whilst primarily benefitting the club must also have saved the farmer a bit of hassle. There is also the obvious question of civil liability resulting from wayward shots. Any houses would have to be the appropriate distance away. Density mentioned would make this virtually impossible. Any planning conditions eventually imposed must reduce density and put obligation on developer to erect and maintain a barrier of some sort. Planners should bear in mind the social importance of the GC to the district. It provides a vital leisure facility to 600+ members including a thriving junior section and membership is open to all. Any additional expenditure for the club arising from adjoining development that increased subscriptions and decreased the attractiveness of the course would be a retrograde step. Encroaching development already means the course is becoming more and more a "lung" for M of O and it should be maintained as such.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I write in support of the proposed development. My company Robert Weir & Son own the land proposed to be developed. We also own the access route into the land. This was purchased in June 2007 and has been used as a farm access onto the land. This access route could be incorporated into Newton Park to form access. We also own and have control over the land leading into the Tulloch Development at Groam Farm West which could be used as a loop road or emergency access. We are willing to develop a masterplan and brief to be agreed with the Council. I attach a copy of the Disposition plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

It has consistently been the wish of the Balloch residents that these fields remain as open green space. It is therefore entirely appropriate that if development is to take place on this land it is only to provide playing fields for Culloden Academy.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Remove the suggested use of 'neighbourhood shop'. Add to this area the field around the Balloch Primary School and Hall.

Representation

We believe it is an inappropriate area for another shop as the communities of Balloch and Culloden are well provided with retail outlets. The field around the school and hall could be used to expand existing community facilities to meet the demand for a playpark, all weather sports surface or community garden.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

FORTROSE & ROSEMARKIE COMMUNITY COUNCIL Response to Consultation on Proposed Plan Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council is strongly critical of the fallacious statement that expansion of housing in Fortrose is in keeping with its status as the primary service centre for the Black Isle. Strong opposition to excessive housing growth, on prime land, has been expressed at public meetings which discuss both the Main Issues Report and the current Proposed Plan. The Community Council is very aware of the landscape constraints of a narrow coastal strip; and the poor infrastructure support of excessive developments. Many detailed planning factors have been overlooked or deliberately ignored as a result of the "Tunnel Vision" approach of the planning service to maximise housing growth with little concern for its sustainability or its effect on the environment. Site FR 1 Greenside Farm. The land was identified in RACE local Plan for 30 houses and for 'mixed uses' in the Main Issues Report. An over-development of 50 houses at a density of 25 per hectare (a city/suburban density) with the associated infrastructure problems is entirely out of keeping with the attractive rural setting of the heritage village and Conservation Area. Its location also raises the issue of road safety on Active Travel routes to Rosemarkie shops. Any masterplan must be prepared in full consultation with the community, whose opinion must be a material planning consideration. Site FR 2 Ness Gap. The infill proposed raises the total to 156 houses for the Ness Gap and is vigorously opposed by the community which reluctantly accepted the RACE local Plan allocation of 120 house at a suitably low density to match the adjoining properties. The developer has increased the density at each phase of the programme and the Community Council has been aware since the "Call for Sites" that such adjustments to the masterplan would be a developer priority. The loss of prime land and wildlife habitats cannot be ameliorated by providing miniscule green spaces within the housing estate as outlined in the relevant Supplementary Guidance. There is an obvious detrimental impact on the amenity value of the traditional Easter Greengates Core Path, and criticism has come from tourists and residents. It is not clear whether additional affordable housing is being considered for the Ness Gap as well as for the Site at Rosemarkie. If it is, will the number of extra affordable units be based on the infill of 24 units or on 80 houses as quoted in the Plan? Both these sites are examples of over development which will have a detrimental effect on the amenities, quality of life and social balance of the separate communities of Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Infrastructure. The housing market demand is given in detail in the Plan but there are no matching figures for population. In the Black Isle land is identified for over 1070 houses. As the primary local service centre, Fortrose can expect an increase in footfall of visitors. More parking space will be needed and many other aspects of infrastructure, such as traffic management, school buildings (including the new classroom approved in the present Ness Gap development), new primary school, day care centre, medical services, public toilets and swimming pool need to be developed under POLICY 1 to PROMOTE & PROTECT the status of this former borough. The allocation of 1.6 hectares, which may or may not be required for a primary school, is quite inadequate for the Community purposes. Land was reserved for the Swimming Pool in the RACE Local Plan and MUST be reinstated in this Proposed Plan as an essential facility for an increasing Black Isle population. Settlement Development Area (SDA). There is a suggestion that Fortrose/Rosemarkie may become an SDA. In its response to the Main Issues Report the Community Council advised that the development criteria applicable to Other Settlements were equally applicable to Fortrose. The Highlandwide Local Development Plan lists the conditions that could justify establishing an SDA. The landscape constraints mentioned before, currently poor infrastructure and the quality of the agricultural land, suggest that an SDA would not benefit this communities. The proximity of the A9 Growth Corridor will be an important factor for consideration of this SDA issue. Conclusion. The Proposed Plan does not achieve the aim of Policy 1; namely to Promote and Protect Town and Local Centres. It is obsessed with growth and fails to address the consequences of the excessive developments which it proposes.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Commercial development or housing should NOT be permitted on this site if the proposal to build a Primary School is withdrawn.

Representation

Part of the site has been zoned for a Primary School. Even although the local population is to be increased, and that the demography of the population is likely to mean that many more young children will live in the area, it is now suggested that a primary school may not be necessary. If this land is not to be used for a Primary School in the short term the land should revert to agriculture in accordance with Scottish Government policy on agricultural land. Alternatively it could be used to provide allotments for the occupants of the new houses, as the plot size of their houses are so small that their ability to grow their own produce is very limited. The provision of allotments would assist in improving the sustainability of the development. It would provide open space and improve the wellbeing of the community. By holding the land in this form, it would remain a site that could be used for a community development (a primary school or extension to the secondary school that is already at capacity, if this was subsequently found to be necessary. The proposal to use the land for commercial development is not acceptable. Highland Council's HWLDP para 20.21 States that developments should not have a detrimental affect on the vialbility of village centres. Highland Council held a meeting to discuss this proposal which was overwhelmingly rejected by the large number of attendees. The reasons for rejection of the proposal were and are: It would detract from the existing town centre It would adversely affect existing shops in the town centre It would adversely affect shops in the centre of adjacent villages It would not blend in with the adjacent properties the site is at the highest point of the Ness Gap site. It would increase traffic flows from shoppers from adjacent villages through the existing town centre that already is overcapacity. I am extremely disappointed that Highland Council has allowed this proposal to go forward as it has no merit and it has been made clear that it has no support in the local community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The proposal to use land of high agricultural value for a cemetry extension should be rejected

Representation

The land for the proposed cemetery extension is of high agricultural value and should be retained as such. THC's land use strategy is to ensure that natural assets are protected. MFLDP paras 1.2, 1.5, 2.1 & 2.2). If a cemetery extension is required it could be sited on poorer quality land on the hillside between Fortrose and Rosemarkie or some other site on less fertile ground should be located.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

A commercial development at the North West corner of the area was proposed by a developer. it has not been included in the current Plan (a presentation by the developer proposed a supermarket and other undefined commercial developments). (Grid ref 273E8568N) If, as part of the review of the Plan by the developer this proposal is resubmitted I propose that it should be rejected for the following reasons: It would be constructed on land of high agricultural value It would commence the coalescence of the two villages, which is strongly opposed by the communities (and by THC as stated in the proposed IMFLDP para4.60) It would detract from the existing town centre It would adversely affect existing shops in the town centre It would adversely affect shops in the centre of adjacent villages Suburban development imposed in a rural location detracts from the area and discourages tourism. It would not fit in with adjacent buildings. It would increase traffic flows from shoppers from adjacent villages through the existing town centre that already is overcapacity. Highland Council states (para2.25) that they support development if infrastructure, services and facilities required are provided. No infrastructure or facilities are provided by this development; in fact it detracts from existing infrastructure, in particular the already inadequate road system in the area

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The proposal suggests that further development will help sustain “the primary service centre for the Black Isle”. The community centre and the secondary school is already at or overcapacity and needs no further development to sustain it. The IMFLDP states that “all developments must be in keeping with the scale and character of the conservation area”. The HWLDP (para19.6, policy 34 states that proposals should be judged on compatibility with existing. The proposed development is neither of a scale or character that is in keeping with the conservation area or even the adjacent housing. Highland council’s Highland Wide Local Plan (para4.1) states that growth and development should be directed to places that can support sustainable development. The land zoned for this development is of high agricultural value and should be retained as such. THC’s land use strategy is to ensure that natural assets are protected. MFLDP paras 1.2, 1.5, 2.1 & 2.2). Building on agricultural land is neither sensible or sustainable. This area is part of the Special Landscape Area zoned as such by Highland Council. The development will be contrary to the ethos of the Special Landscape Areas. The housing will impose for traffic loads on the already overloaded high streets of Rosemarkie, Fortrose, Avoch and Munloch. Where no significant measures have been or can be taken to alleviate the already overburdened narrow town centre streets. (Refer to HWLDP para 18.8 refers to physical constraints on development). Highland Council states that new development MUST contribute to more efficient forms of travel, (IMFLDP para 2.22 & 20.31.1) Highland Council’s HWLDP states that masterplans should reduce the need to travel. This proposal increases the need for people to travel as most work is located around Inverness or north of the Cromarty Firth. There will be no easy pedestrian access to Rosemarkie High Street – pedestrians will have to walk along Courthill Road – a narrow country lane with narrow verges and no footpaths or along the A832 which has at one section no footpath which is along the busy A832 trunk road. This land is habitat to protected species of farmland birds (skylarks and starlings) (IMFLDP para 21.4) and should not be developed. The HWLDP para 8.2 states that wildlife should be supported. This development will destroy wild life habitat. Highland Council states (para2.25) that they support development if infrastructure, services and facilities required are provided. No infrastructure or facilities are provided by this development; in fact it detracts from existing infrastructure, in particular the already inadequate road system in the area. Highland Council has a policy of creating sustainable communities (HWLDP para5.1). This development does nothing to maintaining the sustainability of this community. It is a perimeter development, the people living here will be outwith the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00920 Name Mr James Grant Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph Paragraph 2.5, Special Landscape Areas

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Special Landscape area (SLA), Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Ft George: the Plan shows the SLA encompassing part of the land that lies between the villages of Rosemarkie, Fortrose and the A832 trunk road. It does not encompass the whole of this area; part of the land immediately east of Fortrose is shown out with this boundary. . I propose that the boundary of the SLA be moved to encompass all the land south of the A832 that lies between the villages.

Representation

This land is very similar to the land within the SLA with which it is contiguous. Development of the area omitted would detract from the whole of the Special landscape Area

Allocated to Special Landscape Areas

Customer Number 00920 Name Mr James Grant Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph Paragraph 2.5

Reference Special Landscape Areas

Type Change

Comment Changes

Special Landscape area (SLA), Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Ft George: the Plan shows the SLA encompassing part of the land that lies between the villages of Rosemarkie, Fortrose and the A832 trunk road. The boundary runs through the new housing development that is being constructed in the so called "Ness Gap".

Representation

This land can no longer be described as being a Special Landscape Area, quite the contrary. I propose that the boundary be moved so that this no longer forms part of the SLA.

Allocated to Special Landscape Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Further restrictions and controls should be imposed on the proposed development

Representation

This is part of an area described as “the Ness Gap Site” which has been zoned for development under a Master plan under the previous Development Plan for the area. The First development plan prepared for the whole area stated that a maximum of 120 houses (subject to a 10% variation) could be allowed. This recognised the rural nature of the area and the low density of the adjacent housing. It is now proposed that 80 houses in addition to 77 houses that already have been given Planning Permission, a total of 157 houses should be built in this area. The proposed housing density and layout is completely at odds with the existing housing in the area. The houses already constructed look out of keeping with their surroundings. Two storey houses are being constructed against the Council’s policy for this area of a maximum of 1 1/2 storeys that has been in place for more than 30 years and was stated as a condition in the current Master plan. Increased housing in this area will increase commuting to Inverness, the antithesis of Highland councils “green Policies” and sustainability statements. Highland Council states that new development MUST contribute to more efficient forms of travel (IMFLDP para 2.22 & 20.31.1) Highland Council’s HWLDP states that masterplans should reduce the need to travel. This proposal increases the need for people to travel as most work is located around Inverness or north of the Cromarty Firth. The proposal states that the development will be constructed in accordance with the Master plan already in place for the development. In fact the development to date has NOT been constructed in accordance with the Master plan. I am concerned therefore that the following phases will also fail to meet the requirements contained therein. (I append a list of the violations/ post award variations to the Master plan for the area – appendix 1) One of the contentious issues of the proposed development is the increase in traffic through Fortrose High Street. Highland Council are taking measures to amend the High Street traffic layout, but the physical constraints of narrow road width (5.1m at the narrowest) combined with narrow pavements (900mm and 1500mm) immediately adjacent means that existing traffic flows already detract from and pose considerable risks to users of the town centre. No matter what modifications are made to the street layout further increases in traffic flow arising from more housing will exacerbate the problem. Further developments to the east of the town will also increase traffic flows and reduce the town centre to a corridor for traffic to access these expanded communities and destroy the viability and character of the town centre. (ref para 4.6 of the IMFLDP) The Proposed site is bounded in the East by Ness Road. It should be a condition that housing should be built 4m back from the pavement. Reason: to improve the visual amenity of the area. The Proposed site is bounded on the south side by a traditional right of way (called the salmon fisher’s path). The path is already bounded on one side by housing. New housing should be constructed so that their boundaries are at least 4m from the path. Reason: so that the path does not become a narrow, enclosed, claustrophobic, intimidating rat run. The proposed site is bounded on the west by Easter Greengates, a historic right of way. Conditions should be imposed such that the development does not detract from this right of way. The existing Master plan requires that two play areas be constructed for the development. These areas, in addition to having play equipment for small children should be big enough that children have room to play open games, such as football or chasing games. Reason for the health and well being of residents and the community. The 4th phase of development of this area is underway. At least one of these areas should have been constructed. The proposal suggests that further development will help sustain “the primary service centre for the Black Isle”. The community centre and the secondary school are already at capacity and needs no further expansion of their use. The IMFLDP refers to the Area being attractive for tourists. This suburban development imposed in a rural location detracts from the area and discourages tourism. Appendix 1: violations/ post award changes to the Master plan for Ness Gap (FR2) (2) Phasing: housing was to be constructed in phases B to G. After phase A the next phase constructed was phase G (A small development of 6 high cost houses.) (3) The total number of residential units shall not exceed 100 (added to the first phase this makes a total of 132). 157 houses are now proposed. (5) No more than 10 houses to be built before a traffic management plan is enacted. The houses now built exceed 30. The traffic plan is still not in place. (7iii) In general, a maximum of 1 1/2 storeys in height or lower where adjacent to existing single storey houses. There are now quite a large proportion of the houses built 2 storeys high. (7ix) Sustainable technologies (the houses are heated by oil fired heating). (11, 12, & 13) Restrictions on noise, high pitched reversing alarms, and dust suppression were all ignored. (32) Topsoil is not to be stripped from any area prior to notice of Initiation of Development – the whole site at an early date was transformed by a large muck shifting operation, (32) No weed control/ grass cutting has been carried out on undeveloped areas. (34) Landscaping of the proposed amenity area shall be carried out on completion of the first phase of the development. Work is now commencing on the third phase.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR2 Ness Gap

Customer Number 00920 Name Mr James Grant Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph General comment that refers to the whole docuiment

Reference No policy reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Little or no proposals are included in the IMFLDP.The Plan should include detailed proposals as the Coucils Policy to promote agriculture. The IMLDP should include for each area the proposals for promoting agriculture in that area.

Representation

Agricultureis one of the most important facets of our life, economy and culture in this area. It is fundamental to the prosperity and wellbeing of our communities, the landscape and habitat for both us and our wildlife, and the policy of sustainability which the Highland Council avers to support. Nothing in the Highlands is sustainable if we do not have the land or means to grow our food. The continued building on agricultural land is NOT sustainable and the Scottish Government and Highland Council’s policy of NOT building on good agricultural land should be rigorously enforced. It should err on the side of preventing the building on such land unless there is an absolute and overwhelming imperative for such building that can be demonstrated as providing that which is imperative to the sustainability of the Highlands. A social or economic reason is not sufficient cause. There should be in the plan a policy of supporting and promoting agriculture in the same way or in an even greater way than there is for promoting industrial and commercial development. The current policy for inexorable growth is flawed if we cannot retain and promote agriculture, the foundation on which everything else depends.

Allocated to Comments on the vision and spatial strategy

Customer Number 00920 Name Mr James Grant Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Pargraph 4.59 Fortrose and Rosemarkie

Reference Special Landscape Areas Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Further housing on land on the opposite side of Ness Road from the current Ness Gap Development (and site FR2).(Grid ref 2734E8567N was proposed in an earlier stage of the IMFLDP. it has not been included in the current Plan. This proposal, if reintroduced should be rejected because: It would be constructed on land of high agricultural value It would commence the coalescence of the two villages, which is strongly opposed by the communities (and by THC as stated in the proposed IMFLDP). It would increase traffic flows in existing village high street that are already overcapacity. It would increase unsustainable commuting to Inverness. Suburban development imposed in a rural location detracts from the area and discourages tourism. Highland Council states (para2.25) that they support development if infrastructure, services and facilities required are provided. No infrastructure or facilities are provided by this development; in fact it detracts from existing infrastructure, in particular the already inadequate road system in the area

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number 03120 Name Mr James MacDonald-Brown Organisation JMB Design

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.110 - 4.113

Reference H3 Main Issues Report Spring 2012 Type Change

Comment Changes

Re-interdiction of H3 of Main Issues Report Spring 2012

Representation

A Planning application Ref. No.12/00441/FUL was initially submitted after consultation with the councils Local Plan Section concerning what at that time was considered to be a natural extension of the village envelope and tidy up the entrance to the village, this was in the current application being initially withdrawing and resubmitted on the bases of the anticipated Spring 2012 I.M.F.L.P. which was in fact the case as per page 25 of the Main Issues Report. The proposal is now to withdraw the site from the I.M.F.L.P. due to objections from SEPA who has expressed concerns about flooding potential. We have 3 testimonials spanning between 50 – 70 years from residents who have lived on the site or in the vicinity of the site indicating the site hasn't in their experience flooding at any time. I would therefore doubt that SEPA's records extend back this far. I understand that at the public meeting in Beauly it was indicated to a representative of the client that if a Flood Risk Assessment was to be carried out satisfactorily and the house floor levels possible raised and submitted before April 2014 that the site could be reintroduced, therefore on that bases the client is prepared to commission a F.R.A.

Allocated to Inchmore General General

Customer Number 01353 Name Mr Jim Hutton Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Re -IMFDP page 141 site EV2

Reference Change between R&C East local plan inquiry Type Change

Comment Changes

Reinstate " Significant structural planting will be required between the development and the existing housing and on the eastern boundary of site" - this has been " softened to "landscaping to the east boundary with Culcairn"

Representation

I do not have any other objections to the development if appropriately designed, mixed housing with sensitive commercial use if there is landscaping as per inquiry

Allocated to Evanton EV2 Culcairn

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

IMFLDP – Comments and objections from Muirtown Community Council IN 17 Carse Road 16 Houses :- No comment IN 18 Glendoe Terrace, 50 Houses :- This appears to be the existing Co-op Supermarket site, If so we Strongly Object to the proposed change of use as the Co-op is a well used and valued facility which serves it's catchment area extremely well, with a wide range of additional services, over and above that of a normal supermarket. IN 19 Clachnaharry, 16 Houses, quarry site :- Object. We have had strong representations from the community which we fully support. The site is not suitable for housing, it is partly made up ground, is accessed off a dangerous bend on a road with an existing and well documented speeding problem, and is too close to listed Telford houses. The village does not have the necessary infrastructure to support more housing. The site should be retained as it is a wild green space nature area, habitat for indigenous plants and wildlife in an urban area. IN 20 Westerbraigs 37 Houses, business, retail :- As an existing long standing consent we have no objection but would recommend that the Council enforce on the developer the undelivered conditions regarding community woodlands, improved access roads etc attached to the original Craig Dunain Hospital consent. IN 21 Muirtown Basin, Scottish Canals to develop with the Council a masterplan /brief:- We strongly recommend, that there is no restriction on the current public access to the existing canal toepaths, that sufficient land be set aside and safeguarded to allow for future improvements to the existing Muirtown canal crossing (tunnel or second bridge)which constitutes one of the major traffic congestion problems in the City. There should also be a presumption against canal-side housing. IN 22 Highland Council HQ, 50 Houses, business, retaining Ardross St. listed building :- Express concern regarding the potential relocation of so many high salary jobs currently in close proximity to the failing City Centre IN 23 UHI relocating from former RNI. :- Express concern regarding further job relocations from the periphery of the City Centre. In 24 Torvean and Ness-side (north) :- Strongly object as much of this proposal assumes and depends on the approval and implementation of the Option 6 River and Canal crossings to which we Strongly Object and believe will not proceed following public enquiry. IN 25 Torvean Quarry Business and Tourism and temporary stop site for travelling people:- Strongly object to the travelling peoples site which is totally incompatible with the business and tourism proposals. This site is an important tourist gateway to the City and to Loch Ness and should be developed to enhance/ improve the visitor experience. The former quarry site has enormous potential as a country park and outdoor recreation and events arena. IN 29 Dunain Woodland, Community woodland :- Recommend that this area be protected for Community use and that the Council should be more proactive in ensuring that the Craig Dunain developer is more co-operative in their dealings with the Community Woodland Group in order that the woodland can be retained and further developed for the benefit of the community. In order that funding can be accessed it is important that a lease or ownership is obtained. IN 13 Former Longman Landfill Site. Waste management, energy from waste:- Strongly Object. Although not opposed to the waste to energy principle we believe that this is far too prominent a site for an incinerator. It is too close to the city centre and will sit incongruously between potentially high quality developments centred on the Marina and UHI, generating substantial HGV deliveries. This type of development should be located unobtrusively in a well screened more undeveloped location such as the former Daviot quarry or similar.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

1. We wish to see all the open land bordering the B817 from Mull Hall to Polnicol retained either for community or agricultural use. (We recognise that the land immediately adjacent to Mull Hall and Highland Park which borders the B817 has been tested by Ross Estates and because of the clay content of the underlying soil structure it is not suitable for residential development.) 2. We do not wish the existing expansion of Barbaraville to be increased above the current 30 houses. This impacts on the usage of the Delny Railway Crossing as any larger number of houses would mean that the crossing would have to be closed and traffic redirected either to the dangerous Tomich Junction or over the inadequate Garty Bridge. Any other alternative crossing should be the subject of a wide reaching community consultation. Currently new build houses in the village remain unsold such is the low demand – 1 in the old village (below the B817) and half a dozen within Highland Park. 3. We feel the plan should address the usage of the B817 from Invergordon to Kildary especially where speed limits impact on the quality of life and safety in the communities it passes through. Future commercial developments in Easter Ross demand that this issue should not be ignored. 4. We feel the plan should address the usage of the road from Nigg via Arabella especially where speed limits impact on the quality of life and safety in the communities it passes through. Future commercial developments in Easter Ross demand that this issue should not be ignored. 5. We note the recent Lamington Policy Assessment and Capacity Study and wish to see that this is recognised in the IMFDP. 6. We note that the plan does not address linking communities by footpath and that this leaves several communities “islands” only accessible by motor vehicle or by walking along dangerous roads. The plan neither addresses connectivity or any health aspects. This is at a time when communities are looking at linking Easter and Wester Ross by footpaths. The example of the Dalmore to Invergordon footpath is an example of what we should wish to achieve for all our communities. 7. We note that the plan does not take into account changes that will come about as a result of the current schools review and any subsequent school closures or building. These will impact on travel to school routes and areas and we wish to see that the area's infrastructure will cope with this both in terms of safety and accessibility. 8. We are supportive of any development of the Balnagown Quarry at Kildary, particularly for leisure or recreational use. 9. We are supportive of any development of the “other site” at Wester Tarbat which contrary to your Major Issues Report (7.29) is connected to Milton and elsewhere via footpaths and a regular bus service at the B817 road end (Stage Coach X25). 10. We feel the plan is incomplete without a definitive Crofting Land Map and details of the land's usage. This is particularly important in Arabella and Lamington as has been proved in recent planning cases.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01182 Name Mr John D Murrie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference MO4 Type Change

Comment Changes

Drainage from MO1 and MO4 combine, then flow through overloaded ditch system or my land at east Highfield on route to Logie Burn, the first main water course.

Representation

Technical supporting evidence supplied.

Allocated to Muir of Ord General General

Customer Number 01182 Name Mr John D Murrie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph 4.74

Reference MO1 Type Change

Comment Changes

The Plan on page 90 is incorrect and does not match approval 08/001140.FULRC. Site area and housing capacity for area shown allows for 35 houses and 30 completed. Green area to south and west formed part of 08/00140FULAC for 55 houses. Development work may extend beyond plan boundary or indeed local plan boundary. See attached notes.

Representation

Wet land area to North of site should no longer form part of area scheduled for housing development. Open ditch drainage and bank forming activity breached planning approval within wet land.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO1 Broomhill

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Introduce provision that any Drainage Impact Assessment or SUDS scheme relating to any development which may result in drainage waters flowing to the north of the Muir of Ord settlement (and which may, in any way, impact upon the agricultural drainage ditch between grid references NH 518 511 and NH 522 516) should have its discharge point assessed as being the point of discharge to the Logie Burn (grid reference NH 522 516).

Representation

We write on behalf of our client, John Murrie, to make comment on the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, with regard to drainage arrangements relating to development within the Muir of Ord village area, particularly those developments which may generally drain northwards towards our client's property. At present, there is a significant drainage discharge on the northern boundary of the area designated MO4. It is noted that this discharge feeds into an agricultural field drainage system (at grid reference NH 518 511) within our client's property before discharging to the Logie Burn at grid reference NH 522 516. The volumes of water being discharged into the agricultural drainage ditch at grid reference NH 518 511 as a result of previous development has caused significant and adverse impacts on the surrounding agricultural land and existing field drainage infrastructure. Our client has raised concerns regarding this impact on a number of occasions with Planning Officers of the Highland Council, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency and Scottish Water. Our client considers that it is inappropriate that such development drainage should be allowed to discharge into an agricultural field drainage system without appropriate assessment of those drains and ditches having been undertaken as part of a Drainage Impact Assessment or SUDS scheme, and associated mitigation and maintenance measures being put in place. As such, we would suggest that any Drainage Impact Assessment or SUDS Appraisal for future development, where drainage may ultimately flow towards the north of the Muir of Ord settlement, should include and have regard for the full extent of the agricultural drainage ditch running through our client's property (between grid references NH 518 511 and NH 522 516) where this is likely to be affected in any way and that the development proposals within the proposed Plan should make specific reference for this. It is further suggested that the appropriate discharge point for any Drainage Impact Assessment or SUDS scheme should be the point of discharge to the Logie Burn, being grid reference NH 522 516.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We have now had a chance to look at the latest iteration of the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan. There is a lot to commend the document and the way the consultation process has been conducted. The Ardross Community Council approve of the new proposed extension to the Hinterland for our area. And support the newly drawn hinterland map. This area now includes Stittenham which in recent years has come under development pressure for commuter based housing, on both sides of the B89176.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

On behalf of landowners, the Church of Scotland General Trustees and D & H Sutherland we request that the current Adopted Local Plan Housing Site Proposal 9: Knockmuir East, Avoch is maintained in the new LDP, and the section on Avoch (pages 123 to 126 of the Proposed LDP) is modified to specifically include this site as an existing housing site in the new LDP with capacity for the development of 30 units. The site should be recognised and included within the Avoch Settlement section on page 123 to 126 which lists Housing Sites and the Avoch Settlement Proposals Map on page 125 should be amended accordingly. The inclusion of the site within the new LDP and its allocation as an existing housing development opportunity would confirm the appropriate policy framework for the site reflecting its current local plan allocation and its established part of the Housing Land Supply.

Representation

On behalf of landowners, the Church of Scotland General Trustees and D & H Sutherland, we object to the failure of the Council to allocate the existing housing site at Knockmuir East, Avoch within the new LDP. The objection site is currently allocated for housing development in the adopted local plan – Proposal 9: Knockmuir East in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan – but was subject to a phasing restriction which prevented any development on the site taking place until after 2012. The objection site is also included within the Council’s most recent Housing Land Audit, but has been identified as being constrained due to the phasing restriction set out in the Adopted Local Plan. The principle of new housing development on the objection site has therefore been fully proven and established through its allocation in the Adopted Local Plan, and its inclusion within the Housing Land Audit. Given the phasing restriction (which was a specific requirement of the Adopted Local Plan) it is entirely appropriate, and indeed necessary, to have the site’s allocation reaffirmed in the new LDP. This approach would ensure that the new LDP maintains the fundamental presumption in favour of a plan-led system as it relates to Avoch. The current Local Plan identified a long-term spatial strategy for Avoch, including policies and proposals which related specifically to the objection site. This provided clarity for stakeholders on how planning outcomes for Avoch could be achieved, and provided a stable planning context to deliver the planned development, thus allowing coordination of stakeholders, phasing, financing and infrastructure investment over the long term. By ignoring this existing commitment and failing to allocate this existing development site, the Proposed LDP breaches this established approach to development planning. In doing so, the LDP seriously prejudices the landowners’ interests and conflicts with the long term strategy established in the 2007 Local Plan. This is an unacceptable outcome, and one that must be addressed either by the Council or the Reporter through the subsequent LDP Examination. The full ground of our objection are set out in the attached Statement of Objection. The extent of the objection site is highlighted on the location plan (Appendix 1). It is also allocated as Proposal 9: Knockmuir East in the Adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (Appendix 2 & 3) and further identified as Site Reference: AVCH9 in the most recently agreed (2010) Housing Land Audit (Appendix 4). This site has an extensive and long established planning status, and reflecting its allocation in the Adopted Local Plan, applications for full planning permission were submitted to Highland Council in December 2012 and registered in May 2013 (Application References: 13/01833/FUL and 13/01834/FUL). These applications are expected to be determined in early 2014. On behalf of our clients, we therefore request that the new LDP allocates the 2.2 hectare site to the north of Avoch as a housing development site with capacity for 30 units, along with a new access road, tree planting and landscaping. Justification for this suggested allocation is set out in the attached Statement, along with a review of the site’s planning history and a summary of its previous allocation in the Adopted Local Plan and inclusion in the Housing Land Audit.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. No final decision regarding the development should be made until traffic problems through Rosemarkie are resolved, Courthill Road is appropriately upgraded and safety issues addressed (Ref 4.62). 2. Consideration should be given to ensuring that any development does not compromise the future of a possible Rosemarkie by-pass which may eventually become essential. 3. If the development is to proceed, the maximum allocation of houses should not exceed 23 and be of an appropriate architectural standard in keeping with existing housing. 4 Any hydrological survey of FR1 should be carried out by consulting engineers visibly independent of developer interests.

Representation

INNER MORAY FIRTH PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN Ref: 01409 Comments on the proposals in relation to Rosemarkie and Fortrose General As a generality, Highland Council (HC) is in danger of losing democratic legitimacy by persistently favouring commercial and developer interests at the expense of the communities it is elected to represent and protect. References to expansion 'opportunities' and developer interests indicate clearly where HC's priorities lie. HC continues to display a propensity to pick and choose and, where convenient, disregard advice expensively garnered at Public Local Inquiries. Many of the comments on and objections to the previous Local Plan in respect of proposed developments at Fortrose and Rosemarkie are still valid and will not be rehearsed here. However, they remain relevant as HC has made no serious attempt to address them. Summarised in brief, these are that no further expansion takes place because: The A832 between Avoch and Fortrose is already acknowledged by HC as 'dangerous and of a major concern' and further expansion merely makes matters worse Fortrose High Street is not suitable (or safe) for the anticipated increased traffic flows (1) Fortrose and Rosemarkie reached their maximum, tolerable populations acceptable to the existing communities some time ago There are a number of other issues where it appears that commercial considerations seem to be favoured at the expense of interests widely held important to the communities affected. That the communities have experienced the fastest growth in the region (some 30%) is sufficient justification for further aggressive expansion is a HC boast too far. Road and street traffic capacity issues have long been a 'major concern' but HC chose to discard the advice offered by a Reporter a generation ago that no further expansion should take place until the Avoch-Fortrose road was upgraded. HC seems resolved to strain its democratic mandate beyond that which commands consent. Greenside development (FR1) HC is reminded that in the consultation phase of the preceding plan, a petition in Rosemarkie raised over 100 objectors to this development and that HC was unable to point to single instance of a community resident without a financial interest expressing support for the development. HC scornfully disregarded the petition but local sentiment remains unchanged. If HC wished to re-establish its democratic credentials, it might wish to test local opinion. What has changed since the previous consultation is the proposal to build 50 houses rather than the 30-35 proposed in the previous Plan. Even this latter density was considered by many to be excessive. The new proposal equates to a building density of 26.3 houses/ha at Greenside (FR1). At the Ness Gap (FR2), the housing density proposed is 13.5 houses/ha. If this density were to apply to FR1, only 23 houses would be appropriate. It is difficult to see how the proposed density could be achieved without it being 'dormitory housing' which HC says it has no wish to create (2). The planned housing density at Greenside is totally unacceptable and should be reduced by at least half. The proposed local plan refers to the developer being responsible (and presumably paying) for a hydrological survey of the site. This is not merely odd but may lend credence to the suspicion that whoever pays the piper, calls the tune. To believe otherwise is naive. The HC, as the authority vested with the responsibility for planning, should consider employing professional, consulting engineers, independent of all parties so that the community may have confidence in the drainage provision when the developer is long gone. If the development at Greenside (FR1) is to proceed, the community of Rosemarkie will expect HC to respect its previous acceptance that the architecture exemplified at Greenside Avenue and Ryebank was of a disappointing standard and would not be replicated in FR1. Should it proceed, the proposed development must meet higher standards and also reflect the character of existing housing already in that area (3). Courthill Road The Development Plan makes no specific reference to Courthill Road other than a possibility of closure. There is a vague and totally inadequate mention of 'a need to consider the implications of further development on the local road network . . . ' There is no indication as to who will do the considering. This 'consideration' must be visibly independent and not subject to developer interference. HC should also be aware that Courthill Road, designated 'Access Only' with 'No Entry' at the northern end, single-track, occasionally flooded, rutted and potholed, one way over part of its length with a gradient of 10-15% in places, in effect, already serves (illegally) as a de facto by-pass for Rosemarkie. This state of affairs has come about since HC reduced the High Street in Rosemarkie to a single carriageway chicane on which traffic comes to a halt whenever a bus stops and fares are negotiated or commercial vehicles service local shops. Road users, frustrated by the frequent delays to traffic on the High Street, see Courthill Road as a fast-track to and from the rest of the Black Isle. HC should be aware that

a serious accident is waiting to happen on Courthill and the present situation cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. If Courthill Road is closed as suggested, the situation on Rosemarkie High Street, with its elaborate chicane may become untenable when through traffic currently (improperly) on Courthill Road is re-directed along the High Street. The prospect of a Rosemarkie by-pass may not be that long deferred. Since the only possible route for a true by-pass lies through the proposed Greenside (FR1) development, the preferred advice should be that plans for that development be abandoned until such time as Rosemarkie's severe traffic problems are resolved. If it decides to proceed with FR1, even with a reduced number of houses, HC should ensure that an appropriate road lay-out is planned so that a by-pass is not rendered impossible in future. This requires only the exercise of intelligent anticipation of future traffic needs and may be easily achieved by arranging a lay-out which complies with statutory guidance through the proposed housing development with adequate width and appropriate verge provision. Posterity will not deal kindly with HC (or its successors) if it falls short of this requirement or fails to demonstrate adequate forward planning. All that is sought, if the FR1 development is to proceed, is that HC make explicit a commitment that the planned road lay-out at least does not preclude for all time the possibility of a Rosemarkie by-pass which may be needed eventually. It is now time for HC to come off the fence and declare unequivocally whether it is prepared to make such provision or make explicit its opposition to a by-pass for all time recognising that such opposition irrevocably affects future generations whose needs and aspirations HC seems prepared to compromise. To restore community confidence that its concerns are taken seriously, HC should retain consulting engineers (visibly independent) to assess the issues raised here in relation to the intended development and to offer proposals to protect Rosemarkie's future. If HC comes to a decision driven by short term expediency or developer interests, it should not be surprised at the obloquy which will surely follow and it will forever be held accountable for the outcome. The community expects its elected representatives to protect its interests from unrestrained expansion and awaits HC's decision. Summary: HC should restrain developer zeal and accept the recommendation of an earlier Reporter that there should be no further development in Fortrose and Rosemarkie until such time as the widely perceived 'dangerous' A832 between Avoch and Fortrose is upgraded and problems with Fortrose High Street adequately resolved. Should HC choose to disregard earlier advice and permit further development, then no more than 23 houses of an appropriate architectural standard should be built at Greenside (FR1) thereby conforming to the housing density proposed for the Ness Gap (FR2). If (and when) it is decided that the development at Greenside (FR1) should proceed, the road lay-out should be such that a possible by-pass connecting Rosemarkie to the rest of the Black Isle is not forever precluded by poor planning decisions taken at this time. HC should give serious consideration to a future Rosemarkie by-pass even if this is to be long delayed. In order to ensure that any such decision is recognisably objective and command local acceptance, HC must seek independent advice on a matter that is, one way or another, irrevocable. As a matter of urgency, the hazards associated with Courthill Road must be fully addressed. Addendum 1. Reporter 2005, Section 31 'Regarding the infrastructure, the weight of objections suggests that the biggest issue is the road capacity. It is unfortunate that there is no timetable for the improvement of the Avoch to Fortrose section of the A832, but the council says that it is committed to this. And I note that designs have been prepared including the provision of cycle lanes' – and yet the evidence appears that the council is NOT committed to this. Current traffic volume in Fortrose is ~4000/day and the capacity is reduced to ~1500 by on street parking. Reporter suggests: 'The roads authority will examine a suitable traffic management scheme with the local community and developers. There will be a presumption against significant additional development taking place until the scheme has been implemented.' 2. Reporter 2005, Section 9 'The Council says it has no wish or policy approach to create dormitory housing in the local plan area.' 3. Reporter 2005, Section 21 'On my site inspection I visited Greenside Avenue and Rye Bank, referred to at the discussion and in written submissions. These recent developments are uncharacteristic of Rosemarkie and would be inappropriate at Greenside Farm. The council acknowledges this, and design is referred to in the developer requirements, pointing out that it must take account of the surroundings.'

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The justification for proposed development is weak. Field 16. "Bulls cannot now....." 1. If bulls cannot use the field, how can heavy machinery for building? 2. Field 19 "There is no longer a safe work area for tractors at bottom." If true, how can it be safe for building machinery? 3. There is no mention anywhere of the agricultural land being offered to another farm. 4. The artifical food drainage channel on the east side of the field is above the level of the field. This channel has not had time to prove that it will not lead to flooding an area lower lying than itself. It seems to me the Crofters Commision's case is weak and its only justification is raising money to pay for a bull stud development. Fuller details of their consultation process need to be made available to the public to ensure that their decision stands scrutiny.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Loss of green field site.Building 30 houses exiting on to Lodgehill road then to crossroads at Waverely Road is adding far to much traffic to a very busy crossroads which caters for 3 schools and 2 nurserys this road is also main access from west side of Nairn to doctors surgery and Nairn hospital.Football pitch would have to be shifted they would also need room for training on Tuesday and Thursday as training on pitch would ruin it.Parking on Saturday 30th November 29 cars parked on field and 1 bus from visiting team on Lodgehill road.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Primary school on this site should be a preferred option over retail development.

Representation

The Council should acknowledge the low level of local support for any retail development on this site and the high level of support for a primary school, as well as considering the outcome of the Sustainable School Estates Review. Many of us find it hard to believe that an additional primary school in this area can be 'surplus to educational needs' if the local demographic is to be diversified.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Also in Mr Daly's ownership is land to the south east of Knockbreck House which was identified as a "preferred" site MU2 in the MIR with potential for the medium to longer term development and intended to complement the uses on TN5. With the exception of the former roads depot at the southern tip of the site and its potential to be brought back into use in the short term (see our submission above under TN5), our client accepts reference in paragraph 4.82 to the longer term development potential of this land.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Change the text to reflect the fact that the planning status of the land in our client's ownership now has planning permission under 10/02217/PIP. 2. Indicate the fact that not all the land covered by the proposed TN5 allocation benefits from that permission or delete it from the plan. If the former the housing potential requires to be increased and the site area amended. 3. Add the tennis club, car park and land for expansion to the allocation as covered by the planning permission under 10/02217/PIP. 4. Include the former roads maintenance depot and Toll House to the south east of the Strawberry Field within this allocation and the SDA boundary. 5. Explain or delete reference to "avoidance of any adverse effect on the integrity of Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet SPA/Ramsar through preparation of a Recreation Access Management Plan".

Representation

We act for Mr Leo Daly who owns the largest proportion of the land allocated under TN5. Our initial comment is to support the inclusion of this land in the Proposed Plan and to confirm its availability. However, we have a number of comments about the extent of land covered by the allocation and question the need for additional assessments mentioned in the written statement over and above those already carried out in the process of recently securing the Planning Permission in Principle. The largest proportion of this land is covered by the permission granted under 10/02217/PIP for a mix of uses supported by a master plan. This permission was eventually issued on 22 October 2013 almost three years after Committee approval and following a protracted Section 75 Agreement process. The development of the Asda supermarket on adjoining land at Knockbreck Road has effectively opened up the development of TN5 initially to provide a significant amount of effective housing land. However, not all of the land included in the allocation benefits from permission granted under 10/02217/PIP. The land in question is in the ownership of the Bannerman and Baxter families, which is indicated on the attached plans including a copy of the Inset Map. It is therefore incorrect for the Plan to refer to "development in accordance with Permission in Principle 10/02217/PIP" for these areas. These will require to be the subject of a separate application for permission. The text of the Plan should reflect this or alternatively these areas of land should be separate allocations. The permission for 250 houses, business, commercial and community uses is therefore only confined to Mr Daly's land. If the TN5 allocation is to cover this other land then the housing capacity will need to be increased beyond 250 house/flats. In other words any potential for residential development on the Bannerman and Baxter land should not be subtracted from the 250 permitted on our client's land. The site area also needs to be amended if these areas not benefitting from planning permission are to continue to form part of the TN5 allocation. In addition, this allocation should also cover the tennis club, its car park and part of the Baxter land for its potential expansion, which did form part of the permission. We also question reference to "avoidance of any adverse effect on the integrity of Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet SPA/Ramsar through preparation of a Recreation Access Management Plan". This requirement was not included in the Planning Permission granted and there is no explanation anywhere else in the text of what a Recreation Access Management Plan is or entails. In the absence of such an explanation this requirement should be deleted from the text. The former roads maintenance depot and Toll House to the south east of the Strawberry Field was allocated as a business site in the adopted R&CELP (see attached extract from the adopted Plan). However, it is not allocated in the Proposed Plan and is indeed now located outside the Settlement Development Area with no explanation given in the report on MIR submissions of why this is omitted. As this site can be accessed from the superseded part of the A9, in the same way as the Strawberry Field part of TN5, we feel that this area should be added to the TN5 allocation and therefore re-included within the Settlement Development Area. To illustrate comments made the above we attach a single pdf file with the following plans: - (1) Copy of application site plan for 10/02217/PIP also indicating allocated land that does not benefit from this permission. (2) Main Land Uses and Overall Development Framework Plan from approved site Master Plan document indicating areas not benefitting from the planning permission. (3) Extract from the Proposed Plan Inset Map for Tain indicating (a) the areas not benefitting from the planning permission, (b) the former roads depot and Toll House land and (c) the tennis club land etc.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

There is an ongoing military requirement for retention of the Cameron Barracks site for at least the next five years. Any change in the status of the site will be subject to a review as part of ongoing wider basing optimisation studies.

Representation

Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan Central Inverness Proposal IN7 - Cameron Barracks Representation on Behalf of the Ministry of Defence (MOD) by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). 1. MOD notes the policy approach to the regeneration of Central Inverness and the focus on the re-use of previously developed land. The MOD welcomes the flexible and encouraging stance adopted by the Plan in terms of development proposal for potentially surplus sites, including land at Cameron Barracks. 2. The MOD notes the identification of the Cameron Barracks site for mixed use development (Site IN7) of 7 hectares, accommodating business uses, up to 65 houses as well as potentially community and tourism uses. MOD notes that to facilitate development the Council will require a master plan or development brief for the site which deals with the impact on listed buildings; the impact of any proposed development on mature woodland and includes retention of both existing access routes including the traffic signalled controlled junction on New Perth Road. 3. The current primary use for Cameron Barracks is that of training establishment for regular and TA units embarking on training exercises across the Highlands. It accommodates a number of support staff in particular those associated with the Fort George Ranges. There are some 300 bed spaces, messing facilities, a laser range, assembly room, canteen and sports pitch. In essence, the site provides a facilities hub for training and is the springboard for units accessing training across the Highlands. 4. In relation to the Army Reserves the Barracks are used by the TA and Cadets (based at the Gordonville Road Centre) in part as a training base. At present this is an ongoing requirement. 5. The site also provides accommodation for Facilities Management Contractors as well as hosting IT facilities for the area. Conclusion 6. There is an ongoing military requirement for retention of the Cameron Barracks site for at least the next five years. Any change in the status of the site will be subject to a review as part of ongoing wider basing optimisation studies.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Fully concur with development recommendations for Avoch, under the consideration for more discreet building in such a beautiful conservation village. In particular support para 4.125, and specifically -quote"to the North of Avoch opportunities are limited due to prominence in the landscape,limitations of its local roadwork and by presence of amenity woodland "

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

To include the representations for mixed use in the Proposed Plan in Section 5 below.

Representation

PROPOSED INNER MORAY FIRTH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN BLAIRBEG WOOD, DRUMNADROCHIT. It is proposed that 4 house plots are created on the south west edge of Blairbeg Wood. 2 plots would be on the edge of the woodland and 2 on the site of the adjoining brewery. All 4 plots would be accessed from a new private lane off Kilmore Road providing off-street parking for all plots. The remaining area of woodland would be gifted to the local community possibly via the Glenurquhart Greenspace Community Company. The original submission for inclusion in the Local Plan was for 3 plots on the edge of the woodland. Following extensive consultations with the Planning Department their concerns regarding loss of trees have been taken on board and a revised submission is proposed for 2 plots occupying a smaller area of the wood. It was also agreed that there would be compensatory planting in other parts of Drumnadrochit by the community company, prior to development of the plots, of more trees than would be removed and that this could be the subject of a 'condition' of any Planning Permission in Principle. It is envisaged that the development would be carried out at the same time as the adjacent plots, the site currently being occupied by Loch Ness Brewery. The owners of the Brewery, formerly the Royal British Legion and latterly the Blarmor Bar, wish to relocate to larger premises with the expectation of additional jobs being created locally. This also removes an industrial use from this otherwise residential area. The new proposal is for 4 good quality houses to blend in with the existing properties and form a compact group. The development will be screened from Kilmore Road by new tree and shrub planting and every reasonable effort made to protect existing trees on the site. We are mindful of the presumption against loss of any trees but submit that the social, economic and environmental benefits to the Community will outweigh the presumption in this instance. The community will decide how they wish to manage the majority of the wood for the benefit of all. It is not for the present owners to say, but it is hoped there will be regeneration and the wood brought back to a healthy condition, increased use by the public with the upgrading of footpaths, installation of benches etc., and compensatory planting elsewhere. The wood would form part of the green corridor between Coiltie Crescent and the proposed development on the land to its south west (DR6 in the Proposed LDP) to the wider village network. It is appreciated that developments of less than 10 houses will as a rule not be included and put before the Reporter for consideration in the current Local Plan proposals, but it is submitted that the above raises matters other than simply size. We therefore request that it be referred to the Scottish Ministers for consideration by the Reporter.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Macdonald Estates Plc are seeking changes to land allocations in East Inverness, to allocate the land at Balloch Farm, as identified in the attached Development Framework Document, for mixed uses. Specifically, it is sought that land to the north and northwest of Sites IN86 and IN87 should be allocated for residential development and associated uses in connection with the promoted community uses identified at Sites IN86 and IN87. In addition, Macdonald Estates Plc are seeking the inclusion of the overall site of Balloch Farm (as identified in the attached Development Framework Document), within the settlement boundary of Inverness.

Representation

The adopted Highland Wide Local Development Plan recognises that there is development pressure in the Inner Moray Firth Area, and this demand needs to be addressed whilst acknowledging the constraints that exist in the area. Not only do housing land allocations need to provide land for future housing requirements, but also to meet the backlog of housing provision which is the effect of the “economic downturn”. This approach should be adapted in the progression of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, by promoting effective sites able to meet current and future housing needs in the area. The Summary of Issues and Recommended Responses to the Highland Wide LDP Main Issues Report provided by Highland Council stated that Balloch has the potential to contribute to the wider strategy for Inverness, and the longer term strategy beyond this local development plan. In addition, the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan Main Issues Report recognised the development potential promoted for Balloch Farm, and identified part of the site for mixed uses (MU31), which in the Proposed Plan (Committee Version) had been retained within the settlement boundary, albeit without any specific land allocation. We acknowledge the previous recognition that this land has the potential to provide for the future growth and expansion of Inverness to meet housing need and demand, and believe that there is no justification for the removal of the potential development opportunities at Balloch Farm. As such, the site of Balloch Farm – as promoted in attached Development Framework Document - should be progressed within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. Therefore, we object to the proposed designation of part of site at Balloch Farm as outwith the settlement boundary of Inverness (in part), and object to the sole allocation of Sites IN86 and IN87 for community and open space uses. We believe that the site of Balloch Farm, in its entirety – as promoted in the attached Development Framework Document - has the potential to create an attractive residential environment, together with community and open space uses, which the current allocations promoted in the Proposed Plan do not recognise. As such, the site in its entirety should be recognised as a mixed use development opportunity, including the community uses as promoted in the Proposed Plan. We believe that Balloch Farm creates a short-medium term opportunity to promote development in the A96 corridor, and specifically the Inverness Housing Market Area, where other sites are constrained. In addition, the promotion of development on the site of Balloch Farm for housing with associated mixed uses, would also allow for the extension and improvement of recreational facilities at Culloden Academy, the formalisation of green/open space in the area, the provision of community uses for use by proposed and existing residents, and the creation of an established buffer between the settlements of Culloden and Balloch. The overarching benefits of the proposed development at Balloch Farm, in terms of Culloden Academy and designated open space/green space provision should not be forgotten in the consideration of the site for the development of mixed uses, including housing. In relation to the promotion of the land at Balloch Farm for future development, we wish to comment as follows: • The site is flat and developable, and is effective within the short-medium term, in phases if appropriate. • The promotion of mixed uses in the development of Balloch Farm would provide community facilities in an area where they are currently lacking. This would be of benefit to proposed and existing residents. •The green buffer promoted along Barn Church Road, and the retention of land to the south of Barn Church Road (as detailed in the Development Framework Document) for green/open space ensures that there is no coalescence between the settlements of Culloden and Balloch. • Proposed road works are promoted as part of the wider development proposals for Balloch Farm. We note that A96 trunk road improvements are currently being progressed, and this will continue within the lifetime of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. In addition, this site benefits from accessibility to the local public transport system and the proposed development encourages walking and cycling through the site and beyond with the creation of walkways/tracks throughout the site. • We acknowledge that the proposed development will result in the loss of farmland. However, we believe that the proposed development has wider benefits to the community and creates an attractive development site that can accommodate growth in the Inverness area. We propose that Balloch Farm should be identified and supported through the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as an effective development site for mixed uses, including housing, with cumulative benefits to the local communities of Balloch and Culloden. This site promotes a viable development opportunity able to be progressed within the lifetime of the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. As detailed in the

supporting Development Framework Document, Balloch Farm has the potential to provide residential uses constituting of approximately 500 homes, community facilities, local shops and recreational space. The potential allocation of this land for future development also creates the opportunity to provide land for the expansion of, and improvements to, Culloden Academy and introduce public facilities and services that are not currently available in the local area. The proposed layout and setting of the development opportunities at Balloch Farm promotes a sensitive expansion area which integrates the built and natural environment, and retains the semi-rural character of the wider locale. This is an effective and viable housing site that can be realised within the lifetime of the local development plan. The Council should consider allocating sites that can be potentially delivered in a shorter timeframe to avoid deficiencies emerging in the provision of housing land. This would ensure an adequate and generous land supply is available. The full potential of Balloch Farm as a housing release site is detailed in the accompanying Development Framework Document prepared by Mill Architects.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Please refer to attached representation. Seeking a change to the Proposed Plan to indicate the identification of land at Mullans Wood, near Tore, for Industrial use.

Representation

The contributor made previous representations (see attached representaiton in full); seeking the identification of land for industrial use. This is based on an extant planning permission for a recycling centre (now operational) and the availability of further land at the site for expansion of industrial uses. Further details justifying the proposal are found in the attached representation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Focus on existing centres First and foremost, we very much welcome the Council’s clear theme and focus of the draft Plan on supporting and enabling the development of existing centres of population. This is something we have previously encouraged the Council to adopt, and we are delighted our endeavours have borne fruit. But we remain deeply concerned about the Council’s continued determination to develop East Inverness and Tornagrain – indeed we find the Council’s attitude on this intention incongruous. As we have previously said (and as the Council accepts by saying in para 3.10 of the draft Plan “Countering the pull of Inverness...”) the inevitable consequence will be that population and jobs will haemorrhage from across the Highland into the Corridor, so negating otherwise more welcome provisions of the Plan for developing existing communities. Furthermore, there is no case now, nor in the foreseeable future, for new developments at East Inverness and Tornagrain – even on a ‘scaled-back’ basis - when Inverness itself is crying out for investment, and when impending cuts in defence spending are likely to have severe economic effects for Moray and Nairnshire. It is extremely likely that a substantial number of people will travel to work in Inverness from West Moray and Nairn, negating the need for more housing East of Inverness, and these developments could compete with much-needed reinvestment there. Rather, it is vital to retain the ‘green lung’ space between the complexes of Beechwood and those at Westhill, Stratton and Culloden. Once designated for ‘concrete’ development, there will be no going back. The whole area should be designated as open space, of which the district park should take up the majority of land.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Inverness District Park: We welcome the provision for a district park in East Inverness (though we note this was also a provision of the 2006 Inverness local plan!). We (therefore) particularly welcome the Council's intention to prepare supplementary guidance on this and other Ashton Farm-related issues, and by Summer 2014. Inverness bus and rail stations: We are particularly disappointed with (p 33 of the Transport Appraisal) the designation of relocating the bus station nearer to the rail station as a 'long-term aspiration'. The Council makes much of its plans to revitalise the city-centre. Arguably, the bus and rail stations relocation issue needs to be addressed first and as a priority, so that other redevelopment plans can be drawn up around that plan. Putting off this key issue makes a nonsense of further discussion about city-centre redevelopment. West and East Links: The Council makes much of its proposals for West and East Links, but as the Council knows, the business case for the West Link is very weak, and no business case at all has been made by the Council for an East Link. If the Council is so set on a West Link, it should comprise a bridge for pedestrians and cyclists only, which would give ready access to the Bught Park/Whin Island facilities for those staying to the East of the canal and river. The East Link proposal should be dropped entirely – there is little or no traffic demand for it, and its imposition would decimate the Beechwood and planned Aston District Park. Rail: We would welcome a specific provision for a Beechwood/Inverness Light-Rail Shuttle and Halt to be included in the Plan. The case for this facility is strong, and growing stronger, particularly with the recent planning application for student accommodation at Rose St. (NB The halt would be 'off' the main-line, in a siding. We would not expect main-line trains to stop at the halt). We anticipate that the shuttle would run approx every twenty minutes. Such provision would tie-in well with the Council's proposals for a Park-and-Ride facility Energy-from-waste plant provision: We very much welcome the proposals in the draft Plan to make more use of the Longman area for industrial purposes. However, we object in the strongest possible terms – and indeed we see no reason to include - any proposal to designate any part of this area, here or elsewhere in Inverness, for an energy-from-waste facility. There has been no prior public consultation specific to this proposal on this, a well-known controversial issue, with potential wide ranging impacts, and no business case is provided in the draft Plan. The current text goes on to state that the Council will produce a masterplan/development brief for the area; we welcome that intention, which would comprise a useful starting point for any debate on the detailed future use of the site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

2.20 transport Transport: While we welcome some of transport provisions included in the draft Plan and the Transport Appraisal, but we are disappointed that – for the areas for which the Council has sole or lead responsibility - there is such strong focus on road schemes and comparatively little in the way of specific green/active travel measures. Cycling: We welcome the Council’s proposals for an Inverness-Fort William Cycle Route, and the Inverness-East Inverness walking/cycling route, we are disappointed that these appear to be the only two specific cycling projects proposed. This is extremely disappointing , particularly given the Council’s green pronouncements, not least at its recent ‘Carbon Clever’ conference. We recommend that The Council prepare a dedicated cycle/footpath network programme, at least for the main population centres in the short term, and allocate funding for this programme. (Inverness) Park and Ride: We are very enthusiastic about the concept, and we urge the Council to introduce the scheme as soon as possible.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

3.19 Improvements identified as being required for the "Munlochy Junction" on the A9. Until this happens, the brown tourist signs should be removed. 3.20 Core path between Munlochy & Avoch needs to start at N Kessock 4.161 site ML4 needs to be reserved for Education & Community 4.162 NK1 & NK2. Strip of land over gas pipe line to be allocated to Community use. 4.163 Dispute "facilities beyond expectations" ;4.164 Current Local Plan has NK2 for "Leisure Business"- should not be widened. This paragraph (NK2) is ambiguous.

Representation

3.19 Improvements identified as being required for the "Munlochy Junction" on the A9. The original policy for this junction was not to have any brown Tourist signs advertising this route in order to avoid tourist buses coming through Munlochy. . We are not aware of any change in policy, but the Brown signs advertising the junction appeared some years ago. There is still a voluntary ban on lorries carrying timber coming through the village. It seems strange that the similar policy of not encouraging tourist buses has been forgotten about. The School bus to Fortrose Academy has had to use the route via Tore since Double Decker bus ended up in a field at Bog Allan. 3.20 The main issue for cyclists and walkers en route from North Kessock to Cromarty using current paths and roads is the route between the Munlochy War Memorial (near Littleburn Bridge and Munlochy Church. 4.161 (ML4) Any Plans for new schools depends on what happens in Fortrose, Avoch and Tore all of which could be subject to delays especially regarding the new housing developments in Tore. This site therefore needs long term protection from being used for housing. It should be labelled as Education and Community use. 4.161(ML5) . It will tidy up an eyesore for the village and allow safer access to the Killen/Culbokie Road .There is no mention of what happens to the filling station and the loss of this facility to the area. 4.162 (NK1 and NK2) The strip of land over the gas pipe line should be allocated for Community use. It would make an ideal Community Allotment. Knockbain CC has undertaken to explore the safety restrictions but would point out that there are currently Leylandia growing in close proximity to the high pressure gas junction. 4.163 It is not logical to state that 4.163 It is not logical to state that North Kessock has "facilities beyond expectations", and at the same time advocate the opening of a new petrol station with a shop. The current shop might not be able to survive if such a venture was to open, The current shop provides a social as well as a business function for the village. It is also in the correct location for the many leisure boats expected to visit the revitalised Community Pier. The village is about to lose social, welfare and business space with the imminent closure of the Mission Hall beside the old sandstone pier. Social and Community facilities had previously been earmarked at NK1. 4.163 The land to the west at Craigton needs to have a protected access corridor. The narrow road into Craigton is under an imminent threat of collapse. It would require major reconstruction which would be made easier by the retention of such a protected corridor. 4.164 The footpath link under the Kessock bridge does not require a massive engineering project . The path and steps up to the bridge are already in place on the East side (South bound) of the bridge. This would encourage more people (especially under 20) to use the many buses crossing the bridge which do not call in at North Kessock. 4.164(NK2) Any business for this site should be as in the current local plan for leisure businesses. The paragraph needs to be re-written to make it clear that building on this site (NK2) should only be once the golf course is under development, It is worth pointing out that the original reason for the housing to go ahead on the west side of the burn and tree belt contrary to the findings of the Scottish Office Reporter was that they would be amenity housing on the border of the golf course. Delaying construction on (NK2) would be for the benefit of residents at the North West edge of NK1

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I would like to endorse the decision to stop development to the east of the village. Filling the central portion of the village in areas IC1 and IC2 will encourage more heart to the village and less ribbon style development. I would support only development with IC1 &2. It is not clear from the plan whether development is to be permitted within the boundary that has not been specifically identified in the plan.The amenity area in to the north of the old primary school is similarly not identified for specific safeguarding and I would wish this area to be safeguarded for amenity use.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

A cycle path from Beauly to Inverness should be part of the infrastructure requirements for Beauly and surrounding communities

Representation

There are an increasing number of cyclists using the A862 to commute to Inverness, I feel that a specific cycle path should be developed to provide a safe route for cyclists. It is a fast road and very narrow in sections. Furthermore at a strategic level a cycle route around the Beauly Firth would provide both commuter, leisure and tourist use for cycling from and to Inverness. This would further enhance the town of Beauly as a tourists destination as a day trip from Inverness.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Allocate areas within and to the eastern end of the North Kessock Settlement for residential development as detailed and shaded pink on the plans submitted with this representation, and which are allocated within the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan 2006, Chapter 29 "North Kessock", and identified within the corresponding inset plan as area number "2" for such use.

Representation

On behalf of our client, Peter Rattray, we write to promote the re-allocation of two areas of land to the eastern end of the North Kessock Settlement (as identified and shaded pink on the plan submitted with this representation) for residential development. The areas being proposed are considered to be suited to such development and are allocated within the current adopted Local Plan for the area, the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan 2006, Chapter 29 "North Kessock" and identified within the corresponding inset plan as "Area 2" for residential development. Whilst we understand that the Council consider that the general policies within the proposed Development Plan may provide support for residential development on these areas which lie within the settlement boundary, it is of considerably greater comfort and assistance in considering promoting an area for such development to have this formally allocated. Further, allocation of these areas would provide an opportunity for a balance and a variety of development opportunities throughout the settlement, as opposed to having this focused entirely at the western periphery.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the scale of the proposed development, reduced to a level in line with the organic growth requirements, of the existing settlement. I would like a reduction in the amount of prime agricultural land, that would be lost to this development. I would like the development limited to the proposed development areas, which are adjacent to new school.

Representation

I consider the scale of the proposed development to be wholly inappropriate; it will ruin the village by changing it beyond any recognition. Whilst I see the need for the settlement to grow, the proposed development is excessive. I question the requirement for a further 300 residential units over the next 18 years, an increase of over 500%, which also goes against the conservation area status of the village. I question that the school has sufficient capacity to support the village growing by 500%. The development of prime agricultural land should be kept to an absolute minimum. Some of the land is amongst the highest grade of agricultural land in Scotland and also tenanted, the loss of this will impact on the existing tenants businesses. The development should be restricted to areas adjacent to the new school, where the traffic and pedestrian infrastructure, has already been upgraded. Unless planning consent is conditional on a certain number of home/work units, the chances that Cawdor remaining a dormitory village but at a larger scale are considerable.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Access Issues onto/from the proposed site.

Representation

The Development area DW6 which is deemed suitable for Industrial/Commercial/Residential usage will have severe access issues,especially for HGV's who will be turning onto a very dangerous junction and immediately faced with a blind summit over the Railway line.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Part of the land contained within the red boundary(DW6) is my garden and I would wish it removed before submission to the Scottish Government. I have shaded the land referred to and will POST this to you.Please ensure this amendment is made. By simply saying (at the open meeting) that mapping errors will be addressed post submission does not wash with me,as once approved by the Scottish Government,this will have the look of sinister solidity about it.

Representation

The land chosen and bounded by red box DW6 is unsuitable for development due to the drainage issues and flood risk.In developing the site,water run off will have an unintended but very real effect upon mine and other properties.With us being so close to the sea and the hinterland being so flat,even the most sophisticated of drainage will fail at high tides and during periods of wet weather. It was just 2 years ago that we saw extensive and damaging flooding to properties and I have ample photographic evidence to support such. I will try to attach these,but my PC struggles with attachments so I will also POST these as back up. Whilst I appreciate that a drainage survey /evaluation will be required,I was informed (at open meeting) that this is commissioned by and for the developer,and perhaps cynically I've yet to see any report of any genre that doesn't tell the paymaster what they want to hear.I can only therefore hope that both THC and SEPA afford any report due diligence and a questioning and robust response.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

My concerns are mainly for the Cawdor area as it appears that they have not listened to the views of the people who submitted there views or objections as nothing had changed significantly from the original plan that has followed Cawdor Estates "Masterplan" that the Estate devised many years ago when it appeared that the economy was going well. Although the number of houses planned has diminished I believe it is still excessive for Cawdor and should be reviewed due to the present economic climate and the fact that these houses were all subject to the increase in employment in the local area. Can I ask Highland Council where this employment base is coming from because for the foreseeable future I don't see anything happening in the Highlands for many years. Any plan should now reflect the changes in the demography as it would appear that the annual gain in migration during 2012 was only 87, as opposed to the projected gain of 1650 on which the IMFLDP is based. The road network in and around the Cawdor/Nairn area would have to be improved significantly if the number of houses that is proposed goes ahead. As the Scottish Government have not committed to the Nairn by-pass this would also generate an additional amount of cars in the Cawdor area as the B9090 is used as a "rat-run" by motorists who wish to by-pass Nairn. The infrastructure in the Nairn area needs to be in place and funded before any development gains approval. I also have concerns on the access to any development in the Newton Road area, the road is just not suitable for the amount of traffic this amount of housing would generate and widening it would be a major undertaking and not feasible in places. This area of Cawdor would also become a ribbon development in many peoples opinion and the destruction of habitats for wildlife, especially red squirrels, oystercatchers, is of concern. I would object to any significant building along Newton Road as it would also become a satellite area of the main village of Cawdor and lose some of its distinctive character. Planning permission has already been granted for 10,000 houses between Inverness and Nairn, as very little building activity has taken place since this has been granted, I question the need for more housing in the surrounding areas. There are very few job opportunities in the Morayfirth area in comparison to the Easter Ross area so I would suggest that this is an area of growth were more housing should be concentrated on. The Inverness Airport Business Park does not seem to be attracting the companies that are supposed to be providing the job opportunities as predicted, this is going to have a major impact on the need for housing in and around the airport. I would also question Conservation status of the village as well once Cawdor has been built up to this high density. Yes, there is a need for more housing in and around the Cawdor area, however, if it was organic growth and land was made available for this would be more in keeping with the way Cawdor has grown over the years. Whilst many residents in the Nairn and Cawdor area see the need for more housing, many of them question the proposed 600% increase and the loss of prime agricultural land that will put pressure on the inadequate roads and infrastructure. If houses are to be built in Cawdor the areas that should be considered are in the village itself and around the school.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Greater emphasis on land designations to support future growth of the railway at a number of loci throughout the area.

Representation

RAIL TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE FoFNL is pleased to see the Inverness to Tain and Inverness to Nairn railways shown on the opening map as being "improved railways." Rail is an environmentally friendly and sustainable transport mode which is a vital alternative for the Highlands, especially if oil supplies run short for economic or global political reasons. We see considerable future increases in both passenger and freight traffic. It is important to ensure that land is safeguarded in all appropriate places to allow doubling of running tracks and construction of sidings and to allow easy access by both passengers and goods vehicles. Any developments proposed close to the railway should be examined very carefully with this in mind. See next paragraph for practical examples of where this has not happened. On page 9 we would agree that the line from Inverness to Dalcross Airport and preferably also on to Nairn should be significantly improved to become a double track railway. We would point out that previously built road bridges for the A9 at Raigmore Interchange and for the A96 at Gollanfield are too narrow for this and would have to be altered at some cost. The line north towards Dingwall is at capacity at certain times of day and needs the reinstatement of the former double track section between Clachnaharry and Clunes (Kirkhill) together with reinstated loops at Evanton and Kildary. This could usefully have already been done to allow more frequent services to operate whilst the Kessock Bridge is being repaired. PASSENGER SERVICES FoFNL has been talking to Transport Scotland about an hourly service frequency all day between Inverness and Tain with some trains extended to Wick. We have compiled as robust a timetable as is possible with the current infrastructure and considered crewing and vehicle diagrams and costs. We will be happy to supply a copy of this proposed timetable to Highland Council on request. We note the housing expansion currently ongoing at Conon Bridge (4.128) and we consider that further land north of CB6 should be urgently safeguarded for future expansion of the tiny car park initially provided. We are pleased to see that this is to be done at Beaully (4.30). At Evanton, we agree that the land should be safeguarded at Fyrish Crescent for reopening the railway station (4.150). As well as serving the projected major increase in the number of houses in the village, a station here could also serve as a "parkway" for those several years when the A9 Cromarty Bridge is being rebuilt. An additional parcel of land would need to be identified and safeguarded for this. A major problem which has been allowed to happen at Inverness is the inadequate drop off parking zone at the south east side of the station. There were supposed to be 22 parking spaces but only 13 have been provided. The others are usually roped off. The access is also unsuitable for the replacement buses which the railway often has to use. These buses have to reverse in to position amongst other cars, passengers and lorries. Suggestions that taxis may in future also be required to share this limited space would make things worse. Inverness railway station is a major transport hub for Highland residents and for tourists as well Please could the plan find a solution to this which at least restores the promised 22 short term spaces for collecting and dropping off passengers? RAILFREIGHT Railfreight services are also inhibited by the lack of train paths on both the Far North Line and the line to Nairn, Elgin and Aberdeen. It would be helpful to increase the loading gauge on the section between Elgin and the potential transshipment sea port of Invergordon to permit larger international size containers to be carried. This work has already been done for the route from Elgin to Aberdeen and the south. Invergordon has seen intermittent use for importing goods and we would expect this to grow. Map 6 shows planned freight interchanges at Invergordon and Evanton. Forward planning ensured that a rail underbridge was provided when the A9T was improved past Evanton. There are several possible sites mentioned for freight sidings at Invergordon, but it is important to have good rail access to the piers and wharves. We do not support the idea to build houses on the former railway sidings at the west end of the High Street (4.167). Map 6 does not show a future rail connection from the Nigg station area to the Global Energy complex at Nigg. FoFNL thinks that this should be actively considered and the appropriate land safeguarded. We believe that the industrial sites at Nigg have much potential to expand particularly now that it has been designated an Enterprise Area. The Norbord wood plant at Morayhill was built with a railway siding when new. Timber is now being brought along the Far North Line to this locus but is having to be transhipped in Inverness because the factory has been extended and the siding compromised. Planning for a new rail siding here would be useful. However, it should not be allowed to prevent the dualling of the Inverness to Nairn railway line, so there may be a need for designation of an additional parcel of land here. The principal of preventing building from encroaching too close to a working (and now expanding) railway applies here once again. Railfreight requires either direct entry in to an industrial complex, or alongside a quay, or it requires the provision of adequate access for road goods vehicles to deliver or receive the products which are travelling by freight train whether it be containerised or otherwise. FoFNL believes that there is potential for freight sidings to be constructed or continued at the following places: Nairn, Dalcross Airport, Inverness, Muir of Ord, Dingwall, Evanton, Alness, Invergordon, Fearn, Tain

and Edderton. The potential at Muir, Alness, Invergordon and Edderton includes whisky related traffic both inbound and outbound. Such traffic is starting to flow southwards from and to the Elgin area. The Highlands should be next. CONCLUSION We have an expanding railway which is seeing growth in both passenger and freight traffic. It, and coastal shipping, will both have much bigger roles to play in the future as we cannot continue to rely so much on road-borne traffic. It is vitally important to get much more track capacity on our single line railways and to make sure that land access to these services is appropriately available for both passengers and freight. ENDS.

Allocated to				Comments on the vision and spatial strategy
--------------	--	--	--	---

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

14 Resident Objections: a) CT2 site returned to prime agricultural land. b) CT2 site removed from excessive housing allocation. c) Contin located outside the Hinterland Boundary.

*Note the Council have chosen to redact and edit parts of this representation following concerns raised by a third party. Edits are shown in **blue** and redactions indicated by (redacted).

(redacted) **Munro family and others** request Contin to be removed from Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. 2.Contin to be taken out of the Hinterland boundary. 3.Contin is a rural community and the housing provision is excessive and disproportionate for our small village hamlet. 4.There is no demand for new house sites in Contin. 5.Contin Village is in and has been in decline for many years i.e. Post Office shut-down, Contin Primary School closed and computer shop closed. 6.Demand for protecting prime agricultural land and green spaces. 7.Woodland Park has unsold house sites. 8.There is concern over increasing numbers of vehicles through Contin. 9.Properties are unsold and marketed for long periods usually below asking prices. 10.Contin is a farming community surrounded by quality farms and prime agricultural land. 11.Housing would destroy the identity of Contin. 12.Contin has many sites of historical and archaeological significance especially around Preas Mairi, the Beech trees of the Preas Mairi woodland walk and both Contin Mains and Munro Farms. 13.Protecting the green spaces and agricultural land at CT2 preserves the quality of the surrounding area. 14.Contin and the surrounding areas character and rural identity is threatened by the over development and over supply of housing provision. 15.We believe protecting agricultural land in rural communities such as the CT2 site in Contin is a must and if developed would be irreversible and lost forever. Protecting farm land is becoming increasing harder and this is a priority for rural communities like Contin. 16.The Smiddy has been an unoccupied retail unit for two years with no commercial demand, no demand for tourist, retail or business use. 17.Excessive speed of traffic through Contin without adequate calming measures in place. 18.Pedestrian and cycle improvement are desperately needed and the CT2 site would create a new hazard. What measures will the Highland Council consider to improve the trunk road for pedestrians and cyclists? 19.Large volumes of seasonal and holiday traffic. 20.Public and Business parking needs to be reviewed and assessed to include studies of local business use, activities and seasonal differences. 21.Improving road safety: Double yellow lines along A835 trunk road and provision of pedestrian crossings for Smiths Garage and Contin Petrol Station. 22.Contin is one of the few remaining red squirrel hotspots. The CT2 site supports local wildlife and housing would affect its inhabitants including red kites, red squirrels, deer, pheasants, owls and mice. 23.Smiths Garage currently park at Contin Mains without specified planning consent. 24.Highland Council figures for new builds for Contin, Achility, Jamestown and Tarvie area show 11 new homes constructed in last 11 years and 16 new homes in last 16 years. An average of a single property per year. Housing allocation should therefore be on a case by case basis. Provision for 53 house sites in CT2 is clearly excessive, and disproportionate to demand. Being more than half a centuries worth. CT2 Site 1.Scott Delgarno confirmed and detailed to the Police Authority that the CT2 site plan produced by the Highland Council for this IMFLDP is not a land title. Therefore contains land belonging to many parties. 2.CT2 contains land belonging to the parties represented above. 3.All 14 parties represented here object to the CT2 site. 4.All 14 parties represented here call for the CT2 site to be omitted from the IMFLDP. 5.All residence of Smithy Croft do not consent to the allocation of Smithy Croft being used for housing provision or for access to be granted across Smithy Croft for the CT2 site. 6.The owners and tenants of Munro Farm also do not consent to the allocation of Munro Farm land for housing provision and will not permit any vehicular access across Munro farm and object to the CT2 site. 7.CT2 site should remain prime agricultural land. 8.CT2 site encompasses land belonging to The Contin Petrol Station, Smithy Croft and Munro Farm. 9.Housing provision is excessively large and greater than current up take. 10.Loss of necessary public parking in central location. 11.Elevated site in the foreground to Preas Mhairi Burial Chamber and monument would make even bungalows out of keeping with surroundings. 12.Large visual impact from Strathconon and Fairburn.

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

13. Includes land belonging to Smithy Croft and Munro Farm. 14. Red squirrel habitat destroyed as trees have been felled without planning permission. 15. CT2 site would create many unsold plots which will become a lastly eyesore for decades like 'Woodland Park'. 16. Highland Council Guidelines for New developments outlines a) car parking requirements, b) ingress and egress, and c) visibility. 17. CT2 site has very poor visibility and should not be considered. 18. CT2 would increase the risk to road users, pedestrians and cyclists and should be refused. 19. There are too many entrances already at this particular section of the A835 trunk road and therefore not suitable for housing. 20. Because of the bad access and pressures increasing the volume of vehicles here would be detrimental. 21. CT2 site would put pressure on local businesses and create another hazard. 22. **Allegation that** owner of Contin Mains Farm is a housing developer and desperately wants to build for personal financial gain and not for the benefit of local residents and community. 23. **Allegation that** owner has been reported for breaching of planning control. 24. **Allegation that** owner has destroyed the current tree belt at Smithy Croft and Munro Farm in an attempt to gain planning permission and housing provision and should not be supported. 25. **Allegation that** There have been many police documented incidents at Smithy Croft including the restriction of access to the A835 main road (redacted). 26. No decision should be taken on housing provision at CT2 site until the land disputes between the owners of Munro Farm, Smithy Croft and Contin Mains are concluded. 27. **Allegation that** The Contin Mains Farm owner (redacted) has begun alterations to ground levels and large scale excavations without planning permission and therefore the CT2 site should be not be included in the new plan. 28. The CT2 site is too close to Preas Mairi Burial Chamber. 29. CT2 site does not contain or have adequate provision for an alternative or emergency exit from the CT2 site for emergency vehicles. 30. CT2 site would spoil an area of outstanding natural beauty. 31. Housing in CT2 would obstruct the views from the Preas Mairi Burial Chamber and the Preas Mairi Woodland Walk. 32. In the last consultation regarding the CT2 site it stated - 'Furthermore site boundaries should reflect natural or man-made features such as field boundaries, tree belts or other landscape features.' - Yet **allegation that** the eastern boundary fence, tree belt and landscape have been destroyed by (redacted) in an attempted to gain planning. 33. There are current drainage issues affecting Smithy Croft and Munro Farm. 34. Sewage treatment and limited capacity – Environmental considerations. 35. No emergency exit or second access to site 36. No compulsory purchase order because building homes are not compulsory. 37. Homes would block view from Preas Mairi woodland walk 38. CT2 site would create an over supply of housing provision. 39. CT2 site would lower house prices. 40. CT2 site would increase the length of time properties are on the market. 41. Development would create more access issues with Contin Petrol Station, The Smiddy and Smiths Garage. 42. **Allegation that** Housing developers have already destroyed red squirrel habitat by felling trees. Smithy Croft Existing Smithy Croft access. **Allegation that** Red squirrel habitat has been destroyed by housing developer (redacted). **Allegation that** Trees felled in neighbouring properties without consent from owners and without planning permission. (redacted) Smithy Croft has a right of access across the Contin Petrol Station. Any development of the neighbouring farm land would affect Smithy Croft and the Contin Petrol Station. **Allegation that** Petrol Station & Smiths Garage vehicles currently obstruct access to Smithy Croft & Munro Farm. Restriction of access for oil tankers Momentum IT Solutions Ltd Negative impact on The Smiddy Loss of business car parking Contin Mains Farm and Munro Farm Prime agricultural land – Both farms have South-Westerly slopes and perfect growing conditions for commercial barley, oats and wheat. The affects to Munro Farm access & Contin Mains Farm access must be considered and make CT2 unsuitable for housing. Any future development of brownfield land at Contin Mains Steading must be confirmed first before housing and to protect farm land. Contin Mains Steading is recorded in the councils 'Historic Environment Record' and imperatively must be protected. Any development at Contin Mains Farm would have an adverse affect on traffic flow, access, visibility and access to petrol station, smiths garage and the Smiddy. CT2 site would have adverse affects to access to Smithy Croft and Munro Farm (redacted) Turning circle requirement heavy plant machinery and lorries at Contin Mains Farm. Already bad access issues between farms and Contin Petrol Station: No traffic calming. No double yellow lines required and necessary for main road A835. No public crossing/pelican crossing Poor visibility. Dangerous access road to Contin Mains Steading located on a blind bend. Smiths Garage Smiths Garage have inadequate parking and **allegation that** surplus vehicles are parked at Contin Mains Steading. **Allegation that** Smiths Garage do not have current planning consent for such commercial use at Contin Mains Steading. **Allegation that** Smiths Garage vehicles continually park on trunk road and footpath. Will the local plan identify appropriate car parking for all neighbouring businesses and residents? Tenants of West Cottage next door to Smiths Garage also require the use of Contin Mains Steading for car parking. (redacted) Highland Council Planning Application 12/04534/FUL – In the interests of road safety Smiths Garage are required to maintain clear and available parking at all times. Parking on the trunk road (A835) and public footpath is also enforceable by the police authority. **Allegation that it is** Well documented that this Smiths Garage structure causes direct harm to neighbouring homes, businesses and amenity. (redacted) The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulation 2010 The scheduled monument is located to prominently

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change the allocation to Business/Industry, Industry or Mixed Use.

Representation

We make this representation on behalf of Mr Robin Gardner, owner of just over 3 hectares of land to west of Docharty Road and north of Strathpeffer, Dingwall. We note that part of this land extending to 1.76 ha. now forms the Business allocation DW9. The change in status in the MIR from “non-preferred” back to an allocation within the development plan is welcomed in principle. As advised in our Main Issues Report (MIR) submission, this land was the subject of preliminary feasibility work, including the preparation of a draft layout in advance of its potential marketing for development. Market conditions have improved of late and the demand is for more than premises and land in the “Business” Use Class. For example, short term civil engineering contracts continue to require large areas for laydown of materials and a secure compound for external storage. Small industrial units are also in demand for fledgling manufacturing companies and local building tradesmen. Our client also received planning permission in 2004 to relocate his then builders’ merchants business to the north east part of his land (ref 04/00294/FULRC). The high voltage power transmission line passing through the middle of the land restricts buildings from being erected within a corridor of 15 metres either side of it but this should not preclude uses including open storage yards, access roads, parking, landscaping and surface water drainage measures. The land is of course currently allocated for light and general industrial purposes in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, which are covered by both the Business (Class 4) and General Industrial (Class 5) Use Classes. Indeed the land had been allocated in previous Local Plans for this purpose going back more than 20 years. We also appreciate that this limited allocation is due to the assumption from the SEPA Flood Map that as the remainder of the land and the Auction Mart land to the north lie within 5 metres of the level of the River Peffery it will flood in a 1:200 year event. In the absence of a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) our client accepts the allocation and the requirement carry out such a FRA at the time of taking forward detailed proposals. However, in the event that the FRA might identify a greater area of land for development and given that this is located within the Dingwall Settlement Development Area, we would hope that additional land could be included in a future planning application. This might include, for example, land for vehicular access, external storage, SUDS measures and landscaping. At the present time the preferred access (by the Roads Authority) is from Docharty Road, which lies outside the Proposed Plan allocation. In light of the above, whilst we appreciate the allocation of the land in the Local Development Plan we feel that in addition to Business it should also allow for General Industrial uses. This would broaden its potential and align more with the current market conditions. We would also appreciate notification of any contrary views on our client’s land or of similar representations for adjoining land to the north. If as a consequence of any such representations or objections the Reporter decides to hold an Examination Hearing on this issue we would wish to be involved.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The combined areas should be considered as one green space and retained as such without further development. This area represents a pleasant green entrance to the city from north, south or east, to develop the area for any industrial use would have a detrimental impact on approaching the city. This area should be preserved as part of a green corridor around the Moray Firth. The area could be used for light recreational use at the most but not industrial use. The use of the area for siting a waste incinerator, as has been suggested, should not be considered in any way. There must be alternative sites suitable for such a purpose not at the entrance to the city. Vehicle movements, alone, to supply such a development would have severe impact on the already inadequate road system.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

At some point in the future an additional crossing at that end of the canal will be required. The single swing-bridge and road system is already inadequate at busy times for present day traffic . The city is forever expanding and will no doubt in the future do so in the direction of Beauuly along the A862. Whilst welcoming the development of the Muirtown Basin, thought should be given to an additional crossing that would not be inhibited by the basin development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The combined areas should be considered as one green space and retained as such without further development. This area represents a pleasant green entrance to the city from north, south or east, to develop the area for any industrial use would have a detrimental impact on approaching the city. This area should be preserved as part of a green corridor around the Moray Firth. The area could be used for light recreational use at the most but not industrial use. The use of the area for siting a waste incinerator, as has been suggested, should not be considered in any way. There must be alternative sites suitable for such a purpose not at the entrance to the city. Vehicle movements, alone, to supply such a development would have severe impact on the already inadequate road system.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Delete "housing capacity 6" and replace with "housing capacity to be determined by a masterplan".

Representation

Grounds of Objection 1. The Achareidh Estate is allocated for housing and coloured brown on the Proposals Map. No change is sought to the Proposals Map and the allocation should be confirmed in the Plan. 2. That reflects its status in the MIR as a "preferred site (H2)"; and it is understood, the joint Community Council's view of Achareidh as a development site. The Schedule 4 summary of responses does not appear to raise any opposition to the principle of a masterplan approach. That should be respected by the planning authority. 3. However, the capacity of the site as expressed in the PLDP - 6 houses - bears no understanding of its potential for development; nor of the masterplan process or the factors that would inform the quality of development and the setting the proponents would aspire to. 4. The potential of Achareidh Estate has been presented as comprising primarily three fields in agricultural use as a working farm, mature amenity woodland, treed margins, commercial plantations, and a Category B Listed Building and its large, partially-walled garden. 5. These factors represent a fine heritage providing a context which will require a high standard of sympathetic design to integrate with it. 6. In order to achieve this, the development would be subject to a masterplan, underpinned by specialist input, providing a landscape capacity approach, an architectural concept and access details. This will contribute to the aim of producing a sensitive design and layout within, and respecting, the setting. 7. A masterplan would cover the entirety of the estate, avoiding a piecemeal approach, but enabling flexibility in terms of the location and "take" of land for development. 8. The site is an integrated part of the town, well located to facilities, connected within 400m of public transport, adjacent to a structural cycle route, within 50m of the national road network, and existing infrastructure. It is wholly compatible with the principles of "urban sustainability", and would enhance the townscape character, and the town's economic and social prosperity. 9. The site will respond to part of the housing market that is not satisfied at present and extend choice locally; there are limited opportunities for consolidating the town within its existing structure. 10. The Achareidh Estate is perhaps an exception within the Inner Moray Firth area in that it is situated within a key centre, within a historic town and heritage setting, lies within the A96 corridor and is close to Inverness and the airport, national road and rail transport systems. Consequently, it offers important market appeal which perhaps does not exist elsewhere in the plan area. 11. It presents a distinctly different opportunity to the expansive large scale, long-term land stocks peripheral to Nairn that are dependent on resolving major infrastructure, land assembly, landowner co-operation and phasing issues. Case: Capacity 12. The PLDP offers no justification for the capacity it envisages; but refers to a "set limit to development". Such a fixed position is contrary to the masterplan process the planning authority promotes, and is presumptuous of any transport or conservation or other assessment that might inform it. 13. Given a "site area" of "17.9 ha."; the "housing capacity: 6" is completely awry with any reasonable assessment of the development potential. Insofar this is an expression of density, it would give approximately one house per 3.0 ha, and even if applied to the open fields only, one house per 1.3 ha. This bears no comparison with any other site in an urban situation the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. 14. For example, NA1 Housing Capacity indicates 30 houses on 1.8 ha. of land, in a parkland setting; NA2 indicates 90 houses on 6.3 ha. of land; NA 4 350 homes on 34 ha. of land; NA5 Lochloy, 200 homes on 27 ha. of land. As regards Achareidh, this is an inefficient response by the planning authority (see para. 21 below). 15. The PLDP capacity bears no relation to the potential of the Estate for development; even accepting fully the need to respect "...the fabric and setting of the listed building, transport assessment, retention of woodland..." all of which were identified by the proponents. All of these factors would, and must be carefully considered, supported by evidence and informed appraisal. Representations [see documents below] were lodged to the MIR that encouraged the planning authority to guard against a presumptuous judgement where a development footprint would be determined by evidence drawn capacity studies. 16. As the planning authority presents no justification for its "set limit", the proponents wish to present the following in relation to factors that would inform the extent, placement and scale of development; none of which pre-determines a "set limit". These indicate precisely that it is the masterplan process that would facilitate full and proper assimilation of such matters with the heritage; informed by pre-application public consultation that would by statute be required in this case: access • that the A96/Tradespark Road junction is capable of being reconfigured within the Estate land; that Transport Scotland accept its reconfiguration in principle and that the design capacity of such improvement could serve up to 30 houses at present. This would achieve a very substantial improvement at an important substandard junction to the A96(T). An A96 by-pass could reduce through traffic and increase the capacity of that reconfigured junction to serve additional development in the long term; • such improvements would affect the gate-lodge, but that building is owned by the Estate, is 450m remote from Achareidh House, outwith its defined "grounds" and not visible from the main house. It was extended - with planning

permission in 2006, did not require Listed Building Consent; was not advertised as affecting the setting of a Listed Building; nor was it the subject of comment by Historic Scotland. Consideration could be given to relocating it at an appropriate position within a layout or re-using its materials, were that to be an outcome of a masterplan process; • that there is a choice of access routes to the A96 and towards the town centre - in two directions utilising the existing road network. Achareidh Estate enjoys an unimpeded 1000 m/1 km frontage to Tradespark Road and Altonburn Road and thus the potential for improvement to those routes including the Tradespark Road/Altonburn Lane junction. The extent and/or requirement for improvements - and the combination and timing of measures - is properly for consideration as part of a masterplan; • in the Appeal P/PPA/270/632 into refusal of 550 houses at Sandown (west of Achareidh) the Reporters concluded in the context of concerns about “rat-running” through the Tradespark Road/Altonburn Lane network that “the relative attractiveness of alleged rat-run could be reduced substantially by detailed road layout and speed restriction measures... Indeed we note the Council’s final position as being that careful consideration would be required for this aspect of the scheme rather than outright opposition”. That would indicate capacity within the existing road network, notwithstanding the existing A96/Tradespark Road junction”. • in the context of an A96 junction improvement, it is understood the Council would see some benefit in the principle of stopping-up the existing network at an appropriate place. listed building and setting • that the Achareidh policies are part of a registered farm unit. That status and use prevailed in 1982 when Achareidh House was listed; • that the fields are distinct and different from Achareidh House, the stables to the rear, the walled garden (to the ha-ha), greenhouse, cottage and two outbuildings, tennis court and the gate/pillars that would reasonably represent the focus of the curtilage of the Listed Building. This is an integrated composition that derives immediate context from the enclosing woodland. However much the interface of development and the listed building may include open land as part of the setting, the fields are very different in use and character to that composition; and for that they present a development opportunity greater than the PLDP recognises; • that as there is no statutory definition of “curtilage” or “setting”, advice is contained in the Scottish Historic Environment Policy Appendix 1. However much “authorities are encouraged not to interpret setting narrowly”, the fields are not “lawn or grassland for walks and riding” but rather fully fenced for stock/grazings or ploughed, seen from the main house rather than for the pleasure of its occupants (as referred in Appendix 1). In any event, a conservation appraisal would inform a masterplan; • that the Estate is not an “Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes” site; that a tree felling/management programme within the allocation is approved by the Forestry Commission; and that substantial potential exists for replacement tree planting were that to be considered integral to a masterplan.. Scottish Planning Policy 2010 17. Scottish Planning Policy 2010 (para.110) states that the “SPP, the SHEP and the Managing Change in the Historic Environment guidance note series published by Historic Scotland should be taken into account by planning authorities when preparing development plans...”. There is no indication that the planning authority has done so, otherwise it would have balanced the following. 18. At (para. 111) SPP states “in most cases, the historic environment can accommodate change which is informed and sensitively managed, and can be adapted to accommodate new uses whilst retaining its special character. ...Decisions should be based on a clear understanding of the importance of the heritage assets. Planning authorities should support the best viable use that is compatible with the fabric, setting and character of the historic environment”. The planning authority has rejected that premise without a clear understanding of the heritage, and it has pre-empted what could be the most viable outcome. 19. At (para. 112) it states “Development plans should provide the framework for the protection, conservation and enhancement of all elements of the historic environment to allow the assessment of the impact of proposed development on the historic environment and its setting”. The planning authority is pre-empting that assessment of impact, despite having declared that to be the purpose of a masterplan. 20. “Authorities should also consider whether further and more detailed assessment is required to establish the capacity of an area and its sensitivity to change” (para. 112). The planning authority is seeking transport and conservation assessments even though it has decided a “set limit to development”. That is completely awry in process, and devoid of appreciation of the circumstances of the site. 21. At (para. 80) SPP states “Planning authorities should promote the efficient use of land and buildings, directing development towards sites within existing settlements where it is possible to make effective use of existing infrastructure and service capacity and to reduce energy consumption”. The PLDP capacity is not efficient or effective. 22. At (para. 81) it states “Planning authorities are encouraged to use urban capacity studies... to inform the settlement strategy. Where possible, planning authorities should involve the private sector in urban capacity studies”. The allocation of a substantial land holding for development with a completely disproportionate “set limit to development”, is contrary to the rational process, efficient and effective land use outcome that a masterplan would deliver. Conclusion 23. The land is allocated for housing. There is no justification for a “set limit to development” nor that that limit is 6 houses, either or both would indicate no understanding of the development potential, be contrary to the masterplan process promoted and premature to the evidence that would require to inform the scale and placement of development. 24. A masterplan should be comprehensive, considered and not presumed; present a balanced proposal of high quality, and embrace development, accessibility and the heritage as the public appears also to expect. That is the purpose of the allocation of Achareidh Estate on the Proposals Map; and it should be what a masterplan aims to deliver. That would inform the correct outcome. Recommendation It is recommended that “housing capacity 6” is deleted and replaced with “housing capacity to be determined by a masterplan”.

Allocated to	Nairn	NA3	Achareidh	
--------------	-------	-----	-----------	--

Customer Number 00430 Name Mr Ronnie MacRae Organisation Highland Small Communities Housing Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AU1 Montrose Hollow Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Identify infill sites as requested by the community which are suitable for elderly provision near or on the main street and close to services.

Allocated to Auldearn AU1 Montrose Hollow

Customer Number 00430 Name Mr Ronnie MacRae Organisation Highland Small Communities Housing Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DO1 Land South of Dores Hall Type Change

Comment Changes

To extend the area of land to include the land East up to the B862.

Representation

The land allocation is extended to include the land east to the B862 for low density open market housing as it is crucial to the delivery of the affordable housing provision on DO1. Sympathetic planting with native trees throughout the development would lessen the impact of development within the extended allocation.

Allocated to Dores DO1 Land South of Dores Hall

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

That a flexible approach is taken to road access to MB1, Maryburgh allowing for development of a smaller phase of housing development with access from Donald Cameron Court. Denser housing capacity should be provided on the lower side of MB1.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Increase capacity for housing.

Representation

The capacity could be increased in order to maximise the efficient land use.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00430 Name Mr Ronnie MacRae Organisation Highland Small Communities Housing Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference 4.122 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Flexibility on hinterland sites is required for affordable housing due to land ownership restrictions. Flexibility to look at unallocated sites would strengthen the community's position with regard to provision of affordable housing, especially in or around the main village.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 00430 Name Mr Ronnie MacRae Organisation Highland Small Communities Housing Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference KT1 and KT3 Kiltarlity Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

It is important to maintain a good level of land supply and maximise efficient land use.

Allocated to Kiltarlity General General

Customer Number 00430 Name Mr Ronnie MacRae Organisation Highland Small Communities Housing Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA5 Lochloy Type Change

Comment Changes

Increased capacity for housing.

Representation

To maximise the efficient land use in terms of housing density.

Allocated to Nairn NA5 Lochloy

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The wording of the fifth indented para in 4.9 be revised to read:- Land for enhanced recreational and sporting facilities at Torvean comprising improved and extended facilities for rowing, a better golf course, additional sports pitches, changing and meeting facilities and trails. In the Action Plan, an entry should be inserted in relation to IN24 - Torvean - Improved and extended facilities for sports and recreation, including the provision of appropriate clubhouse/boathouse accommodation - Scottish Canals, Highland Council and other interested parties

Representation

Inverness West Link Project, Public Consultation, May 2013 Joint Response to Highland Council from: Torvean Golf Club Highland Rugby Club and Inverness Rowing Club 1. The three sporting clubs making this response are those whose facilities have been threatened by the proposed road project for several decades, and whose development options have been blighted in that period. We have a collective interest in seeing the matter resolved promptly and satisfactorily so that we can each plan our future development securely. 2. This response contains views that we hold jointly, while each club will also respond separately regarding the matters that are of particular concern to them individually. 3. Our respective clubs have engaged with Highland Council at all times during the consultation process relating to the WLR proposals and Highland Council's decision to adopt Option 6 for the route largely because it has been seen as a credible and achievable project that could end the long period of harmful uncertainty. We have also been reassured by repeated commitments from Highland Council that it will provide not just 'like for like' replacement of sporting facilities, but an enhanced provision. Further strong encouragement was received when the report from the planning 'charrette' held in August last year strongly endorsed the concept of a new 'sports hub' at Kinmylies, to provide an integrated and efficient multi-club sporting complex. 4. We are therefore extremely disappointed that the proposals presented in the consultation contained very limited reference to the sports hub, and no evidence whatsoever that any serious thought or preparation had been put into this important aspect of the WLR project. What sports related items did go into the consultation (such as indicative sports pitches, changing rooms and a fitness trail) emerged randomly from the blue, without any prior discussion. 5. We had expected that the eight-month period between the charrette and the consultation would have been used by the Council to hold discussions with our clubs and the other sporting bodies that might have an interest in being part of the sports hub. By obtaining a better understanding of the clubs' individual requirements and aspirations and the scope for integrating their activities within shared sports areas and buildings, the sports hub concept would have achieved a tighter specification in terms of sports grounds, changing and fitness rooms, clubhouse and social facilities, etc. This in turn would have allowed preliminary designs and costings to be drawn up for detailed consideration by the sports clubs, individually and collectively. 6. None of this has happened, and it is our strong impression that the sports dimension has been relegated to very low status and priority within the WLR project. This leaves so many uncertainties and unresolved questions, that it has severely reduced our confidence in the consultation process. Under these circumstances that so crucially affect our interests, it is impossible for us to respond positively to the consultation. Unless this neglect can be remedied promptly and convincingly before the process of planning approval starts, we may be obliged to object formally to the proposals. 7. The sports hub concept is a very powerful one, with the potential to provide a greatly enhanced and operationally efficient sports complex for the future of Inverness. It is without doubt, the most cost-effective way for the Council to honour its repeated pledges to provide genuinely enhanced sports facilities along with the WLR. If it fails to pursue this opportunity in partnership with the sporting community, then the competence of the Council will be in severe question, along with its good faith. Hamish Spence, Chairman, Torvean Golf Club Andrew Little, Chairman, Highland Rugby Club Roy Sinclair, Chairman, Inverness Rowing Club May 2013

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The draft correctly identifies the status of Fortrose as the primary service centre for the Black Isle. But it fails to mention that as a main centre for education, leisure and recreation for the whole 10,000 or so population of the area, the area has not got a swimming pool, the provision of which is desired throughout the Black Isle for which the community has campaigned for over 60 years. I urge, therefore, that the fourth indented para. in 4.59 be re-worded specifically to mention a swimming pool as a main possible enhancement. (The wording in the existing plan is an example to follow) In the Action Plan in the relevant place reference to Highland Highlife should be eliminated or qualified as HH has no funds of its own and simply acts as an agent for the Council. It is for Highland Council to decide policy in regard to provision of leisure and recreation facilities and to make capital and revenue funding available to achieve such provision or to assist others with funding so that they can do so.

Representation

The draft correctly identifies the status of Fortrose as the primary service centre for the Black Isle and states that housing expansion proposed will help to sustain this role. It however fails to mention that as a main centre for education, leisure and recreation for the whole 10,000 or so population of the area, the area has not got a swimming pool, the provision of which is desired throughout. The Black Isle community has campaigned for such a facility for more than 60 years. A few years ago it seemed within reach had it not been for Highland Council's decision not to support it with the modest annual revenue subsidy required. The land and Planning Permission (purified) for a pool exists as does the will to make it a reality given modest Council backing. As some 1000 new houses are planned, the case for a pool is now even stronger.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Allocation for 19350 homes should be reduced by approximately 66%.

Representation

'Land for 19350 homes from 2011 to 2031' is a huge overestimate and planning permission for such a large number of houses is not required. Highland Council should review estimates (downwards) in line with more recent housing demand and revise appropriate sections of the IMFPDP accordingly. Council document BACKGROUND NOTE - HOUSING LAND REQUIREMENT AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF WINDFALL AND METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING THE CAPACITY OF HOUSING AND MIXED USE SITES stated 18343 as the Total Land Requirement for Inverness and Nairn combined. This includes a +25% "factor" for flexibility/market choice. This is also an overestimate as the same document stated 7722 houses were built in in the Inverness and Nairn area in the 13 years between Jan 2000 and March 2013, i.e. at an average of 48.5 houses per month, and this was a period that included unsustainably high rates of housing growth. An equivalent high rate would translate to 11656 houses over the next 20 year period thus the 19350 house allowance in the IMFLDP is massively overestimated by approximately 7700 houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01248 Name Mr Scott Macdonald Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.41

Reference NA2 South Kingsteps Type Change

Comment Changes

Delete area NA2 from the IMFLDP, or reduce the Housing Capacity for area NA2 from 90 to between 20 and 60 houses

Representation

The entire development is not required as the IMFLDP projected demand for housing in Nairn is a gross over-estimate. The applied-for figure of 90 homes appears to be derived from a transport study that stated that the existing Lochloy Rd at Kingsteps has capacity for traffic from an additional 90 homes, and not from any study based on appropriate housing density. The development's housing capacity should come from a much broader basis than just the capacity of the existing road. Further the transport study mentioned above was based on inadequate data i.e. a single 1hour survey of existing traffic, and did not account for recent growth in foot, cycle and road traffic from the Lochloy developments heading east via Kingsteps, either to Kingsteps carpark or further afield and therefore the study appears to overestimate the additional capacity of Lochloy Rd. The proposed housing density of 90 houses in 6.5ha would represent a huge increase compared with directly neighbouring areas and such a high density is not appropriate or required. 90 houses in 6.5ha is equivalent to 14 houses/ha, which is 450% higher than neighbouring properties at Kingsteps and 50% higher than neighbouring properties in the new Lochloy developments. A more sensible housing capacity would be in the region of 20-60 houses. The sensible and safe option for the NA2 development's road links is via the existing Lochloy developments (via Montgomery Drive and/or future Southern link across railway line to A96) rather than via Lochloy Rd. The capacity and safety of the arterial road through the Lochloy developments is significantly greater than Lochloy Rd which has numerous danger spots. The roading and surfaced areas of the development will result in increased quantities and accelerated rate of run-off into the burn to the North of the site. This plus possible modifications to the burn route and vegetation along the banks of the burn could increase risk of flooding to existing properties on the North of the burn. The existing burn in the area of the development is relatively untouched with a winding route and banks with mature trees between the existing properties to the North and the proposed development. The burn, including its trees, banks, and the narrow field to the North of the proposed development should be protected from future development as they provide a natural wildlife corridor and amenity between existing properties and the new development. It is noted that one of the original planning application submissions for NA2 stated that the owner of the site lives on the site. This is not correct and could be construed as misleading. Our understanding is that the owner only lived on the site on a temporary basis as their new house was being built on another site, and has not lived on the site for the last 2 years. Common-sense arguments similar to those that defeated the application to develop Nairn South dictate that a significant development in East Nairn accessed via Kingsteps/Lochloy Rd does not make sense. The bulk of commuter traffic from East Nairn will go through or around Nairn on its way West to to Inverness, and subsequent traffic, Nairn congestion, and back road rat-run safety issues have not been considered adequately. Until a bypass has been built, the obvious location for development of Nairn is the West side closest to Inverness.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 01248 Name Mr Scott Macdonald Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.41

Reference NA2 South Kingsteps Type Change

Comment Changes

Delete area NA2 from the IMFLDP.

Representation

Further to the comments I submitted on 16 Nov 2013, and as clarification to those comments, I would like to make it clear that I strongly object to the area NA2 being developed in any capacity. The reasons are: The houses are not required (i.e. the demand for housing can be met in more appropriate sites west of Nairn). The site is not appropriate for a "dormitory" to Inverness as it is on the opposite side of Nairn from Inverness and thus will increase existing congestion problems in Nairn. Lochloy Rd cannot accommodate any additional traffic above the existing levels. The burn will be adversely affected.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 01573 Name Mr Simon Cole-Hamilton Organisation Cole-Hamilton and Co Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph IN52

Reference IN52 Type Change

Comment Changes

We would prefer lower density housing There is a lack of clarity over options for access

Representation

The site is a green wedge at present which is important in a residential setting and historic village It is attached to a listed building and development could detract from the attractiveness of the building You do not state how access is to be achieved except to say "no intensification of access to Old Perth Road". Does this allow for access off Culcabock Avenue? If so how would that be achieved?

Allocated to South Inverness IN52 East of Culcabock Ave

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Sir, This is a supplementary comment to a 6-page document which I handed into the planning department of the Highland Council on 12th December 2013. I object to the current wording and the intent on the paragraph concerning area IN21 (Muirtown Basin) which is currently on the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. I would like the words 'Business' and '30 homes' removed from the paragraph.

Representation

The reasons I wish to see the words 'Business' and '30 homes' removed, is because I would like to see the area purely developed for 'Community', 'Tourism' and 'Leisure' aspects alone. I believe that the area should not be used for 'business' use (if it only means 'offices') ... or for building '30 homes' (or thereabouts) in this vicinity. Because this unique area could be used for something far better for the local community, tourism, and leisure at large. On top of that, I object to the fact that the paragraph did not specifically state whether it should be a minimum of '30 homes'...or a maximum of '30 homes', as this is very unclear... and it is also very unclear to my neighbours where exactly they would be located around the 'Muirtown Basin'. Please refer to the 6-page document for details of my many objections and alternative suggestions to do with this, which was handed into the planning department on 12th December 2013.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Wants this site allocated for combined police, fire and ambulance station.

Representation

The existing swing & railway bridge constraints increase emergency vehicle response times to the west side of Inverness and the Aird area. Situating a station here would improve response times. Visibility problems could be resolved via a lights controlled junction.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01976 Name Mr Stanley Fraser Organisation Titanic Museum

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN30 Type Change

Comment Changes

Seeks a community, tourism and/or leisure use as part of Muirtown Basin masterplan.

Representation

Believes this land should be part of the masterplan for the Muirtown Basin.

Allocated to West Inverness IN30 Carse Industrial Estate

Customer Number 01976 Name Mr Stanley Fraser Organisation Titanic Museum

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN21 Type Change

Comment Changes

Sir, This is a supplementary comment to a 6-page document which I handed into the planning department of the Highland Council on 12th December 2013. I object to the current wording and the intent on the paragraph concerning area IN21 (Muirtown Basin) which is currently on the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. I would like the words 'Business' and '30 homes' removed from the paragraph.

Representation

The reasons I wish to see the words 'Business' and '30 homes' removed, is because I would like to see the area purely developed for 'Community', 'Tourism' and 'Leisure' aspects alone. I believe that the area should not be used for 'business' use (if it only means 'offices') ... or for building '30 homes' (or thereabouts) in this vicinity. Because this unique area could be used for something far better for the local community, tourism, and leisure at large. On top of that, I object to the fact that the paragraph did not specifically state whether it should be a minimum of '30 homes'...or a maximum of '30 homes', as this is very unclear... and it is also very unclear to my neighbours where exactly they would be located around the 'Muirtown Basin'. Please refer to the 6-page document for details of my many objections and alternative suggestions to do with this, which was handed into the planning department on 12th December 2013. [redacted]

Allocated to West Inverness IN21 Muirtown Basin

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

3. Section 2.3: TARBAT NESS SHOULD BE A SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA - The headland at Tarbat Ness and the Tarbat Ness lighthouse are one of the most important parts of natural and built heritage of Scotland. Visitors never cease to be astonished by the views, with the Moray coast to the south and the mountains of Sutherland and Caithness to the north. The headland itself is a gem, with attractive moorland falling away towards the sea. There is a diversity of habitats, including several species of migrating birds which make their first landfall on the moor and frequent visits from the internationally famous bottlenosed dolphins as they head to and from the Dornoch Firth. The approaches to Tarbat Ness, whether by foot along the coast from Portmahomack or from Rockfield or by road from Portmahomack, are not just ancillary to it but important and attractive parts of that heritage in their own right. We note with concern, however, that the draft IMFLDP does not extend to Tarbat Ness the protection of being designated as a Special Landscape Area. The purpose of such a designation is of course protection from developments which create unacceptable impacts on the amenity and heritage resource. We are concerned that there are two threats which could create unacceptable visual impacts. First, there is, as described in s.2 above, already pressure for housing. We believe that there should be a regime in place to ensure that all planning applications in this area are scrutinised to ensure that their mass, location and numbers do not create unacceptable impacts. Secondly, planning applications are already being made for wind turbines in our Community Council area. The countryside in the triangle between Tarbat Ness, Portmahomack and Rockfield, a particularly windy and open area, could well become a target for further wind turbines or for wind farms. We feel that any wind turbines would constitute a totally alien and unacceptable impact on this important part of our national heritage. We have examined the criteria which were used to decide which locations in the Highland Council area should be designated as Special Landscape Areas. It seems to us that the Tarbat Ness area meets all of these criteria. Accordingly the Tarbat Community Council requests that the triangle of land between Tarbat Ness, Portmahomack and Rockfield should be designated as a Special Landscape Area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Settlement map for Portmahomack

Representation

1. Section 4: THE ABSENCE OF A PLAN AND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES FOR PORTMAHOMACK - We are seriously concerned that the draft IMFLDP does not include a plan specifically for Portmahomack or a map showing the settlement boundaries and sites on which development will be encouraged. We object to this omission because The Portmahomack settlement area has always featured in and been defined by past approved plans, including the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan still in force. These gave context and strategy for land use planning in the area and some certainty as to what proposed developments should and should not be approved. S. 7.33 of the report produced following the Call for Sites contained a list of key development issues and indicated with the help of a map which sites were preferred. This report, and the accompanying map, was presented at a public meeting in the Carnegie Hall, Portmahomack and many residents made comments. It was also discussed by the Tarbat Community Council who made specific comments on it. The previous plans referred to above were produced by a transparent and reasonably democratic process. They thus gave clarity and legitimacy to planning decisions taken in accordance with them. The report mentioned in (b) above was part of the same kind of process, but for some unexplained reason it has been aborted. The absence of a plan and a defined settlement area would mean that decisions would be taken by individual planning officers and councillors. However well-intentioned they are there are bound to be inconsistencies, anomalies and uncertainty. This we regard as undemocratic. There is huge pressure for development in the countryside around Portmahomack (see 2 below) and the absence of a defined settlement is bound to exacerbate this. The draft IMFLP proposes a Ross-shire Growth Area which cuts across the Easter Ross peninsula from Dingwall, through Invergordon to Tain, only 9 miles away from Portmahomack. The Growth Area includes sites at Nigg, Fearn Aerodrome and the Fendom which are all close to Portmahomack. This will inevitably put considerable further pressure on Portmahomack and the area round it, and there should be clearly defined settlement boundaries. The Tarbat Community Council would be happy with the settlement boundaries proposed in s. 7.33 of the report produced following the Call for Sites - effectively those in the existing plan with the addition of H1 (mainly developed), and H2 and H3 which are logical additions to the present settlement. Our only reservations related to the width of the approach road, Tarbatness Road. It seems to us possible that the omission of Portmahomack may relate to this problem. Members of the Tarbat Community Council would happily meet you to discuss the various proposed sites and the re-instatement of, and the boundaries of, the Portmahomack settlement.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Modify hinterland to include area west of Tarbat Ness & east of Tain

Representation

2. Section 2.7: UNDESIRABLE RIBBON DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA AND THE NEED FOR PROTECTION BY INCLUSION IN THE HINTERLAND - The Tarbat Community Council has been concerned for some time at the amount of development in the open countryside along the roads in the area. This is particularly marked along the main road between Portmahomack and Tain (the B9165 and B9174), and the un-numbered road between Portmahomack and Rockfield, and there also are increasing signs of it along the un-numbered road between Portmahomack and Tarbat Ness. At the recent rate of planning approvals this could soon mean that Portmahomack and Tain are joined by an almost continuous line of houses. In answer to our comments on this during the consultation we were advised by your staff that the reason such housing is allowed is that the relevant area does not lie within the Hinterland within which the Highland Council will presume against development in the open countryside. Our concerns about this ribbon development include the following:- These strung out housing units do not encourage any sort of community life. The other side of the coin is that existing settlements miss out on having residents who could enhance their community life and their social balance. The ribbon development is destroying, irrevocably, the fine landscapes in the area and the magnificent and unparalleled views of the Dornoch Firth and the Sutherland and Caithness coastline and mountains. These views are a major part of the attraction of an area which is very dependant on tourism. Members of our Community Council are aware of a huge number of likely planning applications in the pipeline along the road between Portmahomack and Tain. We are seriously alarmed by this. The proposed Ross-shire Growth Area is already taking off with the enhancement of facilities and additional employment at Nigg Yard. It can be expected to continue to generate employment opportunities during the life of the forthcoming plan. This will inevitably increase the pressures on the open countryside, particularly the pressure for ribbon development. The Main Issues Report on the Highland Wide Local Development Plan issued in 2009 said that the Preferred Option in relation to question 13, relating to the Hinterland, was that the Highland Council should "identify areas of development pressure for housing in the countryside". We are very surprised that this process did not lead the Council to observe that in recent years Easter Ross - particularly the area east of Tain and west of Tarbat Ness - has become a major commuter area, not just for Tain, Invergordon, etc. but also in increasingly large measure for Inverness. This alone should, in our view, justify the inclusion in the Hinterland of at least this part of, if not all of, the Easter Ross peninsula. When one adds in the prospect of a Ross-shire Growth Area the case for its inclusion in the Hinterland would appear overwhelming. The Tarbat Community Council therefore requests that the area between Tain and Tarbat Ness, including the whole of our Community Council area, should be designated as Hinterland - either as an extension along the north coast of the peninsula of the existing Hinterland to the west of Tain or as part of a wider definition of the Hinterland which includes the whole of the Easter Ross peninsula.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I support the Plan and the prospect for growth within the boundary of the A-9 I ask the council to REJECT any outline planning permission for development of the farmland around St Vincent. It is unconscionable that having sold the farmhouse that the owner can then seek to transform fertile pasture into a housing development and profit from selling those rights. They would also have to create infrastructure via Viewfield Road which is also unsuited to development. Please keep me apprised of any applications from the current owner who is seeking to partition this historic land for his own economic benefit and ignoring the legal and moral rights of the current homeowners.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Comments on the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan 4 Development Allocations Fortrose and Rosemarkie, Pages 80 et seq 1 Para 4.59: The draft correctly identifies the status of Fortrose as the primary service centre for the Black Isle and states that housing expansion proposed will help to sustain this role. But it fails to acknowledge the consequence of this, mainly the additional pressure which will be put on already overstretched main road in village which will be made worse by the traffic calming measures being put in place. 2 It also fails to mention that as a main centre for education, leisure and recreation for the whole 10,000 or so population of the area, the area has not got a swimming pool, the provision of which is desired throughout. The Black Isle community has campaigned for such a facility for more than 60 years. A few years ago it seemed within reach had it not been for Highland Council's decision not to support it with the modest annual revenue subsidy required. The land and Planning Permission (purified) for a pool exists as does the will to make it a reality given modest Council backing. As some 1000 new houses are planned, the case for a pool is now even stronger. 3 I urge, therefore, that the wording of the fourth indented para. in 4.59 be re-worded specifically to mention a swimming pool as a main possible enhancement. (The wording in the existing plan is an example to follow) In the Action Plan in the relevant place, reference to Highlife Highland should be eliminated or qualified as HH has no funds of its own and simply acts as an agent for the Council. It is for Highland Council to decide policy in regard to provision of leisure and recreation facilities and to make capital available to achieve such provision or to assist others with funding so that they can do so. It would therefore be more accurate to substitute "Highland Council" for "Highlife Highland". 4 In regard to Para 4.60, the draft again identifies the growth imposed on growth by the desire (the strength of which has never been tested) to maintain a physical separation between the villages. This, if continued with in its entirety, would have prevented the provision of the new water treatment plant, and now is leading to the concentration of housing and commercial development in the centres of the villages, using scarce high- quality agricultural land, and which, aided and abetted by traffic calming in High Street, will cause traffic chaos in Deans Road and at top of Ness Road. 5 As the two settlements are only a short distance apart- were joined for civic purposes some 400 years ago, and are already inextricably linked, sharing education, medical, postal, pharmaceutical and most other services, it seems senseless and counterproductive to maintain what is now a wholly artificial separation. There may well be a case for retaining the southern part of the land to the south-east of the main road, but there is no good reason for this prohibition on the land to the north-west, which in any event already has been developed by the Water Treatment Plant. 6 I therefore urge that the whole of the land to the north-west of the main road between FR3 and the Water Treatment Plant be designated for commercial and light industrial uses, particularly for local servicing businesses. There is no need to preserve land for an extension of the existing fairly new cemetery, which after 30 years or so of use remains less than half full. Such provision is long term and could readily be accommodated on land on higher ground behind the settlements. [redacted]

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The comments represent the views of the community council and a number of residents in the Abertarff area effected by the proposed development, The local fears and views of the proposed development for 58 properties in FA1 is that it is an extensive single housing development in relation to the size of the village. The requirement to meet the needs of the local people should be addressed initially. Any further housing development in the area should be planned to meet the needs of new employment opportunities within the area. There is a severe lack of permanent employment within the community council boundary. Travelling cost for both public and private transport are extremely expensive making the commute to Inverness or Fort William an added financial burden on potential opportunities. To relocate/move families into the area without any employment prospects would not be in the long term interests of the community. The existing capacity available for water and sewage would not be capable of meeting a housing development of the size planned. There is not an easy or favourable access route into FA1 from the A82. FA1 site plan, the current plan boundaries encroaches onto residents gardens, a working croft which has two houses on its land. the caused distress to the effected occupants. It does not include a new vehicle repair workshop built within the area. Any planned development in FA1 should not exceed 10/12 houses in 3 year phased builds to a maximum of 36 properties and within the area next to FA6 on the plan, keeping new houses close to the village centre. Housing developments should be of mixed properties, private and social. The current arrangement of mix of 25% social and 75% private should be maintained. There needs to be a local housing survey conducted to identify the current need for some local housing. The community council would welcome FA5 the possible golf course extension. FA3 a car park extension would benefit the village along with small business units. FA6 be retained for the schools.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03150 Name Mr Tom Ashley Organisation Turnberry Consulting Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN80 Type Change

Comment Changes

The land identified as 'public open space' is included within the Campus allocation (Site IN80)

Representation

Inverness Campus – Site IN80 As you will be aware construction of the Inverness Campus is well underway with the site expected to open early in 2014. We are therefore pleased to note the reference under 4.15 to the Inverness Campus as “an international hub for learning, a centre for modern sporting facilities, and a haven for modern research and development particularly in the Life Sciences”. We also support the allocation of the majority of the land (comprising 62.4ha) under Site IN80 for Business, Student Accommodation and Community “in accordance with Permission 09/00887/PIPIN and related permissions”. However, HIE have asked us to make it clear that they strongly object to the land on the eastern boundary being identified as public open space. As you are aware the Campus will be providing a large area of high quality, landscaped and maintained public open space. Whilst the A9/A96 Trunk Link Road (TLR) will form a divide through the Campus site, it is HIE aspiration that the land to the west of the TLR is effectively integrated with the Campus, accommodating complimentary uses and activities. To this end we suggest the land identified as 'preferred open space' is included within the Campus allocation (Site IN80). This will allow HIE flexibility to effectively integrate this land within the wider (landscape) proposals for the Campus as the site develops (rather than isolating the land as 'open space' which sits outside of the Campus).

Allocated to East Inverness IN80 Inverness Campus, Beechwood

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

HIE request that a separate mixed use allocation is made for their land, to the north of railway, allowing development to come forward on the site in isolation, provided that it can be demonstrated that it can be adequately serviced.

Representation

Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land - IN82 We note that the land to the north of the railway has been included within the site IN82 which is allocated for "1300 homes, community, business, Industrial and non-residential". We also note that the Council intends to produce a masterplan/development brief for the entire site which will be adopted a Supplementary Planning Guidance. HIE have aspirations to bring forward development on this parcel of land in support of the Campus, potentially accommodating complimentary business activities. As such, whilst we recognise that any development on the site would need to have careful regard to development at Ashton Farm, particularly with regard to likely transport corridors, HIE consider this parcel of land is should not form part of the wider Ashton Farm site and should not be dependent upon the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Guidance. Given the relative shortage of sites in the IMFLPD suitable for the types of activities HIE is seeking to promote and encourage alongside the delivery of the Campus, HIE considers it extremely important that a deliverable mixed use allocation for this site is secured. HIE is therefore keen that the allocation is not unduly restricted by planning policy requirements. HIE therefore request that a separate mixed use allocation is made for this land, allowing development to come forward on the site in isolation, provided that it can be demonstrated that it can be adequately serviced.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03150 Name Mr Tom Ashley Organisation Turnberry Consulting Ltd

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN81 Type Change

Comment Changes

Extend allocation to include the whole of this parcel of land.

Representation

West of Castlehill Road – Site IN81 Whilst we are supportive of the Council preferred Mixed Use allocation for this site (Business/Housing/Leisure/Community) we note that it has not been extend to the whole of this parcel of land. We see no rationale for arbitrarily dividing the site and suggest that this entire parcel of land would be best allocated for Mixed Use as this would make most efficient use of the land. In any event we consider the proposed allocation of the eastern part of the site as public open space to be inappropriate, not least since this site is situated directly adjacent to the new Inverness Campus which, as set out above, will deliver a large area open space. As such there will be adequate provision of high quality public open space for the use and enjoyment of the local community in this area. We therefore suggest that there is little need or justification for the (part) allocation of the land west of Castle Road for open space. Notwithstanding the above we recognise that a sensitive approach would need to be taken to the development of this site to ensure that it complimented the delivery of the proposed A9/A96 Trunk Link Road (TLR).

Allocated to East Inverness IN81 West of Castlehill Road

Customer Number 01127 Name Mr Tom Forbes Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph housing must be limited to 132 . not 157 as propos

Reference fr2 ness gap Type Change

Comment Changes

the housing should not exceed the 132 as previously agreed.some plots should be allocated for private designed houses. the site for the primary school must be retained as such and not used for any other especially commerce.

Representation

having knocked on the head the sites up at the wards which was probably because of the required 25% for low cost housing , i know that there is a need for such. initaly the housing was no more than 100 which quickly became 100-120 with a 10% addition making it 132. now it seems to be 157.the developer seems to have increased the density in phase 1 which planning should have realised. why did this happen? finally when all these houses are built and children are born , surely there will be a need for a new primary school in the future.if the site is built on where will it go then.we must not be short-sighted.the land on the rosemarkie side of ness road must not be developed.....

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR2 Ness Gap

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Please ignore my submission to you dated the 30 November 2013 as one fact was incorrect. Under the heading Courthill Road in the second sentence "No Vehicle Access" should read "Access only". I now submit the corrected version below I would like considered. I have three main concerns re the FR1 Greenside Farm proposed development and one observation to finish with. 1. Housing Density The are is 1.9 (ha) for fifty houses i.e. 0.038 (ha) per house. This compares with the FR2 proposed development 5.9 (ha) for eighty houses i.e. 0.073 (ha) per house. Nearly twice the density. The Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan adopted in 2007 referring to Rosemarkie Expansion states "Up to 1.7 hectares of land is allocated for 30 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings." The proposed increase in the number of house is totally unacceptable. 2. Courthill Road With the high local Water Table and lack of good drainage Courthill Road suffers from standing water after rainfall. The road is rutted and despite a sign saying "Access only" is used as a "Rat Run" by a number of motorists avoiding the very narrow and busy Rosemarkie High street. No development should commence until all surface water drainage provision, which is SUDS compliant, be completed prior to the first occupaton of any of the houses. 3. Road Junction Any access junction and visibility splays should comply with Council requirements in the interests of road safety. Finally - a number of years ago the then Highland Regional Council had investigated a Rosemarkie by pass and I remember engineers taking core samples in the field behind my house. Any development at Greenside would make any future bypass even more expensive by pushing the line of the road higher up a steep hill. Now is the time for The Council to consider not proceeding with housing on FR1 so as to make any future bypass more economically viable. The Highland Council need to be honest with the inhabitants of Rosemarkie and state one way or the other if for decades of years to come they will be consigned to put up with the high volume of traffic through their village using a most unsuitable main street and the residents on Courthill Road with speeding traffic using it as a bypass.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00310 Name Mr Tommy Hogg Organisation Nairn River Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Nairn River Community Council wishes to erthe following comments on the IMFLDP 1.There are eight proposals for housing development NA1Showfield NA2S Kingsteps 90 NA3 Achareidh 6 NA4 Sandown 350 NA5 Lochloy 200 NA6 Delnies 300 NA8 Nairn South 520 NA9 Nairn South long term 410 We are concerned that these proposals are excessive and are an overprovision which Nairn will not be able to absorb. 2.The proposed developments have signalled the traffic problems that will ensue.The major issue is the provision of Bypass/Dualling to Nairn.Current discussions on the possible route shows he need for a speedy resolution of the route showing that there can be linkage especially to the proposed sites at Nairn South.At present the only suggestion for alleviating the bottleneck at The Cawdor Road Nairn Railway Station Bridge is the provision of sets of traffic lights which we feel will not contribute to improving the traffic flow within the town in general. 3.There are serious concerns about the sewage and waste water facilities which are already giving problems within the system.Para 4.39 states "there needs to be provision of upgrades to the water supply".There are already major problems in Fishertown area of the town during periods of heavy rain and high tides. We remind the Council of the advice given to them in 2006 by Halcrow Consultants That "It is essential that the opportunity for economic development in Nairn matches the overall aspiration for growth.There should be a clear balance between population growth and economic growth over the long term."

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 00912 Name Mr W MacLeod Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Natasha Douglas Ryden LLP

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA3 Type Change

Comment Changes

NA3 to be deleted from the proposed LDP and its allocation transferred to land at Fort Reay.

Representation

What is the specific change you would like to see in the final Plan? It is requested that the allocation given to NA3 in the proposed LDP is transferred to land at Fort Reay. Site NA3 was allocated as site reference S2 within the Nairnshire Local Plan 2000 however, it has not come forward for development. As per guidance contained in Scottish Planning Policy Highland Council should 'focus on what has changed, for example the extent to which key assumptions remain valid, whether land allocations have proved viable' (paragraph 20). It is evident that the allocation at NA3 is no longer valid; had it been an application for planning permission would have been submitted. Accordingly the allocation should be removed from the Plan and the allocation transferred to land at Fort Reay. Transferring the allocation to Fort Reay, which is deliverable in the short term, would contribute to the housing land requirements stated in the Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP).

Allocated to Nairn NA3 Achareidh

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

What is the specific change you would like to see in the final Plan? It is requested that the allocation given to NA1 in the proposed LDP is transferred to land at Fort Reay. Site NA1 was allocated as site reference S2 within the Nairnshire Local Plan 2000 however, the site has not come forward for development. As per guidance contained in Scottish Planning Policy Highland Council should 'focus on what has changed, for example the extent to which key assumptions remain valid, whether land allocations have proved viable' (paragraph 20). It is evident that the allocation at NA1 is no longer valid; had it been an application for planning permission would have been submitted. Accordingly the allocation should be removed from the plan and the allocation transferred to land at Fort Reay. Transferring the allocation to Fort Reay, which is deliverable in the short term, would contribute to the housing land requirements stated in the Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP). Transferring the allocation to land at Fort Reay will secure the sites current status as an area of open space; it is identified in the Highland Greenspace Audit 2010 as 'public parks and gardens'. The loss of this land to accommodate development is not only detrimental to the local community, but directly contravenes Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) which states clearly in paragraph 149 that 'Planning Authorities should support, protect and enhance open space'. Identifying NA1 for development is therefore at odds with national policy. In discussing greenspace provision in Nairn the Highland Greenspace Audit 2010 explains that there is an undersupply of provision for children and teenagers in the form of play areas. NA1, being identified as a public park and garden within a residential area is ideally located to accommodate play facilities thus meeting the shortfall in provision. Highland Council should recognise that Scottish Planning Policy has changed since the adoption of the Nairn Local Plan in 2000 and should not, in keeping with SPP, identify NA1 for development. Instead Highland Council should protect NA1 safeguarding it for open space; thus complying with the objectives of SPP. With alternative options for development, such as Fort Reay, there is no requirement to carry NA1 forward into the proposed LDP. It is understood that the Nairnshire Farmers Society seek allocation of NA1 to finance the relocation of the Nairn Show, as it has outgrown the show field at NA1. It is considered that land could be made available within the expansion areas to the west (NA4 and NA6) or south (NA8 and NA9) of Nairn to accommodate the Nairn Show. Doing so would not only benefit Nairnshire Farming Society but would retain public open space within Nairn town centre. With the opportunity to identify areas of the larger site for community use, Highland Council is encouraged to use this avenue to relocate the Nairn Show in preference to unnecessary development on open space at NA1. Whilst the scale of the Nairn Show may require larger grounds in the future this does not mean that the current ground, which is currently open space in the town centre, is suitable for and should be lost to housing development. It is therefore respectfully requested that NA1 is not carried forward into the proposed LDP. Its allocation should be transferred to land at Fort Reay.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

It is requested that the Plan is changed to identify land at Fort Reay, Sandown Farm Lane, Nairn (MIR reference H1) for residential development. A table should be inserted on page 74 to include land at Fort Reay, Nairn for the development of circa 35 dwellings. The proposals maps for Nairn should be modified to reflect and identify this allocation.

Representation

What is the specific change you would like to see in the final Plan? This representation is submitted to object to the proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). The proposed LDP has failed to identify land at Fort Reay, Sandown Farm Lane, Nairn (Main Issues Report Reference (MIR) H1) for development. It is requested that this is changed to include allocations at Fort Reay, Nairn. A table should be inserted on page 74 of the proposed LDP to include land at Fort Reay, Nairn for residential development. The proposals maps for Nairn should be modified to reflect and identify this allocation. Background A development bid was submitted to Highland Council in April 2011 identifying the site's ability to accommodate residential development. The MIR identified the site as H1. A further representation was submitted to Highland Council in response to the publication of the MIR. The representation requested the allocation of the site and advised that whilst a layout had been prepared for 35 dwellings, the site was capable of accommodating in excess of 60 dwellings. The land owner is aware of Highland Council's desire to retain the wooded area to the north east of the site however, the open areas lend themselves to development in keeping with the existing character of housing at Fort Reay and the surrounding area. Development of land at Fort Reay will therefore make for a high quality and attractive development, which is sympathetic to the character of local area. Justification Objection is made to the failure of the proposed LDP to identify land at Fort Reay, Sandown Farm Lane, Nairn (MIR site reference H1). It is respectfully requested that land at Fort Reay is allocated for development in the proposed LDP for several reasons, in particular given its location within the settlement and proximity to adjoining allocated sites reference NA6 Delnies and NA4 Sandown. Comments received in relation to the proposed LDP acknowledge that the site has development potential however, there has been a failure to allocate the site for development in the proposed LDP. In discussing the site concern was noted that the main constraint to the development of the site was tree loss, potential flood risk and access improvements. It is accepted that any development on the site could result in the loss of some trees however, significant areas of trees would be retained to the north of the site. Regardless of this, there is a significant proportion of the site that can be developed with minimal impact on the trees located on the site. We would confirm that it is only the most easterly part of the site that is identified by the SEPA Indicative River and Coastal Flood Map as being at risk of flooding (see attached). No development is proposed on this part of the site. Nonetheless if requested a Flood Risk Assessment would be undertaken and submitted as part of any planning application for the site; which would identify any required mitigation measures. It is noted that flood risk is not a constraint solely experienced by land at Fort Reay. There are other sites allocated for development in the proposed LDP that are identified in the SEPA Indicative River and Coastal Flood Map as being at risk from flooding (including site reference NA8) regardless of this constraint. Whilst comments received in relation to the proposed LDP note access to the site as being a constraint this was not identified as a constraint to the development of the site within the MIR. Given the scale of development at NA4, significant upgrades to the local road network will be made to accommodate development. The Sandown Development Brief states that development 'presents an opportunity to retain and extend access routes in this part of Nairn'. Detailed provision will be determined through a Regional Access Management Plan, to be prepared at Masterplan stage. It is noted that the Sandown Lane/ Sandown Road Junction will be improved as part of the development of NA4. Development of NA6 brings further road improvements to the local area. A new roundabout is proposed to the west of NA4 which will provide a new distributor connection to the western boundary of NA4. This offers the potential to extend the distributor loop road through NA4 to connect to the A96 at Sandown Lane/ Sandown Road. The site at Fort Reay is therefore well placed to take advantage of these improvements. Furthermore, development of NA6 and NA4 will increase bus service provision in the area and will also deliver a number of foot and cycleways. This reinforces the fact that Fort Reay will be well served by a number of modes of transport thereby delivering a sustainable development. All of the issues identified as restricting development of the site can be overcome in advance of submitting a planning application and should not prevent the allocation of this site. Indeed the advantages of the site were recognised during consultation on the MIR which acknowledged that a significant advantage of the development is the potential for development to form part of the wider Sandown development. There are no barriers to the development of the bulk of Fort Reay and it should be identified for development. Whilst the proposed LDP lists three constraints, which are disputed, to the development of land at Fort Reay it has carried forward allocations from the Nairnshire Local Plan 2000 for development which have similar perceived constraints to development. For these sites tree loss and access to development are not considered to be constraints to development. Consequently they should not be cited as a

constraint to the development of land at Fort Reay. Had Highland Council adopted the same assessment criteria to land at Fort Reay it would have been allocated for development. In discussing development in Nairn the HwLDP explains in paragraph 14.1 that as there is only one major housing site under development in the Nairn area which acts as a 'constraint on the operation of the housing market'. As such, the release of further housing land in Nairn will assist in providing a choice of housing and stimulate the housing market. The HwLDP has adopted a strategy which identifies releases at Lochloy, Sandown as well as initial phases Delnies and Nairn South. Noting in paragraph 14.3 that development in Nairn must be seen in the long term aspirations for a bypass. Table 3 'Potential distribution of development to meet housing land requirement in the Nairn Housing Market Area', indicates that in the first period of the Plan (2011 – 2016) Nairn has the potential to accommodate 846 dwellings with this reducing to 747 in the second period (2016 – 2021). Sites identified by the HwLDP are carried forward into the proposed LDP. These are large scale expansion areas. Delivery of these sites to the market takes longer than smaller scale allocations as the site preparation and infrastructure requirements are greater. It is accepted that the proposed LDP has allocated two smaller sites (NA1 and NA3) however, they only amount to 36 units of housing. Their ability to deliver development having been allocated since 2000 is questioned. The proposed LDP should allocate land at Fort Reay in preference to these allocations as it can deliver development in the short term and has a land owner who is keen, willing and able to bring the site to the market. Allocation of land at Fort Reay is required to allow the Inner Moray Firth LDP to meet the housing targets set by the HwLDP. Allocation at Fort Reay, which is deliverable in the short term, would contribute to the housing land requirements. In doing so it would provide a choice of housing ensuring that allocations are not restricted to the larger scale housing sites, and will also assist in stimulating the housing market in Nairn assisting the Inner Moray Firth LDP meet the targets set by the HwLDP. Furthermore development of land at Fort Reay would contribute financially to identified strategic infrastructure requirements thus assisting Highland Council realise their vision for Nairn. Land at Fort Reay is ideally located to accommodate development. The site lies less than 380 metres from a bus stop, thereby promoting sustainable travel and complying with guidance contained within paragraphs 38, 39 and 168 of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) all of which encourage the use of public transport. Fort Reay is also located in close proximity to the A96 which provides links to Inverness, Forres and Elgin. Fort Reay, lying to the west of Nairn, adjacent to the A96, provides excellent access to Inverness airport. Development of land at Fort Reay would promote sustainable travel and transport opportunities thereby reducing the reliance on the private car. Land at Fort Reay lies within the catchment area for both Nairn Academy and Rosebank Primary School. Nairn Academy is currently operating at 90% capacity which is forecast to decline to 82% in 2018/2019. Similarly Rosebank Primary School also has a declining school roll which is predicted to decline to 87% of capacity in 2015/16. Development at Fort Reay would support both these falling school rolls. Land at Fort Reay is bound to the south and west by NA4 Sandown. A Development Brief was approved as Supplementary Guidance in March 2012 by the Planning, Environmental and Development Committee. A concept Masterplan has been produced for the development at Sandown which highlights that land at Fort Reay will form an infill site following development of NA4. Development at Fort Reay, as an infill site, not only directs development to the best location, but makes the best use of land which is a finite resource. Development of land at Fort Reay would encourage the efficient use of land, thus achieving the objectives of SPP. The Development Brief for Sandown states that development will create employment, leisure and community facilities, retail, tertiary education and children's play area. Furthermore public transport services will be improved and there will be a number of infrastructure improvements such as, improvements to Sandown Farm Lane and the Sandown Road junction. Fort Reay is ideally located to take advantage of the services, facilities and improved infrastructure that development at NA6 and NA4 Sandown will deliver. Development of land at Fort Reay is therefore compliant with the aims of sustainable development. Paragraph 5 of SPP emphasises that the Scottish Government believes strongly in the value of forward-looking, visionary and ambitious plans that will guide development. As noted above, following the development of NA4, land at Fort Reay will form an infill site. Lying within the settlement boundary the site lends itself well to development. Land at Fort Reay is in private ownership and has no recreational or amenity value, it will therefore be out of place within a residential/ business area. In line with the advice contained within SPP, the Council should take a strategic view and allocate land at Fort Reay for development as an extension of NA4. To conclude, land at Fort Reay should be allocated for development. It is ideally located to accommodate development lying within 400m of existing public transport routes and services. Development of land at Fort Reay will also maximise opportunities offered by the development of both NA6 and NA4 Sandown. It is therefore respectfully requested that land at Fort Reay is identified for development. Conclusion To conclude, land at Fort Reay should be identified within the LDP for development. It is ideally located to accommodate development lying within 400m of existing public transport routes and services. Development of land at Fort Reay will also maximise opportunities offered by the development of both NA6 and NA4 Sandown. It is therefore respectfully requested that Fort Reay is identified for development within the LDP. Recommendation It is recommended that MIR site reference H1 is allocated in the LDP for the development of at least 35 dwellings.

Allocated to	Nairn	General	General	
--------------	-------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number 00242 Name Mr Will Downie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Inclusion of Garblies Farm, Auldearn, redundant steading as a potential site for 3 house sites. Inclusion of Torbeggie at Garblies Farm, Auldearn as a single house site. Previous site of traditional steading.

Representation

Sites were considered too small in the initial "call for sites" proposals. We considered the HC were looking for large scale sites of 10+ houses.

Allocated to Auldearn General General

Customer Number 04107 Name Mr William Dingwall Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.70 Muir of Ord

Reference M05 Type Change

Comment Changes

I object to and would like to have the Development Allocation M05 removed from the Proposed Plan on the basis of major impact on traffic and congestion in the local area. I object to and would like to have the Development Allocation M05 removed from the Proposed Plan on safety grounds due to the development being adjacent to a SEPA regulated site.

Representation

Any further development in the Muir of Ord area will compound existing traffic congestion on the A862 route. Current developments at the care home in Muir of Ord as well as construction of approximately 170 residential units have already impacted on this road in and around Muir of Ord. Developments in the wider area will also impact on the volume of traffic on this route. Any closure of the Kessock Bridge due to accident or weather event diverts all traffic via the A862. Any development of M05 for residential, retail or business use and any development of M06 for industrial use will only make the situation worse. In addition any development near to the SGL Carbon plant (a SEPA regulated site) has safety implications if the evacuation of the surrounding area during a major incident is delayed due to increased development. The proposed development at M05 by Colliers International (agent) proposes a pedestrian crossing in an unsuitable position. Having resided at Wyndhill since 1989 the proposed crossing does not address the problem we as locals have with traffic on the A862 at the Wyndhill/Windhill crossroads. Should this development proceed I would suggest an alternative location. At present the pick up and drop off points for school and public service buses is at the Wyndhill/Windhill crossroads. A traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing at this position would be a much needed, safer system for school children, pedestrians and cyclists crossing the road. It would also improve access for vehicles joining the A862 from the side roads. In addition I suggest that a new footpath is incorporated from the M05 development to join the existing footpath from Windhill to Beaully making it safer for pedestrians and cyclists travelling to Beaully from the M05 development.

Allocated to Muir of Ord M05 Land to South of The Cairns

Customer Number 01072 Name Mr William Gill Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Ken Bowlts Bowlts Chartered Surveyors

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.5

Reference AL3, AL4 and AL11 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We write on behalf of our client, Mr William Gill, the owner of sites AL3, AL4 and AL11, identified within the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan as Achnagarron South, Achnagarron North and Achnagarron Farm. We write to confirm our clients' continued support of the inclusion of his land within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan and his hope that the land can be brought forward for development in early course.

Allocated to Alness General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We act for Mr William Gill who owns land to the south and east of Alness and following our Mr Bowlt's recent telephone conversation with your Lynn Clarke, now enclose herewith a plan showing outlined in red the site discussed with Ms Clarke. At the Main Issues Report stage, this site was identified as H8 and shown as "non-preferred", the suggested cons being that development of this site would result in loss of open space, a visual impact, a loss of prime farmland and the site was also not favoured because of its proximity to the A9. However, a significant pro was the site constituted a useful infill opportunity which had been allocated in the existing Local Plan, according to the table in the Main Issues Report. The site lies within the settlement boundary of Alness and at a Public Consultation Workshop meeting for the Alness area on 10th May 2012, the following pertinent facts were highlighted:-

- Alness has capacity within its schools to accommodate more children; most of the schools run at around two-thirds capacity and Obsdale capacity at about one third;
- there was capacity within the existing water and sewerage systems to accommodate growth;
- development should help to secure local facilities and should be encouraged;
- maintenance of a green barrier between Alness and the A9 was desirable;
- the importance of ensuring that any land allocated for housing should constitute an effective land supply given the history of some sites at Alness not coming forward for development;
- the importance of having a number of sites within different ownerships allocated for housing.

We have considered carefully your Council's Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan and are disappointed to note that our above client's site and the opportunity that it affords for a small scale infill development within the settlement boundary has been disregarded. We have prepared the attached initial sketch proposal illustrating how it should be possible to have 11 detached units, of similar size to the recently constructed dwellings in the Davis Drive development, with access from the old A9 main road immediately to the north of the site, with access junctions staggered at 50m. Our sketch proposals show a minimum of 15m and a maximum of 55m between the A9 road edge and the proposed site boundaries. This buffer would consist of planting and a 6m access road. The layout of the houses is indicative but reflects the pattern of Alness at Obsdale Road. The houses are located nearer to the old A9 edge of the site, whilst still giving adequate garden space, but a larger buffer to the trunk road. Although this area is currently allocated as farmland, limited housing development and a buffer zone is a much more productive use of the land. In terms of the policies of the Highland Wide Local Development Plan, we would refer to Policy 28 – Sustainable Design and would suggest that the proposed development is compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools and electricity) and it accessible by public transport, cycling and walking as well as car. We would also refer to Policy 34 – Settlement Development Areas and would confirm that this site sits within the existing settlement boundary of Alness and therefore would be able to make use of existing infrastructure and services. We understand that water and sewerage provision either lies within or immediately adjacent to the site. The site sits opposite an existing development and as noted above, is compatible with the existing pattern of development and landscape character. We would be grateful if you could give further consideration to the inclusion of this site within the IMFLDP and treat this letter as a request that the merits of the site be reconsidered and our client's objection to the site's exclusion from the IMFLDP.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We would ask the Council to consider the following amendment: The last sentence of Para 4.31 reading "Early engagementTreatment Works. to be substituted with: "Whilst sufficient capacity currently exists at Assynt Water Treatment Works and Muir of Ord Waste Water Treatment Works, the cumulative impact of all proposed development within the plan makes it necessary for early engagement to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands in the future can be delivered in line with development."

Representation

There is a significant amount of capacity available at the Assynt WTW currently but the current sentence might be interpreted as there being capacity issues currently. However, the cumulative impact of the overall plan must be considered and at some point in the future additional capacity may be required. We feel that the suggested amendment encourages development by making it clear that there is existing capacity but as a matter of routine, planning for future development is essential to deliver capacity in line with growth.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Scottish Water supports the Council's drive to utilise existing spare capacity wherever possible. This helps maximise the sustainability of development, minimises development costs and ensures that funding for increased treatment capacity can be targetted appropriately and efficiently to help deliver sustainable growth across Scotland.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.127 Page 124

Reference Tomatin Type Change

Comment Changes

Request additional wording within this section to insert after the words 'Assynt Treatment Works/: "across the planning period and beyond"

Representation

Emphasises that the engagement is important on an ongoing basis and not as a result of a current capacity issue.

Allocated to Tomatin General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.116 Page 116

Reference Inchmore Type Change

Comment Changes

Request amendment to last sentence in para 4.116 beginning "Early engagement.....". Suggest substitution with "Early engagement is required to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands at Glenconvinth Water Treatment Works and Kiltarlity Waste Water Treatment Works in the future can be delivered in line with development.

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to Inchmore General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Request amendment to Para 4.75 after semicolon to read: "Whilst sufficient capacity currently exists at Assynt Water Treatment Works and Muir of Ord Waste Water Treatment Works, the cumulative impact of all proposed development within the plan makes it necessary for early engagement to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands in the future can be delivered in line with development.

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

We would ask that in addition to the existing text the following be added: "Scottish Water are funded to provide capacity at their strategic water and waste water assets, to meet the demand of domestic growth and the domestic element of commercial growth , provided such development meets the five ministerial criteria set out to trigger this investment."

Representation

Emphasises that Scottish Water is funded to address the cumulative effect of the proposed development on its assets across the planning period. However early engagement is vital in ensuring this investment is planned and takes place in line with growth demands.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph 3.8 pg 22

Reference Policy 4 Type Change

Comment Changes

We would ask that some clarification be inserted with regards to the statement "At present the water quality in the Loch is poor due to the level of sewage effluent entering the loch, originating from the surrounding area." We would suggest that 'originating from the surrounding area' be replaced with "from individual private waste water treatment arrangements in the vicinity of the loch."

Representation

We would ask that his be amended to make it clear that Scottish Water do not have any waste water assets in the area surrounding the loch and that any pollution is not as a result of a public asset.

Allocated to Policy 5 Development Within the Water Catchment of Loch Flemington

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Bullet 6 Page 63

Reference Nairn Type Change

Comment Changes

We would ask that in addition to the requirement for improvements to waste water treatment provision that improvements to the networks will almost certainly be required.

Representation

A minor addition to ensure developers are aware of the potential requirement for network investigation and mitigation with significant development focussing on the edges of the settlement and connecting to well established housing and their networks.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.151 Page 139

Reference Evanton Type Change

Comment Changes

Amendment to sentence reading "Early engagement....." Suggested sentence to replace: "Early engagement is required between developers and Scottish Water to ensure sufficient capacity can be delivered across the planning period as part of Scottish Water's investment programme, taking into account the cumulative demand on Assynt WTW and Evanton WWTW."

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to Evanton General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Para 3.9 Pg 21

Reference 4 Water & Wastewater Type Change

Comment Changes

Potential addition to this section or removal to reflect that Scottish Water does this as a matter of course through its every day business. e.g after the words 'Scottish Water' insert a full stop and new para. Insert "Scottish Water will continue to work closely with its Regulators and other Agencies as part of its daily operations, to ensure no adverse effects impact on the integrity of these sites." ...Policies 4&5.....

Representation

We feel that this is a business as usual activity for Scottish Water and we are strictly regulated in our activities that may impact on Scotland's natural environment. Prior to any operational alterations Scottish Water would have to carry out a number of assessments including a Habitats Regulation Assessment, therefore specific mention of the existing statement within the plan may not be pertinent. We are happy to discuss further with regards to specific wording if required.

Allocated to Policy 4 Water and Waste Water Infrastructure in the Inverness to Nairn Growth Area

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Point 3

Reference Policy 5 Type Change

Comment Changes

We would ask that the removal of the section 'connection to adequate mains sewerage facilities' be considered.

Representation

As there are no public waste water assets in close proximity to the Loch Flemington Catchment the requirement to connect to 'mains sewerage facilities' is not currently practical, It may be more prudent to emphasise the the upgrading of an existing private septic tank. It may also be prudent to comment that it should be considered to build the septic tank to adoptable Scottish Water standards, should closer public infrastructure become available as part of the A96 development corridor.

Allocated to Policy 5 Development Within the Water Catchment of Loch Flemington

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.122 Page 120 Bullet 3

Reference Tomatin Type Change

Comment Changes

Suggest the bullet point reading "New development will help to sustain local facilities and prompt investment in the waste water network....." may benefit from further clarification. In most development scenarios it would be incumbent upon the developer to mitigate any issues resulting from their development being added to the existing network. This is a priority required by Scottish Water to protect existing customers. Therefore it is suggested that the section be amended to "...., prompt investment in the waste water network delivered as a result of new development....."

Representation

Clarifies the responsibilities for network mitigation to ensure existing network services are protected.

Allocated to Tomatin General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.62 Page 80

Reference Fortrose & Rosemarkie Type Change

Comment Changes

Request change to second sentence in paragraph starting "Early engagement....." Suggested amendment: "Early engagement is required between developers and Scottish Water to ensure sufficient capacity can be planned and delivered across the lifespan of the plan and beyond at the Assynt Water Treatment Works"

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.50 Page 72

Reference Alness Type Change

Comment Changes

Change the last sentence in 4.50 from "Early engagement.....Treatment Works" to: "Early engagement is required between developers and Scottish Water to ensure sufficient capacity can be planned and delivered across the lifespan of the plan and beyond at the Assynt and Newtonmore Water Treatment Works."

Representation

Makes it clear that current capacity exists and advance engagement helps plan for additional capacity within and beyond the current plan requirements.

Allocated to Alness General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.141 Page 133

Reference Cromarty

Type Change

Comment Changes

Suggest substitution of existing sentence in 4.141 to read as follow: "The cumulative impact of all proposed development within the overall plan on shared treatment asset such as Assynt WTW makes it necessary for early engagement to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands in the asset can be delivered in line with development."

Representation

Emphasises that engagement is important on an ongoing basis to address the cumulative impact of development on an asset which currently has significant free capacity and not as a result of a current capacity issue.

Allocated to Cromarty General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.133 Page 127

Reference Avoch

Type Change

Comment Changes

Request amendment to the sentence including ".....and early engagement is required...." Suggested insertion to read "whilst capacity exists currently at Assynt WTW, the cumulative impact of all proposed development within the overall plan on shared treatment assets makes it necessary for early engagement to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands at Assynt WTW and Conon Bridge WTW in the future can be delivered in line with development.

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to Avoch General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.83 Page 92

Reference Tain Type Change

Comment Changes

Suggest substitution of existing first sentence in para 4.83 to read: ""Whilst sufficient capacity currently exists at Assynt Water Treatment Works and Newtonmore it early engagement is required to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands in the future can be delivered in line with development."

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to Tain General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.113 Page 115

Reference Inchmore Type Change

Comment Changes

Request amendment to last sentence in para 4.113 beginning "Early engagement.....". Suggest substitution with "Early engagement is required to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands at Glenconvinth Water Treatment Works in the future can be delivered in line with development.

Representation

As previously suggested this makes it clear that there is existing capacity and that a cumulative effect over time may require investment but does not present an issue currently.

Allocated to Inchmore General General

Customer Number 00396 Name Mr William Paton Organisation Scottish Water

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.39 page 64

Reference Nairn Type Change

Comment Changes

We would ask that a minor addition be added similar to previous comments relating to capacity over the whole plan. Therefore after the sentence "The provision of upgrades....development of the settlement" we ask for a full stop inserted after settlement, followed with the following additional sentence: "Whilst capacity exists currently, the cumulative impact of all proposed development within the overall plan on shared treatment assets makes it necessary for early engagement to take place between Developers and Scottish Water, to ensure any additional capacity demands in the future can be delivered in line with development."

Representation

With the availability of the large water mains extension an Whiteness and the overall potential of Loch Ashie (and other augmenting sources) it is important to state that there is current capacity. Whilst the requirement for additional capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works is closer on the horizon, we feel that reinforcing the message of available capacity and the process for planning is important.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number 01129 Name Mrs Ann Forbes Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference FR2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Change housing capacity

Representation

Page 82 - Mixed Use - Site FR2 NESS GAP. - a) You state a figure of 80 homes with development "in accordance with 09/0047/OUTRC". I object to this statement because it is actually 156 (as per the e-mail from your dept. to me) and consequently anyone looking at the Proposed Plan could not possible know what the true situation is. The figure of 156 is an increase of 24 houses over and above the outline planning 09/00471/OUTRC for 132 houses (Originally it was applied for at 100 - 120 houses to which 323 people objected.) b) I object to more houses putting even more pressure on local services eg. Fortrose Academy not admitting any more 1st years. c) As per the aforementioned e-mail, "This type of housing density is considered medium and appropriate for this site". I object to this statement because I don't think it is appropriate to THIS site.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR2 Ness Gap

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the bullet point which states, 'Expansion of settlement forms part of the wider growth strategy for the A96 Corridor'. I would like this bullet point removed. I ask for the removal of this bullet point because it is clear that expansion of this number (over 300 new homes) is definitely not the amount of development which was apparently approved as part of the consideration of the A96 Masterplan (a masterplan which was then set out in a 'concise strategy document', the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework). This is a very important distinction and readers of the IMFLDP must not be left with the impression that the numbers for the village arose as a direct result of the A96 masterplan work 'approval'.

Representation

I object to the bullet point which states, 'Expansion of settlement forms part of the wider growth strategy for the A96 Corridor'. I would like this bullet point removed. I ask for the removal of this bullet point because it is clear that expansion of this number (over 300 new homes) is definitely not the amount of development which was apparently approved as part of the consideration of the A96 Masterplan (a masterplan which was then set out in a 'concise strategy document', the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework). This is a very important distinction and readers of the IMFLDP must not be left with the impression that the numbers for the village arose as a direct result of the A96 masterplan work 'approval'. A more detailed rationale for this objection is as follows. At their meeting on Wednesday 14 March 2007, and after some debate, The Planning, Development, Europe and Tourism Committee produced the following 'Decision': The Committee AGREED the recommendations as set out in the report, subject to the inclusion of point (vi) below: i. amendments to the draft A96 Corridor Masterplan as set out in the Annex to the report; ii. that a concise Strategy document, taking account of the amendments at (i) above, be issued as interim guidance, pending (iv) below; iii. that priority development status be accorded to the proposed Inverness College/UHI Campus and associated amenity/sports provisions at Beechwood, to enable implementation of this strategic project prior to 2011, having regard to policies 2.8(vii), 2.41(v) and 3.1 of the adopted Inverness Local Plan; iv. a revised developer contributions protocol for the A96 corridor, to be applied as the interim framework for negotiation of essential s.75 Infrastructure Agreements on qualifying sites within the Corridor, pending (iv) below; v. that the revised Masterplan be fed into preparation of the strategic Highland Local Development Plan scheduled for later in 2007, subject to consideration of outstanding Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) consultation responses from the statutory agencies by the incoming Council; this to facilitate the early completion of statutory plan-making procedures, including provision for any objections to be heard at an independent Public Local Inquiry; and vi. to recommend to the new Council that a formal strategic partnership, without executive powers, be formed to facilitate liaison between the major bodies involved in the proposals. If we focus on points (i) and (ii) of the 'Decision' For point (i) - The annex to the above noted report, 'Appendix 1', summarised the non-statutory 'consultation' that had taken place in early 2007 and noted the Council's response to it. With respect to Cawdor village, the submission made by the landowner was summarised by the Planning Authority as: "Scope for at least 240 houses to be added to Cawdor village based on new school, other services and village amenities. It is important to note that the original representation, on which the Planning Authority's summary had been based, had asked for development to be brought forward to the 2006-2011 timeframe and for the build rate to be at least 60 dwellings per 5 year period. – to cover 4 'periods'; hence the 240. The Planning Authority's response to this request was: "Cawdor is already recognised in the Strategy as a key village capable of expansion. There is an existing stock of zoned land and planning consents here. Given its special built conservation value, any additional proposals will need to pay particular attention to the heritage considerations, and will require to be progressed through the formal development plan process. The rate of development should respect the threshold of a maximum 25% housing increase in any given ten year period. Development will be liable to the developer contributions framework. RECOMMENDATION: No Change" With respect to the 'approved' A96 masterplan; the consultant's suggested growth figure for Cawdor village appears to be 237 in total and is assumed to cover the 35 year period from 2006 to 2041 and hence assumed to include the already existing Nairnshire local plan allocation of 30. For a 20 year plan period this would equate to a total growth of no more than 140 houses, whereas the IMFLDP carries forward a figure from the HwLDP of more than 300 – an allocation which I believe derives from the developer interest rather than, as I have just set out, from the original A96 Masterplan 'approval' figure.. With respect to point (ii) The A96 GCDF was prepared as a concise strategy document and interim guidance. Councillors agreed that the strategy document was required to take account of amendments (as presented as appendix 1 of the Report) to the draft masterplan. This A96 GCDF was not a rewrite or an update. It was simply to be a more 'readable' version of that which had been approved in March 2007 taking into account the amendments.

Allocated to Cawdor General General

Customer Number 00511 Name Mrs C Stafford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 45

Reference Site IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes Type Change

Comment Changes

I object to the text as written for Site IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes. I seek an expansion of the plan text for Site IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes given the sites potential importance to realising the Planning Authority's bold ambition to link the A96, A9 and A82. I question the reasoning behind allocation the land for a specific purpose such as retail.

Representation

I seek an expansion of the plan text for Site IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes given the sites potential importance to realising the Planning Authority's bold ambition to link the A96, A9 and A82. It makes no sense to set out plans for the construction of a 'West Link', which did not achieve the support of the STPR outcome, in the IMFLDP, whilst seemingly giving insufficient weight in the plan text to Site IN55's importance to the construction of the eastern part (which was supported by the STPR) of the Trunk Link road The Highland Council exhibited proposals for the 'Inverness Trunk Link Road' <http://www.highland.gov.uk/nr/ronlyres/4a4bcb6a-936a-4347-b593-3c71bdc409d7/0/itlrpresentation.pdf> and the proposals were described as, '...the central plank of the transport master plan for Inverness.' The exhibition also highlighted possible route options, and, whilst I do not agree with any options as presented, (what happens to any residents?) I feel there should be some further recognition in the text for this site in the IMFLDP.

Allocated to South Inverness IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes

Customer Number 00511 Name Mrs C Stafford Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Map 5, page 23

Reference Map 5, page 23, 'Inverness to Nairn Growth Area' Type Change

Comment Changes

I ask that a much clearer map showing the Loch Flemington Catchment is produced in the IMFLDP.

Representation

I ask that a much clearer map showing the Loch Flemington Catchment is produced. At the moment it is unclear as to what land area and which of the smaller settlements will fall within the Catchment area.

Allocated to Policy 5 Development Within the Water Catchment of Loch Flemington

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

I object to the inclusion of the bullet point, 'Proximity to Inverness Airport Business Park providing employment opportunity' in paragraph 4.42 and ask that this bullet point be withdrawn.

Representation

I object to the inclusion of the bullet point, 'Proximity to Inverness Airport Business Park providing employment opportunity' and ask that this bullet point be withdrawn for the reasons that I have set out here. I object to the assertion that the Inverness Airport Business Park, IABP, will be in a position to provide employment opportunities locally given the current state of progress with the venture. Should the Authority feel unable to change the text as requested and this becomes an unresolved representation I seek that the Reporter takes note of these extracts from the Committee Report, regarding the Inverness Airport Business Park's financial status, to the Council's Strategic Planning Committee (PED) this year, 2013. (PED Report Extracts) 'Inverness Airport Business Park Ltd issued Loan Stock of £1.175m to the Council to reflect the cost incurred by the Council in building the new access road to the airport from the A96. The repayment of this Loan Stock will allow the Council to recover its costs in constructing the road, albeit over a period of time... ..As reported to the Planning Environment and Development Committee in January 2011, Inverness Airport Business Park Ltd opted to defer the first repayment of the Loan Stock, amounting to £587.5k, due to be received by the Council in May 2010. This deferment was made in accordance with the Loan Stock agreement which allows the Company to defer the payment if they believe the repayment would have a prejudicial impact on their business proposals for the Business Park. Under the deferment arrangements, the 2010 repayment now becomes payable to the Council in May 2015 unless independent reviews of the Company's accounts indicate the deferred amount can be paid earlier... ..Inverness Airport Business Park Ltd continues to have insufficient funds to repay the Loan Stock without the payment having a prejudicial impact on their business proposals for the Business Park...The Balance Sheet to March 2013 indicates the net worth of the company as £317,799 (£392,782 as at March 2012) and the Profit and Loss Accounts report a loss of £77,983 (loss of £21,475 for the year to March 2012) over the same period. These figures reflect that the company has still to fully commence its trading activities and is at an early stage in developing the business park.' (Extract ends) I also seek that the Reporter takes note of the following facts; The table below is taken from the Inverness Airport Business Park Environmental Statement; Technical Annex 7, Socio-Economics, March 2008, section 5, page 34 Table 5.2 Employment capacity of IABP at full occupancy (number of workers Business Industry Other Total 2008 - 2011 1,120 283 125 1,528 2012 - 2021 3,360 849 339 4,548 2022 - 2041 7,280 1,840 615 9,735 2042 - 2061 11,200 2,831 882 14,913 (NB TABLE DID NOT UPLOAD PROPERLY) It clearly shows that capacity was anticipated to be provided for a significant number of workers from 2008 onwards. No building work has been undertaken in the last 5 years. When the new plans for the Airport Business Park were unveiled for public display in early 2008, 'The Caithness Business Index' reported that it was estimated that the first phase of development, to 2021, could create around 70,000 sq metres of business accommodation, including an airport hotel supporting hundreds of new jobs. In April 2011, Urban Realm reported that, 'Roxhill has signed a seven year deal with Inverness Airport Business Park (IABP) to develop 400,000sq/ft of warehousing and industrial space. Work on the £30m scheme, designed by 7N Architects, could start by the end of the year and complete by 2012 – subject to occupiers stepping forward to pre-let the space.' On the 25 September this year, 2013, in an article in the 'Strathspey and Badenoch Herald', <http://www.strathspey-herald.co.uk/News/Inverness-airport-loan-repayments-up-in-the-air-25092013.htm> , Dr S Black, the Former 'Director of Planning' at the Highland Council, was quoted as saying that, "...the IABP had been operating in tough market conditions." The new IABP chairman, David Hastings, was the subject of a press article in the local press in March 2013 which stated: PATIENCE will be needed as efforts continue to attract companies to the Inverness Airport Business Park, the organisation's new chairman has warned. More than three years after the 250 hectare project received planning consent, Bond Air Services remains the only tenant and no operator has come forward to run a hoped-for hotel. As chief executive of the Strathleven Regeneration Company, a post he will continue to hold, Mr Hastings has helped attract more than £50 million to the Lomondgate development at Dumbarton and sees many parallels with the Inverness development. "Both are very ambitious projects and long term proposals," he said. "It is very difficult to establish a new business location. At Strathleven the public perception was that nothing happened for seven years but there was in fact a lot of activity going on to put things in place. "Things came and went then we were successful in obtaining Aggreko as a tenant, which has just completed a £25 million manufacturing facility and transformed the location." Given the points outlined above I believe that it is appropriate for this IMFLDP to be clearly informed regarding the status of this business park venture. Unless Highland Council can provide detailed documentary evidence that a reasonable variety of jobs can be provided at the airport site between 2014 and 2021, in the first instance, then the local plan should not allowed be allowed to

reflect that there will be any opportunities for employment on that site in the short to medium term.

Allocated to Tornagrain

General

General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object both to the lack of clarity in paragraph 4.36 and to the principle from which I assume the first sentence, ('The potential for settlement growth in Nairn is based around the development of the major development sites, established through the HwLDP, at Delnies, Lochloy, Nairn south and Sandown') is derived. I require that the 'link' between the site specific allocations in the HWLDP and the corresponding site specific allocations in the IMFLDP is broken.

Representation

I object both to the lack of clarity in paragraph 4.36 and to the principle from which I assume the first sentence, ('The potential for settlement growth in Nairn is based around the development of the major development sites, established through the HwLDP, at Delnies, Lochloy, Nairn south and Sandown') is derived. I require that the 'link' between the site specific allocations in the HWLDP and the corresponding site specific allocations in the IMFLDP is broken. My rationale for this objection is as follows. Planning Circular 1 2009; Development Planning contains the following policy on implementation of legislation or procedures. ...Strategic development planning authorities (SDPAs) are required by section 4(1) of the Act to prepare and review strategic development plans (SDPs), and submit these to Scottish Ministers within four years of the approval of the existing plan. The SDPA Designation Orders of 2008 only established SDPAs in the Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee and Edinburgh city regions. ...Section 16 of the Act requires all planning authorities to prepare one or more local development plan (LDP) for their area as soon as practicable after the Act comes into force. These must cover the whole of the authority's area, although one location may be covered by more than one LDP if prepared for different purposes (e.g. minerals), and LDPs may extend across the areas of more than one planning authority. Regardless of how many LDPs cover a local authority area, all must be replaced at least every 5 years. Authorities must also keep their plans under review. ...Section 15 of the Act requires LDPs to contain a spatial strategy, this being a detailed statement of the planning authority's policies and proposals as to the development and use of land. Outside SDP areas, LDPs must also contain a vision statement, as described in paragraph 14 above. Planning authorities may also include any other matters in the plan that it considers appropriate. ...Scottish Ministers expect LDPs to be concise map-based documents that focus on their specific main proposals for the period up to year 10 from adoption. Outside SDP areas, they should also provide a broad indication of the scale and location of growth up to year 20. Minor proposals and detailed policies may be removed to supplementary guidance, especially if there is no significant change from the previous plan, and provided an appropriate context remains in the plan itself. In SDP areas, LDPs need not repeat policy material contained in the SDP. Report 59/13, which was presented at of the Planning, Environment and Development Committee held on Inverness on Wednesday, 18 September 2013, notes that: The HwLDP includes some development sites (and corresponding text) that lie within the Inner Moray Firth (IMF) area. These sites have been tested through an independent Examination and so the principle of development has been accepted. The vast majority of these sites have been "rolled forward" into the Proposed Plan with little or no change. It is therefore intended that any Proposed Plan content that was previously approved through the HwLDP should not be re-examined through the IMFLDP process. Minor changes such as the mix of uses or phasing would be open to comment. Some of the same sites now have an extant planning permission, for example at Delnies, Tornagrain and Stratton. It is intended to take a similar approach to these sites. The IMFLDP itself states that, 'Any allocation and text in the adopted HwLDP that relates to sites within the Inner Moray Firth Area will be updated by this plans content' Inverness is not an SDPA and therefore it appears that there is no requirement for a separate strategic document, however, in recognition of the geographical issues that Highland Council faces, it may be reasonable to consider the HwLDP as a 'pseudo structure plan' for Highland wide policies. However, the HwLDP is not an SDP; it is simply, in terms of land allocation, an LDP. Circular 4 2009 quite clearly expresses that the same site should not appear in two different LDP's unless it is for different purpose. The public should not be prevented from commenting on all planning aspects relating to all the sites that have been rolled forward from the HwLDP to the IMFLDP. The economic climate continues to change and the Area LDP should be open to challenge and evaluation in the light of these ever changing financial circumstances.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I also object to the last sentence in paragraph 4.43, also with regard to the reference to 'Emerging employment opportunities at the Airport Business Park and ask that this be replaced with a sentence to state, 'In order to facilitate non-car travel a shuttlebus, for which developer contributions will be sought, will provide a connecting service between Tornagrain and the rail halt at Dalcross.'

Representation

I also object to the last sentence in paragraph 4.43, also with regard to the reference to 'Emerging employment opportunities at the Airport Business Park and ask that this be replaced with a sentence to state, 'In order to facilitate non-car travel a shuttlebus, for which developer contributions will be sought, will provide a connecting service between Tornagrain and the rail halt at Dalcross.'

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

I seek recognition within, and amendment of, the 'Site CR2' text to reflect that a significant proportion of the 'Mixed Use: Site CR2 West of primary school' specifically lies within the Kildrummie Kames Esker system. Please see Representation section for details of the changes in wording sought. In support of this objection to the text and the request to redraft the text I have attached a document which is available on line and which is itself an extract from the 'Geological Conservation Review', Volume 6: Quaternary of Scotland, Chapter 7: Inverness area Site: KILDRUMMIE KAMES (GCR ID: 418)

Representation

I seek that, given the potential environmental sensitivities of this site the text of the 'Mixed Use; Site CR2 West of Primary School' is redrafted to state that: 'Area (ha) 15.0 - Uses: residential (no more than 150 units), retail and community Requirements: "The council, further to consultation with the relevant statutory agencies, and taking into account measures set out in Policy 5 of this plan, will prepare a development brief (to be adopted as Supplementary Guidance) in order to ensure that the appropriate environmental mitigation would be in place before development of any kind progresses on this site. The brief will address phasing. Any development proposals presented would need to take into account this guidance and also address; improvements to linkages to the A96 and Mid-Coul roundabout and the B9006; transport assessment and necessary mitigation of impacts on local and trunk road networks; provision of appropriate SUDS; provision of footpath/ cycleway connection to wider village network; provision of open space, which should be delivered in line with the requirements of Open Space in New Residential Developments: Supplementary Guidance; Development of this site to 2031 should take place in 5 year periods and numbers permitted in construction phases will take into account the timing of environmental monitoring and the restoration of the Croy Burn.'

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the text as written in paragraph 2.12 and wish to see the third sentence of the paragraph altered as follows, "However a different capacity than that specified may be acceptable; for instance, where environmental policy indicates that a lower number may be necessary or where the presence of particularly high quality design and layout in an application demonstrates that an increase in unit number or density will bring numerous clear social benefits to the area.

Representation

I object to the text as written in paragraph 2.12 and wish to see the third sentence of the paragraph altered as follows, "However a different capacity than that specified may be acceptable; for instance, where environmental policy indicates that a lower number may be necessary or where the presence of particularly high quality design and layout in an application demonstrates that an increase in unit number or density will bring numerous clear social benefits to the area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the wording of the text as it stands and seek an addition to the text to reflect the existence of Policy 5 and the topography of the village. Please add the following sentence at the end of the text for this site, "Development proposals for site CR1 should take into account the IMFLDP Policy 5 and site CR1's potential proximity both to the Croy Burn and to the Croy section of the Kildrummie Kames esker system.'

Representation

In support of this objection to the text and the request to redraft the text I have attached a document which is available on line and which is itself an extract from the 'Geological Conservation Review', Volume 6: Quaternary of Scotland, Chapter 7: Inverness area Site: KILDRUMMIE KAMES (GCR ID: 418)

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

I object to the text as written and I wish for the removal of the following sentence from this paragraph, ‘...especially the nearby proposed new settlement at Tornagrain and also the Inverness Airport Business Park.’ Please refer to the ‘Your Representation’ part of this online form for the justification for this request. I also wish to add to the sentence at the end of the paragraph as follows, ‘...and in order to facilitate non-car travel a shuttlebus, for which developer contributions will be sought, will provide a connecting service between Croy and the rail halt at Dalcross.’

Representation

I object to the assertion that the Inverness Airport Business Park, IABP, will be in a position to provide employment opportunities locally given the current state of progress with the venture (I do support the recognition in the text that local employment opportunities will continue to be limited). Should the Authority feel unable to change the text as requested and this becomes an unresolved representation I seek that the Reporter takes note of these extracts from the Committee Report, regarding the Inverness Airport Business Park’s financial status, to the Council’s Strategic Planning Committee (PED) this year, 2013. (PED Report Extracts) ‘Inverness Airport Business Park Ltd issued Loan Stock of £1.175m to the Council to reflect the cost incurred by the Council in building the new access road to the airport from the A96. The repayment of this Loan Stock will allow the Council to recover its costs in constructing the road, albeit over a period of time... ..As reported to the Planning Environment and Development Committee in January 2011, Inverness Airport Business Park Ltd opted to defer the first repayment of the Loan Stock, amounting to £587.5k, due to be received by the Council in May 2010. This deferment was made in accordance with the Loan Stock agreement which allows the Company to defer the payment if they believe the repayment would have a prejudicial impact on their business proposals for the Business Park. Under the deferment arrangements, the 2010 repayment now becomes payable to the Council in May 2015 unless independent reviews of the Company’s accounts indicate the deferred amount can be paid earlier... ..Inverness Airport Business Park Ltd continues to have insufficient funds to repay the Loan Stock without the payment having a prejudicial impact on their business proposals for the Business Park...The Balance Sheet to March 2013 indicates the net worth of the company as £317,799 (£392,782 as at March 2012) and the Profit and Loss Accounts report a loss of £77,983 (loss of £21,475 for the year to March 2012) over the same period. These figures reflect that the company has still to fully commence its trading activities and is at an early stage in developing the business park.’ (Extract ends) I also seek that the Reporter takes note of the following facts; The table below is taken from the Inverness Airport Business Park Environmental Statement; Technical Annex 7, Socio-Economics, March 2008, section 5, page 34 Table 5.2 Employment capacity of IABP at full occupancy (number of workers Business Industry Other Total 2008 - 2011 1,120 283 125 1,528 2012 - 2021 3,360 849 339 4,548 2022 - 2041 7,280 1,840 615 9,735 2042 - 2061 11,200 2,831 882 14,913 It clearly shows that capacity was anticipated to be provided for a significant number of workers from 2008 onwards. No building work has been undertaken in the last 5 years. When the new plans for the Airport Business Park were unveiled for public display in early 2008, ‘The Caithness Business Index’ reported that it was estimated that the first phase of development, to 2021, could create around 70,000 sq metres of business accommodation, including an airport hotel supporting hundreds of new jobs. In April 2011, Urban Realm reported that, ‘Roxhill has signed a seven year deal with Inverness Airport Business Park (IABP) to develop 400,000sq/ft of warehousing and industrial space. Work on the £30m scheme, designed by 7N Architects, could start by the end of the year and complete by 2012 – subject to occupiers stepping forward to pre-let the space.’ On the 25 September this year, 2013, in an article in the ‘Strathspey and Badenoch Herald’, <http://www.strathspey-herald.co.uk/News/Inverness-airport-loan-repayments-up-in-the-air-25092013.htm> , Dr S Black, the Former ‘Director of Planning’ at the Highland Council, was quoted as saying that, “...the IABP had been operating in tough market conditions.” The new IABP chairman, David Hastings, was the subject of a press article in the local press in March 2013 which stated: PATIENCE will be needed as efforts continue to attract companies to the Inverness Airport Business Park, the organisation’s new chairman has warned. More than three years after the 250 hectare project received planning consent, Bond Air Services remains the only tenant and no operator has come forward to run a hoped-for hotel. As chief executive of the Strathleven Regeneration Company, a post he will continue to hold, Mr Hastings has helped attract more than £50 million to the Lomondgate development at Dumbarton and sees many parallels with the Inverness development. “Both are very ambitious projects and long term proposals,” he said. “It is very difficult to establish a new business location. At Strathleven the public perception was that nothing happened for seven years but there was in fact a lot of activity going on to put things in place. “Things came and went then we were successful in obtaining Aggreko as a tenant, which has just completed a £25 million manufacturing facility and transformed the location.” Given the points outlined above I believe that it is appropriate for this IMFLDP to be clearly informed regarding the status of this business park venture. Unless

Highland Council can provide detailed documentary evidence that a reasonable variety of jobs can be provided at the airport site between 2014 and 2021, in the first instance, then the local plan should not allowed be allowed to reflect that there will be any opportunities for employment on that site in the short to medium term. With respect to Tornagrain, Andrew Howard, managing director of Moray Estates Development Company, was quoted in the press <http://www.inverness-courier.co.uk/News/New-towns-first-resident-by-2015-29102013.htm> as predicting that construction of the new town 'could now last until 2063'; literature associated with the planning application submitted in 2009 originally describes a phased build over 35 years – (from 2011 to 2046). We are now talking about a timescale, if work on phase 1 starts in 2014 of 49 years (from 2014 to 2063) The same article also mentions that in the anticipated first phase of construction, there would be 'about 200 homes...a shop and café'. This is hardly going to create a broad range of / large number of employment opportunities. Logic dictates that a plan led system should produce Local Development Plans which provide clarity regarding the employment opportunities available to support and sustain development within the plan period, particularly the early phases.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the text of the paragraph at 4.99. The text fails to note that areas of Croy village are part of the Kildrummie Kames Esker system. I would like the text of paragraph 4.99 to be amended to the text as set out in the comment box 'Your Representation'.

Representation

The text at Croy paragraph 4.99 should be rewritten as: 'Croy lies within the catchment of the Loch Flemington Special Protection Area. Loch Flemington, along with some land in Croy village, forms part of the Kildrummie Kames SSSI / Flemington Esker system and eskers are vulnerable to groundwater pollution due to the porosity of the sand and gravel. Further, the Croy Burn, which arises from field drains in the village, is the only surface water input into Loch Flemington. To avoid any detrimental effect, on the water quality of the loch development, proposals will be required to comply with Policy 5 of this Inner Moray Firth Local Development plan.' In support of this objection to the text and the request to redraft the text I have attached a document which is available on line and which is itself an extract from the 'Geological Conservation Review', Volume 6: Quaternary of Scotland, Chapter 7: Inverness area Site: KILDRUMMIE KAMES (GCR ID: 418)

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I seek both an addition to and an alteration of paragraph 4.97, page 103. I seek the addition of the following bullet point; the bullet point uses the same wording as appears for Policy 20, Croy Expansion', in the HwLDP • 'Avoidance of any adverse effects on the integrity of the Loch Flemington SPA and Kildrummie Kames SSSI' I seek an alteration of the bullet point, 'Capacity for over 180 new homes'. This should be replaced by, 'Capacity for around 180 new homes'.

Representation

I make these objections in the context of: Paragraph 2.12, 'Site Capacities' – which I am also seeking to amend, please see relevant comment form; The descriptions of other land allocations in the IMFLDP PP such as, Nairn, 'Capacity for around 1990 new homes'; Tornagrain, 'Capacity to accommodate around 2,500 new homes till 2031; Auldearn, 'Capacity to accommodate around 60 new homes' etc. Paragraph 1.7, page8, of the IMFLDP, which states, 'Any allocation and text in the adopted HwLDP that relates to sites within the Inner Moray Firth Area will be updated by this plans content;

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the words in paragraph 3.7, "The West Link, which will join the Southern Distributor road to the A82, is required to relieve traffic congestion in the city centre and open up land allocated for development" and the words, "There is potential for a rail halt at Dalcross." I wish the first sentence removed from the paragraph and the latter sentence amended as set out in the 'Your Representation' section of this objection comment.

Representation

I object to the words in paragraph 3.7, "The West Link, which will join the Southern Distributor road to the A82, is required to relieve traffic congestion in the city centre and open up land allocated for development" and the words, "There is potential for a rail halt at Dalcross." I wish the first sentence removed from the paragraph and the latter sentence amended as set out in this 'Representation' section below. The rationale for the request to remove the words, "The West Link, which will join the Southern Distributor road to the A82, is required to relieve traffic congestion in the city centre and open up land allocated for development" is as follows. Firstly, 'Tulloch Homes' stated, in a consultation response for the 'West Link', that it has 57 acres of residential development land at Ness-side and that 'Tulloch Homes' is confident that the new West Link is not essential for the delivery of housing on this site and that current access and highway arrangements and road capacity can accommodate at least 500 units, subject to a Transport Assessment. Secondly, The Reporter's ILP PLI conclusions in 2004/2005 noted that SDR Phase V was not intended to serve primarily as a bypass and whilst the completed road would carry some through traffic, as its name suggests, it would serve primarily as a distributor road and extend through a built up area on the periphery of the city. The Reporter also highlighted that the Structure Plan, "...does not encourage longer-term expansion to the south-west along the A82, but refers to the A96 corridor as providing an opportunity of linking new housing to business opportunities associated with the airport and rail link to Inverness". The HwLDP and NPF2 place emphasis on the A96 Corridor as an expansion area, particularly in terms of major infrastructure projects, as does the NPF3 MIR. Thirdly, the area around the new UHI campus would be an ideal location for another sports and leisure complex to serve as an 'eastern hub'. It seems ridiculous that, with all the consented development planned for the east and all the development that has already taken place – at 'Inshes' and 'Milton of Leys' for example – and the desire to attract people to Scotland – including the Highlands – that there is only one large (ageing) leisure centre to the far west of the city (with waiting lists for classes). Inverness and its surrounding areas suffer from what I describe as an 'amenity deficit'. There is one District General Hospital; one main arts theatre, one main indoor shopping complex; one main concentration of restaurants and cafes. But, there are golf courses everywhere, North, South, East and West. Inverness is divided by railway lines, river, canal; everyone gets in their cars all the time. Why not put services near to where people live now and provide more homes for people to live in the town centre near the services there? That would make Inverness and the surrounding area a much, much, much more desirable place to live if no one had to travel too far to access a wide range of services and facilities. There was 'talk' of seeking to fund a 'velodrome' near the Uni Campus, but we do not need 'specialist' projects at the moment, just 'common or garden' leisure facilities with flumes, climbing wall, tennis courts, sports halls and play park carefully located to service sections of population. That would bring in more families. The new district park at Inshes, for example, could be further developed in a shorter timescale to make it more attractive to a wider range of residents. If Inverness cannot provide and sustain a diverse range and quantity of quality leisure facilities for the number of jobs it has now (and hopefully in the future) then simply allocating land for open market housing and building more local roads for people to travel on to access limited facilities would be not be sensible and would be contrary to the ambition to reduce emissions. The final sentence of paragraph 3.7 should be rewritten as follows: 'A rail halt at Dalcross is a key component of the infrastructure required to facilitate any significant expansion in the A96 Corridor.' I base my objection regarding the wording of paragraph 3.7 on the fact that this rail halt at Dalcross is vital to the success of the Council's vision for expansion in the A96 Corridor. This is demonstrated, in part, by the inclusion of the rail halt in the IMFLDP Modelling Report. In this report it is listed as a planned intervention necessary to mitigate against development pressures, including pressures on the Raigmore interchange and the A96 itself. The report envisages that the halt will be operational by 2021. A rail halt at Dalcross was accepted by the STPR. The expansion of the A96 Corridor is described as the 'Transport Option'. Planning permission for development in the A96 Corridor has already been granted; permissions granted for hundreds of acres of land giving potential for both thousands of homes and sqft of business space. However, this development is predicated around the infrastructure improvements to the A96, the rail line and the building of a rail halt at Dalcross.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the wording of both Policy 5, 'Development within the Water Catchment of Loch Flemington' and its related introductory paragraph (which is recorded as point, '3.8?') the wording should be changed and expanded to the text that I have included in my representation as below.

Representation

I object to the wording of both Policy 5, 'Development within the Water Catchment of Loch Flemington' and its related introductory paragraph (which is recorded as point, '3.8?') the wording should be changed and expanded to the text that I have written out below. Please amend the introductory paragraph and the wording of Policy 5 as follows; Introductory paragraph: 'Loch Flemington is designated as a Special Protection Area (SPA: 79/409/EEC) situated within the Kildrummie Kames Site of Special Scientific Interest, (SSSI). It is a small, shallow loch with no surface outflow, which is fed by both groundwater and the Croy burn; the burn being the only surface water input. It has suffered from persistent phosphorus enrichment which has caused major ecological decline. However, Loch Flemington has recently been the subject of a novel and experimental lake management approach with the primary goal of improving water quality conditions. Active monitoring of the Loch's ecosystem is continuing, alongside the consideration of options for the restoration of the Croy Burn. The Kildrummie Kames (also known as the Flemington Kames or more properly, as the Flemington Eskers) are said to be ('Geological Conservation Review') "...probably the best example of large, braided eskers and one of the longest continuous esker systems in the country that remains essentially unmodified by sand and gravel extraction.". Eskers in general are 'extremely to highly' vulnerable to groundwater pollution due to the porosity of the sand and gravel. Policy 5 'The Council will produce, in close collaboration with the relevant experts, Supplementary Guidance to ensure that no development proposed, within the water catchment of Loch Flemington, gives rise to pollution which is to the detriment of the past and future measures to improve the ecological recovery of Loch Flemington. All such development proposals must comply with this Supplementary Guidance following adoption of this guidance. The guiding principles and objectives for such guidance will be: 1 To safeguard the water quality of Loch Flemington; water quality which is vital to its habitat value for Slavonian Grebes and therefore its Special Protection Area status; 2 To ensure no increase in phosphorus discharge within sewage effluent entering the loch and originating from development within the catchment; 3 To ensure no increase in phosphorus entering the loch as a result of soil disturbance due to development, including soft landscaping, in the vicinity of the Croy burn; 4 To ensure no increase in phosphorus entering the loch as a result of soil disturbance due to development in the areas known to be part of the Kildrummie Kames esker system; 5 Phasing of development and housing numbers to take into account timescales required for both the effective long term monitoring of water quality in the loch and the restoration of the Croy Burn; 6 To achieve point 2 above; to ensure all development proposals incorporate suitable phosphorus mitigation. Acceptable mitigation will be defined and include diversion of foul water outwith the catchment, connection to adequate mains sewerage facilities, or an upgrade of an existing septic tank within the catchment to a higher standard of treatment; 7 To provide detailed guidance to applicants on how relevant applications will be processed, conditioned and these conditions enforced. Ends Supporting statement Loch Flemington is a site of European ecological and scientific importance. In recent decades the ecology of the loch has suffered due to high nutrient pollution, which, due to the lack of natural outflow, has become stockpiled within the bottom sediments of the loch and is cycled between the loch bed and the surface water. This pollution has led to the common occurrence of potentially harmful algal blooms. These algal blooms pose a health risk to the public and to the plants and animals living in the loch. A treatment of the loch sediments, with a product designed to remove phosphorus from the water and reduce the occurrence of algal blooms has been undertaken. This restoration project work was shortlisted for an RSPB 'Nature of Scotland' Award for, 'innovation recognising an outstanding initiative, practice, or technique (management or otherwise) that has aided nature conservation'. Dr. Bryan Spears, Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, UK, wrote, "The Loch Flemington case study is a fantastic example of the innovative management required to restore polluted lakes. Lessons from this study will help in the protection of freshwater resources across the world. The project group is delighted that the RSPB has recognised the project as part of the Nature of Scotland Awards and we hope that the loch will now continue to provide a safe and attractive environment for visitors." A collaborative team of experts has also been working on identifying input sources of the key nutrient, phosphorus, into the loch. There is concern over continuing inputs from the catchment via the Croy Burn and potentially via the groundwater. I am given to understand that the Croy Burn arises from field drains in a field adjacent to Croy village and there is a short, above ground section adjacent to the primary school, before the flow in them culverted again for approximately 200m under the village before emerging. It is not known whether any other flow joins the culvert along this buried section. Shortly after emerging the Burn passes the sewage works then continues on through agricultural land to the loch. A recent SNH commissioned report looks at options to and

sets objectives for 'restoration of the Croy Burn'. The objectives for restoration are: • To return Loch Flemington to favourable condition for the habitats directive; • To reduce phosphorus input into the loch and thereby allow works taking place within the loch itself to be successful in reducing the long term issue of eutrophication. The report notes, as a way forward, that: 'It is likely that a combination of option 1 in coordination with wider catchment works to address diffuse pollution will be the most effective way to reduce P input into the loch in the long term. P needs to be more rigorously monitored to allow sources, transport mechanisms and sinks to be more comprehensively understood and appropriate mitigation actions taken.' There would be two options for this: 1 Increase the monitoring resolution to allow the more short term option (of an unmanaged silt trap) to go ahead. This would allow 5-10 years to undertake detailed monitoring and target catchment P issues before the silt trap becomes ineffective and fully vegetates over, depending on the rate of vegetation growth and silt build up. 2 Continue with the current monitoring strategy and opt for rotational dredging of the silt trap. Not increasing spatial or temporal resolution would mean that monitoring would have to be undertaken over a much longer timescale. Once monitoring is complete and catchment P issues have been resolved, then dredging could stop and the silt trap could be allowed to vegetate over as per option 1. I ask that, given the significant importance of Loch Flemington and the work that has already been done and the work that will need to be undertaken in the future, the wording of both Policy 5 and its supporting introductory paragraph is altered. I seek clarification as to why the Kildrummie Kames SSSI is not designated as an SLA as per the IMFLDP Section 2 'Guiding and Delivering Development'?

Allocated to Policy 5 Development Within the Water Catchment of Loch Flemington

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the fact that the Settlement at Croy is seen as a part of the wider growth strategy of the A96 Corridor and seek that the Settlement at Croy should no longer be regarded as part of the wider growth strategy of the A96 Corridor.

Representation

Rationale Firstly, there is no specialist 'A96 Corridor Developer Contributions Protocol' in place as yet, despite it being described as a prerequisite for development in the A96 Corridor and it being listed in the HwLDP. Whilst 'Inverness and the Inner Moray Firth' appears as an 'Area of Co-ordinated Action' the main focus of the relevant NPF3 MIR section appears to be on the improvements to transport connectivity to facilitate the delivery of buildings for homes and jobs. The NPF3 section also covers things like, 'sense of place, environmental quality and community wellbeing; alongside recognition of the benefits to be gained from key sectors of tourism, food and drink and energy. The NPF3 MIR records that, 'Meeting our housing requirements will need delivery of a great many development proposals, from small to large, right across Scotland. Given the scale of this requirement, we do not think it is appropriate for NPF3 to single out for priority any particular developments on the sole or principal basis of their contribution to meeting housing need'. Furthermore, I was given to understand that a National Planning Framework is not a 'prescriptive blueprint' and development details are more properly the concern of the local authority. There is now no reason why, and I make these comments in the context of the statement made at paragraph 1.7 page 8 of the 'Introduction' section of the IMFLDP, 'Any allocation and text in the adopted HwLDP that relates to sites within the Inner Moray Firth Area will be updated by this plans content.' Croy's relationship to the A96 corridor should not now be redefined

Allocated to

Customer Number 04050 Name Mrs Caroline Hooper Organisation Kiltarlity Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference KT2 Type Change

Comment Changes

We have objected to KT2 due to increased density of KT1 and KT3 but if it is agreed to keep KT2 within the Plan, then we would like to restrict the housing numbers to less than the proposed 29; the road to be widened up to Tomnacross School and a defined kerb and path with street lighting to allow the children to walk safely to the School.

Representation

If it is agreed that KT2 must stay within the Plan, then we would like conditions that the road be twin tracked up to the School with a defined kerb and path with street lighting for the safety of the children.

Allocated to Kiltarlity KT2 Glebe Farm South

Customer Number 04050 Name Mrs Caroline Hooper Organisation Kiltarlity Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.114 - 4.117

Reference KT4 Old Mill Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We support the Plan as Business use with the requirement that the junction is upgraded and visibility improved.

Allocated to Kiltarlity KT4 Old Mill

Customer Number 04050 Name Mrs Caroline Hooper Organisation Kiltarlity Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference H5 Old Builders Depot Type Change

Comment Changes

We feel that the old Builders Depot being an abandoned brown field site should be developed in this Plan as sheltered housing rather than building on green field sites.

Representation

We feel that this unsightly site needs to be developed before any green field sites are developed.

Allocated to Kiltarlity General General

Customer Number 04050 Name Mrs Caroline Hooper Organisation Kiltarlity Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph K.114-K.117

Reference KT2 Type Change

Comment Changes

We are objecting to KT2 due to the increased density of housing on the sites of KT1 originally 70, now 96, and KT3 originally 14, currently now planning for 24 houses on this site.

Representation

We are objecting to KT2 due to the increased density of housing than was originally agreed. KT1 originally 70, now 96 houses and KT3, originally planning for 14 houses, currently now planning for 24 houses on this site.

Allocated to Kiltarlity KT2 Glebe Farm South

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We support the Council policy of no development on H1 green field site as we feel the village has more than doubled with the existing planning permission. We also support the Council policy on H8 for the same reasons as above but we do feel that South of this site next to the Tomnacross Cemetery should be earmarked for expansion of the Cemetery which is almost full.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The roads and infrastructure need upgrading and drainage is a big problem.

Representation

Kiltarlity has suffered quite badly recently with flooding of the roads down beside Brockies Lodge Hotel where water gathers causing problems with access to and from the Village. There has also been a big problem in Balgate Drive with the water running down the School Road and entering into the sewerage system causing it to flood. The Fire Brigade were in attendance most of the night to avoid contamination.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IA1 Type Change

Comment Changes

We object unless the site has a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. This in order to ensure any prospective developers are full informed that the site is at flood risk and that the developable area may be affected.

Representation

We object unless the site has a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. This in order to ensure any prospective developers are full informed that the site is at flood risk and that the developable area may be affected.

Allocated to Inverness Airport IA1 Inverness Airport Business Park

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference MO4 Type Change

Comment Changes

We object unless the site has a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. This in order to ensure any prospective developers are full informed that the site is at flood risk and that the developable area may be affected.

Representation

We object unless the site has a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. This in order to ensure any prospective developers are full informed that the site is at flood risk and that the developable area may be affected.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO4 Ord Hill

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DW7 Type Change

Comment Changes

The site is likely to be at significant flood risk and it is uncertain whether the principle of development can be established in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy.

Representation

We therefore object unless it is removed from the Plan or a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at prior to inclusion in the Plan which demonstrates that the proposals would comply with Scottish Planning Policy

Allocated to Dingwall DW7 Dingwall Riverside (North)

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN30 Type Change

Comment Changes

We object to IN30 (Carse Industrial Estate) unless, as outlined previously, Highland Council's TEC Services has confirmed that appropriate embankments are in place.

Representation

We object to IN30 (Carse Industrial Estate) unless, as outlined previously, Highland Council's TEC Services has confirmed that appropriate embankments are in place.

Allocated to West Inverness IN30 Carse Industrial Estate

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN9 Type Change

Comment Changes

The site is likely to be at significant flood risk and it is uncertain whether the principle of development can be established in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy.

Representation

We therefore object unless it is removed from the Plan or a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at prior to inclusion in the Plan which demonstrates that the proposals would comply with Scottish Planning Policy

Allocated to Central Inverness IN9 Land to South and East of Inverness Harbour Marina

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG12 Type Change

Comment Changes

The site is likely to be at significant flood risk and it is uncertain whether the principle of development can be established in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy.

Representation

We therefore object unless it is removed from the Plan or a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at prior to inclusion in the Plan which demonstrates that the proposals would comply with Scottish Planning Policy. A developer requirement to restore the watercourse should also be added.

Allocated to Invergordon IG12 Delny

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AR5 Type Change

Comment Changes

The site is likely to be at significant flood risk and it is uncertain whether the principle of development can be established in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy.

Representation

We therefore object unless it is removed from the Plan or a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at prior to inclusion in the Plan which demonstrates that the proposals would comply with Scottish Planning Policy

Allocated to Ardersier AR5 South of Cromal Terrace

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DW8/DW11 Type Change

Comment Changes

The site is likely to be at significant flood risk and it is uncertain whether the principle of development can be established in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy.

Representation

We therefore object unless it is removed from the Plan or a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at prior to inclusion in the Plan which demonstrates that the proposals would comply with Scottish Planning Policy. In addition a developer requirement to restore the watercourse should be included.

Allocated to Dingwall DW8 Dingwall Riverside (South)

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DR4 Type Change

Comment Changes

The site is likely to be at significant flood risk and it is uncertain whether the principle of development can be established in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy.

Representation

We therefore object unless it is removed from the Plan or a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at prior to inclusion in the Plan which demonstrates that the proposals would comply with Scottish Planning Policy

Allocated to Drumnadrochit DR4 Land west of Post Office

Customer Number 00523 Name Mrs Cerian Baldwin Organisation Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN6 Type Change

Comment Changes

We object unless the site has a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. This in order to ensure any prospective developers are full informed that the site is at flood risk and that the developable area may be affected.

Representation

We object unless the site has a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. This in order to ensure any prospective developers are full informed that the site is at flood risk and that the developable area may be affected.

Allocated to Tain TN6 Cemetery

Customer Number 00262 Name Mrs Doreen Hughes Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4-124 to 4-127

Reference Avoch Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like to see the area to the East side of the village stretching eastwards from the Church of Scotland above the old railway and between that and the Knockmuir Road along toward Newton Farm. Much of this area was included in the previous Development plan but has been excluded from the new one with no reason given and some much less attractive areas included on the West side of Avoch. The east side land offers what are widely acknowledged as some of the finest views in the Black Isle and it is not hard to envisage it attracting individual quality houses designed to take advantage of this wonderful location . I feel serious consideration should be given to restoring this area to the plan thereby giving would be residents the opportunity of having a home with character rather than be stuck with the dreary clumps of little boxes which seem to be the likely result of the Proposed Plan.

Representation

I am seeking this change because I do not wish to see the opportunity missed for Avoch to get its share of one off houses.This area would if sympathetically developed would be sought after for this purpose. Fortrose and Rosemarkie have a much better balance of housing ,this should be the planning aim for Avoch.

Allocated to Avoch General General

Customer Number 00313 Name Mrs Eveline Waring Organisation Nigg And Shandwick Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NG1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Plan should mention natural and built heritage features of Nigg

Representation

Whilst Nigg has clearly been identified as an employment growth area it is to the detriment to it's other attributes by playing down that it is an area of great beauty, largely agricultural with a bird sanctuary and many historic sites including the Nigg Old Church and Celtic Stone. It is a tourist area with coaches coming in on a daily basis and a ferry to and from Cromarty. Little or no mention is made of these attributes surely they should be of equal consideration when looking at planning matters.

Allocated to Nigg NG1 Nigg Yard

Customer Number 00313 Name Mrs Eveline Waring Organisation Nigg And Shandwick Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference SB4 Type Change

Comment Changes

SB4 needs careful thought for the proper mix of houses. business (shop) and tourist accommodation to blend in with the rest of the area

Representation

SB4 needs careful thought for the proper mix of houses. business (shop) and tourist accommodation to blend in with the rest of the area

Allocated to Seaboard Villages SB4 Land south of Shore Street

Customer Number 00313 Name Mrs Eveline Waring Organisation Nigg And Shandwick Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference FE1 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Our observations on the Main Issues Report have been acted upon and the reduced area designated FE1 appears to be acceptable.

Allocated to Fearn Aerodrome FE1 Fearn Drome Industrial Estate

Customer Number 00313 Name Mrs Eveline Waring Organisation Nigg And Shandwick Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph

Reference Policy 3 Type Change

Comment Changes

Review the location of Pitcalnie as presented on Map 3 Review the reasoning for including Pitcalnie in Policy 3

Representation

Pitcalnie continues to get a mention as though it is a seprate district/area - this is not so. In fact Pitcalnie addresses are spread throughout Nigg. (a) It is difficult to identify what you call Pitcalnie; the area that you circled on map 3 appears to be closest to an area which is locally called Lower Pitcalnie which is only one of a number of places which have Pitcalnie in thier addresses. (b) It is even more difficult to understand why you have singled out this area an attached it to your Policy 3 Other Settlements Comments on page 18 in the proposed report (c) Locally we can see no difference between this area and the rest of Nigg - can you please explain?

Allocated to Policy 3 Other Settlements

Customer Number 00313 Name Mrs Eveline Waring Organisation Nigg And Shandwick Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 1.Introduction Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduce plan area

Representation

It is more difficult due to the chnage in presentation to establish what action, if any, has been taken on the rest of the comments contained in our response of 28th June 2012. Certainly the area we are in (Inner Moray Firth area) remains far too large and includes all manner of settlements both hihgly and sparsely populated, industrial and rural. Incidentally, why did we fall in a different operational area for planning issues (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross)? Where is the sense in this?

Allocated to General Comments

Customer Number 00313 Name Mrs Eveline Waring Organisation Nigg And Shandwick Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph 2.3-2.6

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Development of any nature should be banned without all the 'ifs and buts'

Representation

Comments on the role of special landscape areas (SLAs) on page 10 of the proposed plan contains more information about these areas, but still requires one to search through the Highland Council's website for details of policies. Surely if a stretch of land is deemed to be of natural beauty to an area and considered worthy to be protected then development of any nature should be banned without all the 'ifs and buts'. Note - attached copy of original submission recieved by email

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number 00313 Name Mrs Eveline Waring Organisation Nigg And Shandwick Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference NG1

Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduction in size of allocation

Representation

We are pleased that the area designated industry (NG1) and incorrectly dsignated Nigg Yard has been considerably reduced from the totally inapprorpaite area it covered in the Main Issues Report. The land on the East of the B9175 is not part of Nigg Yard and it is the strong opinion of this community that it should be further reduced so it certainly does not include any of the private houses and thier land which is on the East side of the road (B9175). It should also be even more constricted so it does not include any of the land on the East side of the road returning it to open and agricutlural use. According to our understanding there are no industrial intentions for this land - can you please amend accordingly

Allocated to Nigg NG1 Nigg Yard

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

[redacted] I would like to comment on the above mentioned plan as follows: I realise that seven year worth of comments based on well researched facts and figures plus a good dose of common sense has made not one iota of difference to either the HWLDP or now the IMFDP, and this letter will be noted and binned along with all the rest. 1. Population Figures. Throughout the entire consultation process about the HWLDP there have been submissions from many knowledgeable sectors of the Highland population showing that the projected population and housing figures for the next 20 years contained in the plan were ridiculously high, and completely unachievable. The last four years have only confirmed this opinion, and made the HWLDP completely unfit for the purpose of rational planning in the Highland area. This really has to be addressed before any sensible planning can take place at site specific level. The HWLDP was based on 1650 annual gain of population into the Highland Council area per year. This was looked on by HIE as the minimum gain to give critical mass for the growth proposals in the so called 'A96 corridor'. As informed people in the area had foreseen, the recession and housing crash has led now to a very small annual gain in population from migration, (87 people in 2012) and probably from 2013, a natural decrease with more deaths than births. (Fig.1and 2) There now has to be a radical rewrite of the Inner Moray Firth Plan to adapt it to the changed circumstances. The events leading to the crash of 2007 can in many ways be ascribed to the 'housing madness' that led to toxic loans which could not be repaid. Colossal overprovision of housing particularly in Ireland, Florida, and Spain have led to economic disaster in these areas, so hearing Highland planners talking about it 'only being a matter of time before we get back to normal' ie 2007 makes one wonder if they are living in some parallel universe Nairn Population HC Briefing Note 52 July 2012 2010: 12,193 2035: 13,496 Increase : 1303 Annual increase 52 2.1 per house = 25 houses annually HWLDP to 2019 = 160 houses annually. Births already less than deaths . Natural decrease situation. Approx 25 /year Migration estimate: 78 / year. So why is this relevant? The planners are very fond of saying that 'it will all happen a bit slower'. The problem at the minute is that in the haste to give multiple sites planning permission to fulfil this now completely discredited HWLDP, infrastructure problems such as roads, water and sewage, and other services are being ignored and not provided for. Also sites which are contrary to HC agricultural, coastal, landscape, sustainability, emissions, housing in countryside and ribbon development policies are being allowed because of the supposed pressure of population and 'necessary settlement strategy' based on hugely inflated population and housing numbers. The legacy of this will be piecemeal groups of unrelated housing in all sorts of inappropriate places with no coherent planning at all. Cawdor is one glaring example of this (see below). Few developers will feel confident that they have the critical mass to sell enough houses to provide the infrastructure and a profit, with all the competing schemes in the pipeline. Placement of houses. The A96 framework was rushed through after secret meetings with landowners and developers had subverted the findings of public consultation, (which did not support the scale or positioning of the changes proposed) . It placed almost the whole Highland emphasis for housebuilding between Inverness and Nairn, supposedly on the back of the Airport Business Park, for which not one sod has been turned yet. In fact Nairn has fewer jobs than it had five years ago. By contrast, Easter Ross seems to be attracting more industry, and it looks as if Ardersier, if it develops at all, would be used as a 'layout' facility employing a couple of hundred people. The fact that both Forres and Inverness are now Enterprise Zones with favourable business conditions make the prospect for new jobs in Nairn poor. There is certainly absolutely no major employment source obvious for the 30,000 people who were meant to be housed between Inverness and Nairn. It is surely very ill advised to lock the Local Plan into a 20 year pattern which is probably going to be very different from that which was envisaged in the A96 Framework. Nairnshire. Roads There has to be an acceptance that the A96 traffic coming through Nairn is an intolerable load for a small town, and that it is hugely affecting the tourist economy and the ability of locals to go about their business, as well as being the cause of frequent and sometimes fatal accidents. Nairn cannot possibly support the volume of housing proposed with no by pass or new road under the railway. The chicane which has been built under the bridge is useless, and anyway, the traffic from Nairn South will have to exit via Waverley Rd or Leopold Street which are both notable bottlenecks. Housing Need Nairn has a social housing waiting list, but there are very few homeless, so the majority on the list are in a house, but they would prefer a council house. Many are in private rentals using housing benefit. If they are rehoused, there will be a house vacated which can be used by someone else. The idea that everyone on the waiting list should have a new house built for them and everyone coming into the town will also need a new house is statistical nonsense. Rental is currently also a popular choice as housing is no longer an investment, and rental allows mobility when houses are very slow to sell. There are around 200 houses on the second hand market at present. As the population is elderly, and death rates greatly outweigh births,

it could well be that Nairn actually needs few new houses in the future. Recycling and upgrading existing buildings is surely a much better pattern. The Community Enterprise Company which is now set up will also be able to build social housing on Common Good Land which will increase the stock for those from the area. Housing As there is absolutely no statistical basis for 50% increase of housing in Nairn the housing numbers have to be scaled back and reassessed. 170 houses per year in HWLDP as opposed to the current build rate of about 25, and long time average of 64 is quite unacceptable. The proposal to have 300 new houses in Cawdor Village is wanton vandalism. Cawdor is a conservation village of 50 houses around Macbeth's 13th Century castle. This is one of the biggest tourist draws in the Highlands. There is no shop, post office, medical centre and practically no permanent employment in the area, so everyone in the new houses will be car dependent and commute many miles to work each day, with the road in both directions very narrow and winding. The road to Inverness also means crossing a Wade bridge which is in a parlous state. If sustainability means anything, you cannot put this volume of housing into a conservation village with no employment. The Nairn Local Plan of 2001 had twelve new houses proposed which followed the rule that there should be no more than 25% increase in housing in any small settlement. Water and Sewage Nairn sewage is at capacity, and heavy rain leads to overflow at the river and onto the beach, which is in danger of losing its beach awards. There appears to be no money to upgrade the works, far less put in sewage from hundreds more houses. Sustainability Where are the jobs? Highland is supposed to be following a pattern of sustainable communities where one can walk or cycle to work. However as mentioned before, there is no obvious source of employment for the people in the 2500 houses planned, and therefore one has to conclude that if 50% of them commute 40 miles to work each day it will clock up 50,000 miles a day! Housing has got to be placed where there is a chance of employment – not in small rural communities so that the developers can charge more for the houses. Tourism and other industries Nairn's biggest source of employment is tourism. This depends on having a compact and thriving town, not a sprawling dormitory suburb. The congestion in Nairn is already putting Nairn's tourist credentials on the line, when with the glorious beaches, golf courses, wildlife, and good hotels and restaurants it should be one of the jewels in the crown of Highland tourism. Because of the planners obsession with business parks and housing, very little in the plan will help tourism and most will have an adverse effect. Other industries of import to the area such as agriculture, forestry, food and drink production, outdoor pursuits depend greatly on a clean uncluttered environment too. In conclusion, it has to be said that the Inner Moray Firth Plan flies in the face of every statistic and projection that is available at present. Because you are planning for a hypothetical huge expansion with little hope of improving infrastructure and because the plan is so totally unfocussed on where development might conceivably actually take place, it makes no sense at all and should be withdrawn until there is some factual evidence base on which it can be taken forward. Yours faithfully Joan L Noble

Allocated to				Comments on the vision and spatial strategy
--------------	--	--	--	---

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

i am seeking a change to the Plan and I would like to see Site IN22, removed from the Proposed Plan. Failing this, I would like to propose two Additional developer requirements: retention of existing woodland and green spaces within the site retention of footpath route through the site

Representation

I support the redevelopment of Inverness City Centre. Too many large organisations have moved or plan to move away from the city to the detriment of economic growth. This proposal would take away the staff who will no longer have easy access to the local shops, cafes and restaurants which are struggling to survive. By retaining the Council HQ in situ, with its constantly updated digital technology facilities, close to the centre, it should be able to provide a good working environment and continue to make operational savings. The addition of 50 homes on Glenurquhart Road will add to the traffic congestion, air pollution from stationary vehicles and cause additional noise and disturbance to residents of Bishops Road, which is already an island surrounded by vehicular traffic day and night. The footpath provides a safe route for parents and children going to and from the local schools. It is a route which is preferred to Glenurquhart Road with its inherent traffic issues, and is possibly one of the reasons for no fatal accidents being recorded for that part of the A82 Trunk Road. I do not accept that the present infrastructure (based on the condition of the drainage/sewerage provision) can be upgraded to meet the requirements of an additional 50 houses. I would like to know the criteria on which a move for the Council from its present location will be based.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Our client requests that land at Upper Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Reference H6) is allocated for residential use.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Mrs Wylie. Our client owns the land at Upper Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H6) and wishes to object to the exclusion of this site as a residential development allocation in the Proposed Local Development Plan. We consider that the allocation of this site will allow the Council to maintain an effective housing land supply to address the housing requirements and demand for this area. Current Policy Allocation Part of this site at Upper Wards is currently allocated for residential development within the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (adopted February 2007). The adopted plan allocates this site for a courtyard style development on the site of a former steading and the adjacent land. The Background text for Fortrose in the adopted Local Plan (page 72) details that the town maintains a high level of housing demand, particularly from people who work in Inverness or are retired. Housing predictions set out in page 72 of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan details that there is a combined requirement for up to 144 more houses within Fortrose and Rosemarkie by 2011, with a further 96 from 2011 to 2017. The allocation of land at Upper Wards for residential development allows for the Council to maintain an effective housing land supply within Fortrose. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments The land at Upper Wards was not identified as a preferred site at the Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation stage. The Council recognises that part of the site is allocated for residential use in the adopted Local Plan and that this site presents an opportunity for significant expansion to the north east of the settlement. However, the Council considered that the site is outwith the active travel distance of the settlement centre, road infrastructure improvements would be required and the development of this site would have significant visual impacts. As stated in our previous representations to the MIR consultation, it is not our client's intentions to develop the whole site within their ownership for residential use. We recognise that this would not be a scale suitable for a settlement of this size and the development of the site as a whole would have landscape and visual impacts. The scale proposed is in keeping with the existing settlement pattern. The development of the site proposed would also ensure that there remains a distinct separation between Rosemarkie and Fortrose. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to site H6 at Fortrose the Council has stated that: "The site is located further up the hill from H3 and additional road improvements would be necessary to enable development. It is also considered that the site is sensitive in terms of its impact on the landscape, introducing a cluster of development in the upper hillside location where the landscape can only successfully accommodate isolated dispersed development. More substantial clusters of housing would appear inappropriate in this location and would appear as an unsympathetic extension to Fortrose. It is considered that the current isolated dispersed housing pattern here reflects the upland farming landscape here and helps maintain the accessibility issues from the steep slope and lack of footway. For these reasons it is considered that this site is inappropriate for housing development and it is recommended that it should not be allocated in the Plan." We consider that the allocation of this site presents an opportunity to create a low density housing development that is sympathetic to the settlement pattern and landscaped setting. The design of the development can be controlled through planning policy requirements for a design statement/development brief to be prepared for the site. Planning Justification for the Continued Allocation of Site The Proposed Local Development Plan proposes to only allocate one residential site within Fortrose. The allocated site at Ness Gap (Site Reference: FR2) is zoned for 80 units. Tulloch Homes has obtained outline planning permission for this site. This has been followed up by the submission of a number of detailed applications. Work has commenced on the site and Tulloch Homes are actively marketing the residential development. This site has started on site and it is assumed will be completed in the short – medium term. As this is the only housing site identified for Fortrose in the Proposed Plan, we consider that the Council has not identified an effective housing land supply for this area. It is identified in the adopted Local Plan that Fortrose attracts a high housing demand as it is within commutable distance from Inverness. This demand is likely to increase and the residential market continues to improve. The Chief Planner issued a letter to all the Heads of Planning on the 29th October 2010 in relation to providing an effective supply of land for housing. This letter details that: "Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) states that a supply of effective land for at least 5 years should be maintained at all times to ensure a continuing generous supply of land for housing. Planning authorities should monitor land supply through the annual housing land audit, prepared in conjunction with housing and infrastructure providers. Development plans should identify triggers for the release of future phases of effective sites where a 5 year effective supply is not being maintained." The allocation of the land at Upper Wards for residential development would allow the Council to maintain an effective housing land

supply to meet current and anticipated increase in demand at Fortrose. This is an effective housing site that is free from constraints that would impact on the delivery of the site for residential use. The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. Our client has undertaken pre-application discussions with Erica McArthur of The Highland Council in relation to the proposed submission of a planning application for a residential development at this location. This demonstrates a commitment to bring the site forward for development. The land at Upper Wards represents a natural extension to the settlement boundary and would allow the Council to demonstrate a sufficient supply of housing land for this location. The site is capable of being developed for low density housing and can be sensitively designed to mitigate against landscape and visual impact. We therefore request that this site is allocated for residential development.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number 01850 Name Ms Amelia Windsor Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph 4.56

Reference DW2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Changes to area

Representation

The present roads which now serve the residential areas of Dingwall are barely adequate during the twice daily "rush hours" namely Old Evanton Road, Kinnairdie Brae and Craig Road. Until Craig Road becomes a cul de sac at no.1 level crossing, we cannot support any further houses because of the increase in the number of vehicles that will be generated. Drivers must be forced to use wider, safer Newton/Relief road.

Allocated to Dingwall General General

Customer Number 01850 Name Ms Amelia Windsor Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph 4.57

Reference DW7 & DW8 Type Change

Comment Changes

Changes to area

Representation

Until Craig Road becomes a cul de sac at no.1 level crossing we cannot support any development here. Craig Road is wholly unsuitable now for the HGV's and other heavy vehicles that use it now.

Allocated to Dingwall DW7 Dingwall Riverside (North)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Public transport connections need to be improved with a cycle path under the top span of the bridge at Craigton and a bus service to the new housing development at Bellfield.

Representation

The current bus services serve North Kessock once an hour with inconvenient gaps at times. Other more frequent buses pass by on the A9 but North Kessock residents are only able to access these via laybys at Craigton and Charleston. There is no link between bus stops at Craigton except over the A9, an unofficial route under the top span of the bridge or a very long and steep diversion to the lifeboat station and back up. Transport Scotland have now agreed that it would be possible to convert the unofficial route to a proper cycle path along the culvert and round the 'cage' under the span. This would also improve access from the Tourist Information Office to walks on Ord Hill. At Charleston whilst a bus stop has been built at the new development there seem to be no plans for it to be used. A link path from the Charleston layby directly to the housing would work much better and a footbridge or link via the Kessock underpass for buses stopping at the Coldwell layby on the other side for the return journey.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The priority should be for empty houses and buildings to be used. Prime farm land should be protected. It will be needed to grow food. Each Community should have access to allotments or community growing. Innovative schemes like co-housing should be encouraged.

Representation

So far only 30 Empty Homes seem to have been brought back into use in Highland whereas there are said to be thousands <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-Environment/Housing/supply-demand/emptyhomes> Explanation of Co-housing can be seen here <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cohousing>

Allocated to

Customer Number 01208 Name Ms Anne Thomas Organisation Friends of the Earth Inverness

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 1.Introduction

Paragraph 1.11

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

Be consistent with other plans i.e. the ambitious aims for a carbon neutral Inverness in a low carbon highlands in Carbon Clever should apply to IMFLDP. Adoption of something like the Merton Rule <http://www.merton.gov.uk/environment/planning/planningpolicy/mertonrule.htm> for housing currently under construction would help achieve this. Zero carbon houses are an option now.

Representation

Much more thought needs to be taken in re-localising economies as much as possible as it will be impossible to achieve the carbon targets without this and projections are for energy and other resources to become increasingly expensive as production peaks but demand grows. The Highlands is very vulnerable to fuel price. It needs to become much more resilient again.

Allocated to Comments on the vision and spatial strategy

Customer Number 01208 Name Ms Anne Thomas Organisation Friends of the Earth Inverness

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas

Paragraph 4 Water and waste water

Reference Policy 65

Type Change

Comment Changes

All new sewage works should include anaerobic digestion and old ones should be converted to this.

Representation

Anaerobic digestion of sewage is now the cheapest form of energy as costs for disposal are also saved. This technology does not seem to be implemented for sewage in Highland yet at all.

Allocated to Policy 4 Water and Waste Water Infrastructure in the Inverness to Nairn Growth Area

Customer Number 01208 Name Ms Anne Thomas Organisation Friends of the Earth Inverness

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph 2.7

Reference Hinterland Type Change

Comment Changes

I would like to see provision for new crofts with appropriate housing seen as appropriate development for Hinterland.

Representation

Provision of New Crofts would enable the more than 200 people on waiting lists for Crofts a chance of finding somewhere and would help the Highlands to meet its Carbon Clever objectives of more sustainable food.

Allocated to Hinterland boundary

Customer Number 01208 Name Ms Anne Thomas Organisation Friends of the Earth Inverness

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.8

Reference IN13 Longman Site Type Change

Comment Changes

Change to 'energy from waste excluding incineration'

Representation

Energy from Waste is too vague a term. I would welcome the collection of the landfill gasses to use for generating energy or an anaerobic digester but an incinerator is inappropriate and should be excluded. It would reduce the impetus to re-cycle and release pollutants such as dioxins.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN13 Former Longman Landfill

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Forget any expansion in Fortrose. There has been far too much already, and the basic infrastructure cannot support what is already passed planning. Moreover much of the changes are entirely developer profit led and do not support the needs of the community. There is a great lack of affordable housing and a lack of mid-level housing. In addition, there is no provision for any other type of housing other than developer led. This is in direct contradiction of national objectives and is totally unacceptable. There is no mention in the plan of the place of agriculture in the life of the Black Isle. Why;? This is one of the the major features of this area but it merits not one single word in the plan. That is unbelievably pathetic!

Representation

I have to say that the selection of Fortrose as a centre for the Black Isle and its untrammelled expansion without proper consideration of the basic suitability of the infrastructure appals me.. The town has a narrow congested High Street which cannot be expanded to accommodate more traffic . There is only limited parking in the centre of town and no location for more parking. Your solution is to move the major retail store to the edge of town, an act which has been shown to be detrimental to the viability of communities throughout the land. How stupid is that? Then there is the fiasco with Scottish water spending vast sums on a fancy new plant which did not work and had to be changed back to the old fashioned method - smelly and nasty? Then there is the matter of the Academy . During the summer we were assured that there was plenty of capacity, but now we have a cap on the first year. Why were the estimates so wrong and will the estimates on the need for a primary school be any better. Given your track record I very much doubt it. Our NHS primary care unit has turfed out all out of area patients. For those with ongoing or chronic problems, this is a loss in terms of care continuity. Moreover, the Ness gap is not complete, so we have no idea of whether they can cope with the number of patients from the new housing already approved ot not - yet you propose to approve yet more new housing in the area. This is unbelievable incompetence arrogance and stupidity.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I object to the proposal for site DR6 as set out within the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. This is because it would have significant adverse landscape and visual effects and would not comply with the policies of the Highland-Wide Local Development Plan. For many years, there has been pressure to develop the area covered by site DR6. However, the community and planners recognised the importance of maintaining the openness and agricultural character of this site and that on the south side of the A82 – both to protect the distinct landscape character of the area, but also the distinct settlements of Lewiston and Drumnadrochit. For this reason, it is now extremely disappointing that the Highland Council are proposing site DR6 for ‘mixed use’ development. During public exhibitions and meetings over the last year (copy attached of comments to the developer copied to Highland Council), the only reason that The Highland Council planning officers could give me for this change in approach was the fact that the site was being pushed by a developer and had easy access to the A82 (criteria that had been long resisted in the past as the main justification for development). No methodical capacity assessment, including landscape sensitivity or capacity assessment, was provided to justify the selection of site DR6. This is despite the fact other sites exist within the village (including some areas not included in the map on p108) on which development could better fit the character of the landscape and follow the characteristic pattern of the Lewiston and Drumnadrochit settlements. The intrinsic character of Drumnadrochit and Lewiston relies on the general openness of site DR6 and the area to the south. This allows views of the distinct setting of the village - seeing the open glen floor within the context of the surrounding hill slopes and Craigmorie, and the meeting of the Rivers Enrick and Coiltie and associated woodland. These views are particularly important not only to residents within the glen, but also to visitors (many observed stopping adjacent to the site to take photographs), including those travelling along the A82 and walking the Great Glen Way that passes the site. The Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) for the area highlights that key characteristics include: ‘... a mix of open agricultural land and small woodlands [that] add diversity to the flat alluvial plains at the base of the glen’. Its guidance warns ‘...new developments within these areas will tend to have a particularly strong influence in the overall perception of rural character and remoteness along the whole of the Great Glen. Additional housing may also obscure views of the loch or encroach upon areas of ... agricultural ground... within the intersecting glens as flat and gently sloped ground is so scarce’. Guidance within the LCA also includes: ‘The key consideration for change in this landscape character type relates to its land use patterns and characteristic balance between openness and enclosure... At the broadest scale, changes in land use should respect each area’s characteristic balance between open and enclosed space; this will help to prevent homogenisation of different areas and retain the diverse mix of landscape patterns and land uses which make the Wooded Glens distinctive’. The Highland Wide Local Development Plan highlights that, through use of LCAs, ‘...the aim is to ensure the landscape has the capacity for development whilst promoting sustainable growth’ (21.7.2). Following this, policy 28 on sustainable design states that all developments should ‘conserve and enhance the character of the Highland area’ and ‘minimise the environmental impact of development’. While the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan acknowledges clearly that ‘The open fields that separate Drumnadrochit’s settlements are important to its character’, it then shows complete misunderstanding of how openness can be maintained by suggesting this could be ‘... safeguarded by green corridors’ and a ‘development landscaped set back’ (p107). For anyone driving or walking through the village or surrounding hills, it is very clear that a narrow ‘corridor’ could not maintain the open character of the site or views across the glen. As the proposal for site DR6 would not maintain the intrinsic landscape and settlement character of Drumnadrochit and Lewiston, it would not comply with the following policies: • Policy 28 - Sustainable design • Policy 35 - Housing in the Countryside (Hinterland areas) • Policy 61 - Landscape In addition, linked to Policy 35 above, the proposal for site DR6 would not follow the Housing in the Countryside and Siting and Design Supplementary Guidance. Specifically, it would not comply with section 5.2 which states that ‘proposals will only be supported when they meet the criteria below:... • Do not impact detrimentally on natural, built and cultural heritage; protected species and scenic quality and are compatible with landscape characteristics...’ I am not against change per se within the Drumnadrochit and Lewiston landscape - this is expected within a dynamic environment and community. However, change should not be at any cost - it is crucial that development is sited sensitively to protect the intrinsic qualities of the Highlands, as highlighted in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan and the Housing in the Countryside and Siting and Design Supplementary Guidance. Unfortunately Site DR6 is inappropriate for the type of development being proposed. This means that, even with the ‘best will in the world’ and good masterplanning and design, development of the proposed site would result in significant adverse landscape and visual effects. This is mainly because good design cannot compensate for

the choice of an unsuitable site in the first place. I am particularly aware of this limit of scope as a Chartered Landscape Architect that has worked in the Highlands for 19 years, including working on landscape character assessments, landscape capacity studies for housing, and providing advice on housing masterplans and housing design. Following the assessment described above, I strongly recommend that the proposals for Site DR6 are withdrawn and that the landscape sensitivity and capacity of the village are assessed to identify areas that are more appropriate for new development.

Allocated to	Drumnadrochit	DR6	Land south west of Coiltie Crescent	
--------------	---------------	-----	-------------------------------------	--

Customer Number 01085 Name Ms Deborah Guthrie Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.59-4.62

Reference FR1

Type Change

Comment Changes

1. Reduction in area of land cited as remaining the 'best option for growth'. 2. Reduction in the number of houses proposed on this environmentally sensitive site. 3. No development considered before infrastructure issues addressed in full.

Representation

I would like to raise three points of objection on the view stated in the plan suggesting the land at Greenside Farm continues to represent the 'best option for growth' to the village of Rosemarkie. Each point of objection poses a fundamental question on this land being developed in the manner and scale proposed and each of these I would respectively ask to be answered. If such answers reference decisions taken by committee which purport to justify the apparent disregard of planning policy (relevant extracts of which are shown below inset in italics), could I please ask for copies of the meeting minutes to be attached or included in your responses as should the issues raised be escalated, such background needs to be fully understood beyond the previous simple statements of decision released by the Council? My objections/questions are > 1.The proposed development area does not represent a logical extension of the village – it forms a very obvious protrusion on the existing village boundary. The logical development of housing and expansion of the village would be as shown below, continuing the lines of housing on the two areas and filling gaps between existing houses. see attached map a.The issue of flood risk in the area at the Western end of Courthill Road can be eliminated with the appropriate type of housing and land drainage. b.Development as shown contains the boundary of the village, constitutes the same area as proposed and spreads the housing more sympathetically to the existing lines of development. c.Importantly, development in these two areas respects and would be consistent with Planning Policy regarding Conservation Village Areas, SSSI's and Greenfield sites. I would like to ask how the Planning Committee consider the proposed area of development land at Greenside Farm to be acceptable when it forms no logical extension to the village, directly adjoins the conservation area of the village and a listed Designed Landscape and SSSI and is high grade agricultural land? We will also judge proposals in terms of how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development and landscape character, how they conform with existing and approved adjacent land uses ... Essentially the purpose of the designations is to exert greater control over the siting and design of proposed development.planning authorities have a duty to bring forward proposals for the preservation or enhancement of Conservation Areas, Development within the designated Outstanding Conservation Area should be carried out in accordance with the established character of the area ... have regard for the Designed Landscape of the Fairy Glen Paragraph 6.37 safeguards good quality agricultural land and viable farm units on the periphery of the settlements, notably at Broomhill and Greenside, from development unrelated to the working of these areas fore agricultural purposes. 2.The suggested housing capacity of this area of land as stated at 50 units on 1.9 ha equates to an average 380 sq m per house. This density of housing is twice that of the proposed development FR2 Ness Gap, is unprecedented in both Rosemarkie and Fortrose, is at the level of inner urban development and does not comply with the Council's stated expectations or national Planning Advice. Up to 2 hectares of land is allocated for 30 to 35 houses, including a proportion of affordable dwellings. As a guideline, the THC will normally expect a maximum plot ratio of 30% (i.e. no more than 30% of plot being covered by buildings) ... This is also consistent with the latest national advice contained in Planning Advice Note 67. The impact of development on the wider landscape needs to be considered and to ensure that the scale of new development in smaller towns and villages is appropriate. How has this housing capacity been decided and how has the number of houses increased from the originally stated level of 30 units to a number which within the footprint of the land in question results in housing density greatly exceeding Planning Advice? The fact that demolition of the farm buildings at Greenside Farm has commenced would appear to suggest the owners of the land have already sold an 'option to buy' subject to planning approval and the increase in housing density points to prior dialogue with the developer and the Planning Department on the commercial need for a higher level of housing capacity to make this development viable from the developer's standpoint. 3.Development of the density proposed on the 1.9ha at Greenside Farm presents serious issues in respect to infrastructure both in the immediate proximity to the development on Courthill Road and for the village centres of Rosemarkie and Fortrose. First there is the issue of road access and traffic, Courthill Road being a single track, access only and partially one-way road with no possibility to be widened. Secondly, there is a pre-existing traffic problem on the main streets of both villages which can only be made worse with additional housing unless alleviated through appropriate measures in advance of further development. Finally, as confirmed in the IMFLDP itself, development on the scale proposed cannot be accommodated by the existing water supply. Proposed developments will be assessed on the extent to which they are compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools, electricity) ... Why does the Planning Authority not require infrastructure to be addressed in advance of considering further development in the

area? ----- One last point – and this is a fundamental matter. The Planning Department has the authority to manage and control development and there is, as with all development, the opportunity to exercise best practice in building ... Respecting the landscape setting and the traditional building patterns of the locality and considering the immediate context and allowing specific site conditions to influence design – as stated by the Scottish Government. Whilst it is accepted the matter in discussion at this point is focused on options for housing development, please at the relevant stage can it be recognised there is a need to enhance and build community as opposed to simply build houses. Today there can be no excuse given on cost constraints – it is down to the resolve of the Planning Department to follow their own clear development directives and ensure outcomes deliver more than an increase in housing stock. It can be done as evidenced by developments such as Burnside in Plockton.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amendments to the 'Safeguarded greenspace' designation.

Representation

6. Requested change: It is noted in the Kiltarlity section of the Plan in paragraph 4.116 that protection is given to the shinty pitch to the east of the village, and this is achieved by the 'green render' designation, which, it is stated on page 166, shows areas where the Council does not wish to encourage development because they represent greenspace from which the public may derive amenity value, and this may be from active recreation, such as in the case of a sports pitch. While sportscotland is on the whole supportive of any protection that can be afforded to sports facilities, pitches etc. through the Development Plan, it is unclear why particular pitches should be singled out in this way when, as noted on page 166, the protection of such areas is already underpinned by, with particular reference to playing fields and sports pitches, Policy 76 in the Highland-wide LDP. sportscotland, as noted in the introductory text to these representations, is content that Policy 76 is a reflection of the provisions of paragraph 156 of SPP, and is therefore concerned that this new designation introduces a hierarchy of importance in the protection of playing fields and pitches. Although reference has been made to Kiltarlity in this representation, sportscotland requests that all existing pitches and playing fields are protected in this way (if this is not already the case – it has not been possible to check that every pitch has been given this designation), or that further clarification is given as to why these pitches have been identified in the way that they have, over and above the protection they already receive from Policy 76. Please note that in accordance with SPP paragraph 156, sportscotland considers that all playing fields, including those within educational establishments, which are required to meet existing or future needs, should be identified in the Local Development Plan. Therefore, our preference is for all pitches/playing fields and sports areas to be identified in the proposals maps of development plans, and the relevant policy/designation for the sites to be shown on these maps. Reason: To ensure that this designation does not create a hierarchy of protection for playing fields and pitches, and to provide clarity. In addition to the above representation, three further comments on the Proposed Plan are set out below. They have been included alongside this representation as the online form does not give the option to add comments - one other comment was submitted in our first and separate online representation form. 7. Comment: sportscotland notes that the requirement for a number of new/replacement school facilities is identified in the Plan, and recommends that the Council makes use of sportscotland's publications, 'Design guidance for primary school sports facilities' and 'Design guidance for secondary school sports facilities' with regard to the design of any new school facilities. These documents outline how both primary and secondary school sports facilities can be designed to provide the ideal environment for providing both physical education and community sport, and can be accessed at the following links: http://www.sportscotland.org.uk/resources/facilities/schools/design_guidance_for_primary_school_sports_facilities http://www.sportscotland.org.uk/resources/facilities/schools/design_guidance_for_secondary_school_sports_facilities Further planning and design guidance on school playing fields specifically is also contained in sportscotland's 'School Playing Fields Planning and Design Guidance' document, which can be accessed at the following link: http://www.sportscotland.org.uk/sportscotland/Documents/Resources/SSC0100192AmendedPlayingFields_PlayingFields_WEB.pdf sportscotland would be pleased to assist the Council in any discussions on the design of any new school with regard to the provision of sports facilities and playing fields. 8. Comment: sportscotland notes that there is a significant amount of new development proposed in the Plan, and also notes that the recent Inverness pitches review carried out on behalf of the Council is yet to be finalised. sportscotland considers that it would be helpful if the review could be finalised in order that it could be used to inform decisions on development in Inverness, whilst recognising that the Local Development Plan is the delivery mechanism for improved sports provision in the area. 9. Comment: sportscotland would be pleased to assist the Council in the preparation of any Supplementary Guidance, Masterplans, or Development/Planning Briefs that will be used to guide development where there is either an existing or proposed sport or recreation interest, including outdoor sport and recreation, and respectfully requests that the Council keeps sportscotland informed of the development of any such documentation as appropriate. The attached document is a cover note and provides information on sportscotland and the context for our representations.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

5. Requested change: sportscotland notes that allocation IN24 Torvean and Ness-side does not contain any specific site requirements, but instead makes reference only to the provisions of the Torvean and Ness-side Development Brief. sportscotland is concerned by this blanket allocation for homes, business, retail, tourism, and community use for this site, particularly given that the Brief does not set out the nature/configuration of the replacement golf facilities and practice area that are to be provided. sportscotland considers that the Proposed Plan should give certainty through its allocations, and considers that in this case it does not. sportscotland suggests that in order for the Plan to provide greater certainty, it should state/be acknowledged in the key site requirements that further work is required to develop a detailed scheme for the site, through a revised Development Brief or Masterplan that will specify the proposals for the golf course in particular, and explain how any housing development will be integrated into the golf course, and which shows on a proposals map the specific land use allocations. It should also be stated in the site requirements that it is acknowledged that existing sports facilities are being impacted, and that these will be replaced as part of the Torvean and Ness-side development. Reason: sportscotland considers that the Proposed Plan should provide adequate detail in order to give certainty with regard to how the site will be developed. It is considered that this is particularly important given that planning applications have already been submitted for the West Link Road elements. The attached document is a cover note and provides information on sportscotland and the context for our representations.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

2. Requested change: Related to our comments on the Glossary, sportscotland notes that there is no reference to Recreation/al Access Management Plans in the Action Programme, and requests that where these are required to be prepared for particular sites, this should be included in the Action Programme against each site. Reason: In order to improve the deliverability of this aspect of the Plan, by providing certainty that Recreation/al Access Management Plans will be prepared where specified in the site requirements. 3. Comment: Related to the above, as detailed in our introductory comments in the attached document, sportscotland has a remit for sport and physical recreation in the countryside/outdoors, and would be pleased to contribute to the preparation of any guidance document/template that is to be developed to assist the preparation of Recreation/al Access Management Plans. The attached document is a cover note providing more information about sportscotland and the context for our representations to the Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

4. Requested change: sportscotland notes the proposed allocation of IN25 Torvean Quarry, and notes that the quarry is currently used for motorbike recreation purposes. It is unclear whether the proposed allocation of the site for 'Business, Community, and a Temporary Stop Site for Travellers', represents a change from the existing uses of the site. If no change is proposed, then sportscotland has no comment to make. However, if the proposed uses do represent a change, then sportscotland would seek to draw to the Council's attention to its policy statement, 'Out There' (sportscotland, 2008), which identifies the reasons why disused quarry sites can be suitable for outdoor sport and recreation purposes. Section 5.3, page 57 states, amongst other reasons, that they can be suitable because there may be little competition from alternative uses, and also, that they can be in locations, or of a nature, where noise from sport is more acceptable. sportscotland considers that a Recreation/al Access Management Plan could be added to the key site requirements for this site to ensure that the proposed uses, if new, do not impact upon the qualities that currently make this site a suitable/preferred site for motorcyclists, or could give rise to potential conflicting/incompatible uses with regard to noise, disturbance etc. Reason: To ensure that the qualities for which the quarry is favoured by motorcyclists are not affected by the proposed allocation, and that the potential for any conflicting/incompatible uses is managed. The attached document is a cover note providing more information about sportscotland and the context for our representations to the Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

1. Requested change: Reference is made throughout the Plan (pages 49, 50, 55 etc.) to 'Recreation/al Access Management Plans'. sportscotland supports any initiative to consider impacts on outdoor sport, recreation and access, which this is assumed to be, but notes that but no definition is given as to what these documents contain or how they are to be prepared/by whom. sportscotland considers that providing a definition in the Glossary would assist understanding of the purpose of these documents. Reason: To aid understanding of the Plan. The attached document is a cover note providing more information about sportscotland and the context for our representations to the Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Your November email to me regarding mapping of the Hinterland boundary satisfied my concerns. Please forward this IMF Proposed Plan Consultation Response to the appropriate person. Many thanks. Consultation responses shouldn't be left to the last day and I should know that by now. On this occasion a power cut of an hour and a half early on, and another tree down blocking the local public road for a while, have disrupted my day, so my response is therefore very short as follows:- For well over a decade since the early stages of the Inverness Local Plan 2006, I , also on behalf of an increasing number of neighbours, have recommended that the whole of the Kinerras area should be included within the boundary of the Hinterland, and that other similar locations to the south of Kiltarlity village should receive consideration along these lines. Kiltarlity Community Council have also long held similar views. I am therefore very pleased indeed to support the Council's decision to include the Eskdale Suggested Expansion shown in the Main Issues Report, within the Hinterland Boundary in the Proposed Plan. I also support the extension of the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig Special Landscape Area as proposed by Inverness West Community Council, as do Kiltarlity Community Council.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reference AR6 development to north of Cromal Terrace, Ardersier. I would like to retain the common in Ardersier as wildlife habitat and a place where local residents and visitors can enjoy the diverse plant and wildlife that exists there and the quality of life that comes with enjoying the common.

Representation

The current plan supports the conversion of about a third of Ardersier common into a caravan park. The area in question is old woodland made up of alder, willow, birch and hawthorn and supports an enormous quantity of wildlife, notably invertebrates that feed the great quantity and variety of birds that inhabit it. This ecosystem relies totally on the high water table and this is what makes it unique. Any change to the water levels by for instance road building or hard stands for caravans which will certainly be required will be of great risk to these trees and the wildlife that relies on them throughout the entire common. It would also be a great shame to lose this unique and very beautiful woodland, both for the residents of Ardersier and for visitors that come to admire it and this could be greatly enhanced by re-opening the paths through it that were fenced off a few years ago. The common in Ardersier is a very valuable amenity for the people living here and a great number of people walk and play there every day of the year. The common was an important factor for me and my family when we chose to move here because of the opportunities it allows to enjoy nature that is unique and beautiful and right next to a village and the same can be said for a lot of our friends around here. A caravan park in that location will detach the common from the village as it will be placed next to the village and cut the common off direct access from the village. Everyone who uses it on a daily basis would have to walk past the caravan park to enjoy the common that rightly belongs to the people of Ardersier. As such the placement of a caravan park in that precise spot will spoil our living environment more than placing it at the other end of the common, or in one of the many empty fields all around the village that might be available for businesses such as this. As a resident of Cromal Terrace I am also concerned about the effect such a development will have on my immediate living environment and specifically the entrance to the area being to the south. The road at the back of Cromal Terrace is narrow and overcrowded with cars, even without all the houses being occupied. Widening the road and subjecting it to more traffic will severely deteriorate my quality of life and that of my young children. The plan refers to the conservation area of Ardersier as being the most important area in the village. It should be noted that this land proposed for a caravan park lies directly adjacent to the conservation area and will be the the view that the many tourists coming in from Fort George will see of the village as they drive in. I hope these points are given careful consideration before carelessly handing out the quality of life of the residents of Ardersier to a developer hoping to make a lot of money out of the green belt land in that is Ardersier common.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The plan supports one house being built on this site. The land in question was gifted to Ardersier Bowling club many years ago and as such should be retained for community use. The land without housing on it offers an uninterrupted view of the sea as you drive into the conservation area of Ardersier, the only spot in the conservation are where this is available. Being in the conservation area it is very important to consider this very carefully before allowing a developer to spoil it where there is no need for additional housing and many other sites are already allocated all around the village for housing where they will not spoil the most beautiful part of the village.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Extend the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig to include the whole Abmachan and Caiplich plateau, the head of Glenconvintu, the area around the small lochs west of the A833 at Culnokirk and an area south of Urquhart Bay.

Representation

We write with reference to the section of the IMFLDP relating to Special Landscape Areas, (SLAs). Inverness West Community Council (IWCC), whose area is shown as API in our references, submitted a proposal for the extension of the Loch Ness SLA to cover an area north of Loch Ness including the whole of Abriachan, the Caiplich plateau, the head of Glenconvinth, the area around the small lochs west of the A833 at Culnakirk and an area south of Urquhart Bay (see AP2). We understand that this proposal has not been included in Highland Council's final draft, and we now seek to have it reconsidered for inclusion in the final plan. Our reasons are as set out below, and we refer also to our original submission, which was supported by Kiltarlity Community Council, additional material sent in by IWCC subsequent to Highland Council's online consultation and a number of comments made by individuals in response to the original consultation, some of which touched on this issue. 1. The striking geological form of the Great Glen and the iconic nature of Loch Ness put together mean that an SLA designation based on Loch Ness is not in question. Put simply, our case is that the rocky moorland plateau north west of Loch Ness mirrors in very many respects the flat moorland plateau area of Duntelchaig and Ashie to the south east included in the SLA, forming the landscape context to the loch. They are so inextricably linked in geographic, historic and social terms to the Loch that it is not logical to include one, and not the other and both together reinforce the special qualities and integrity of the SLA as a whole. 2. The Assessment of Highland Landscape Areas makes an eloquent case for protecting the 'intimate mix' of elements (AP3, p 118~121) in the Duntelchaig/Ashie areas as a contrast to the striking forms of the Great Glen. We submit photographs (AP6) which show that the same mix occurs in our proposed extension area and that the Great Glen Way (see Ordnance survey sheets 416 and 431) and the Abriachan Forest Trust community forest area (AP4) and the A833 (see OS map 431) provide access so that these contrasts can be appreciated by many. Indeed, before a final decision is made on this matter we would particularly request that a visit is undertaken to Carn na Leitire, the high viewpoint of the Abriachan Forest Trust (AP4). This does not require a great deal of time, as a car can be left in the AFT car park. Carn na Leitire affords one of the finest panoramic view points in the eastern area of Highland, and is one of the best places to appreciate the full drama of the Great Glen fault, and the plateaux on either side. 3. We include the professional landscape assessments prepared for us by Caroline Stanton CMLI, APS prepared for our original submission and AP6 in response to online comments by Highland Council. These assessments provide the core of our case, linked directly to the SLA citation produced by the Highland Council as part of the Highland Wide Local Development Plan. They are included here in tabular form and should be read at this point. Caroline has extensive experience in landscape character assessment and was the nominated officer assisting John Richards in the preparation of the Inverness and District LCA for SNH, review 114, relied upon by Highland Council and others in the preparation of the Assessment of Special Landscape Areas. 4. We have also included (AP7) the proposal made, but not followed up on, in 1991 by the Council to designate the area around Loch Laide in Abriachan as an AGLV because 'it offers a marked contrast to the open moorland which occupies the bulk of higher ground above Loch Ness'. This area is at the core of the AFT community forest. 5. We note that current Scottish Planning Policy (at para 140) recommends that a purpose of local landscape designation should be to 'safeguard and promote important settings for outdoor recreation and tourism locally', criteria which in our opinion apply to the Great Glen Way, the area of the Abriachan Forest Trust community forest (30,000 visitors annually) and also the A833 passing through Culnakirk and Glenconvinth extensively used by tour buses and cyclists. This sentiment is echoed in the early stages of consultation on the new SPP. 6. In addition we have included for reference local histories and archaeological records, which provide thorough and detailed evidence of the links between the area and the great waterway of Loch Ness over the centuries, and the archaeological remains which bear a striking resemblance to those in the Duntelchaig and Ashie areas. To include all this detail here might be to overburden the decision-maker, but we would be happy, if requested, to provide further detail on these. Finally, we would ask that this submission be viewed by the decision maker in its entirety. We are making this submission on paper, because unfamiliarity with technology, and slow broadband speeds make cutting and pasting documents of different origins difficult. Of course we understand the convenience of electronic submissions for the Council, but in this instance we would ask that all our appendices be copied into an electronic version, as we feel each contributes to our case. The issue under review is a matter of concern to us as a Community Council and to many of our residents, as we feel an extension to the Landscape Designation will protect the area for the next twenty years both from the viewpoint of the scenery and the recreational enjoyment of residents and visitors alike. We would ask that the proposed extension receive further consideration and acceptance into the

final version of the IMFLDP. Otherwise, we would ask that this be considered an 'unresolved issue' and passed to a Reporter. Planning and landscape assessment, submitted as Appendices, API - AP7. AP 1. area of Inverness West Community Council, Highland Council website AP2. our map showing the existing SLA area in green, and our suggested and recommended extensions. AP3. extracts from Assessment of Special Landscape Areas, Highland Council with SNH, and Horner+ Maclennan, 2011, p 116-122 AP4. map showing the area of the Abriachan Forest Trust community forest area. APS. proposal by Caroline Stanton and submitted as part of our original submission. AP6. additional comments by Caroline, illustrated by photographs. AP7. extract from Drumnadrochit and Fort Augustus Local Plan, Highland Regional Council, 1991 General references: Inverness District Landscape Character Assessment: John Richards, nominated officer Caroline Stanton, SNH review 114, 1999 Scottish Planning Policy, 2010, and draft proposals for the new SPP. Ordnance Survey Explorer sheets 416 and 431 Local history and archaeology: RCAHMS and Historic Scotland: Canmore register of archaeological sites Urquhart and Glenmoriston, William Mackay, second edition, Inverness, 1914 Abriachan, the story of an upland community, Katharine Stewart, published by Abriachan Forest Trust, 2000 The story of Loch Ness, Katharine Stewart, Luath Press, 2005

Allocated to Special Landscape Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We are a bit worried here that after going to a lot of effort getting support for this proposal the actual wording says "limited to caravan accomodation and changing block. It is vital that a manager's house, office, reception, shop and maybe small cafe is added at this stage to make the actual planning permission easier in future.

Representation

It is obvious that these things will be necessary to run a caravan site efficiently.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

1. Modify the mapped extent of the allocation – delete committed/approved development and the client’s house (Eight Acres). 2. Modify the site area – change from 2.3 ha. to 1.4 ha. 3. Modify the site capacity – change from 4 to 7.

Representation

We act for Joyce Hendry who owns the remaining undeveloped land and existing house, Eight Acres, on the south eastern edge of Culbokie, which currently form part of the proposed allocation CU2 North of Carn Mor Dun. Whilst the allocation of the undeveloped land is welcomed and supported, we again request that the committed (with permission) or developed land is deleted from the allocation. We had suggested that the allocation be confined to the land requested as part of the submission to the Main Issues Report. We also question the capacity of 4 houses indicated for the site. The Council’s response to our previous submission states “This site does not have capacity for around 10 or more houses.” We are not sure where the figure of 10 or more houses comes from. However, if the committed development and our client’s house remain in the allocated site we consider that a capacity of 9 houses including these two would be in keeping with the density of development in this large group of houses east of site CU1. Removing the two house ‘plots’ from the area would still provide ample room for 7 houses including an allowance for setting buildings back from the woodland to the south east. A capacity of 7 houses on 1.2 hectares (5/ha.) is still very low density for an edge of settlement development and in contrast with other proposed site allocations in the village. Indeed we note that the capacities for most of the other allocations continued from the R&CELP have increased, in some cases by more than 50%. In particular, CU1 was formerly 20-30 houses and is now 36 (40 minus the 4 at the Cairns) or 12.5/ha. While CU3 was also formerly 20-30 houses and is now 50 or 20/ha. We do not take issue with these capacities but we feel that the capacity of our client’s site should reflect the density of the adjacent developed land. The Council’s response continued: “TEC’s advice is that there is a problem with further development being served off the existing access”. In this regard, on 28 November, 2012, our client was granted planning permission for the formation of a new access and house plot and provision of footpath land to the south west of her own house (12/02770/FUL). The application was the subject of negotiations with the Roads Authority officials over the access, improvements to the public road and a safe connecting footpath towards the main part of the village. Agreement was reached over these provisions and resulted in the application being approved. The proposed road and path works meet the Roads Authority’s requirements for the provision of a revised location for access to the site and serving four existing houses, visibility splays, closure of the existing access, traffic management and provision of a footpath from the site to improve pedestrian access to the village (in accordance with the adopted R&CE Local Plan). A Road Construction Consent application has since been prepared and was recently submitted to the Roads Authority. A copy of the road engineering layout plan for this is attached. The approval and implementation of these works will also provide access to and create capacity for further development. As acknowledged previously, development will have need to be set back an appropriate distance from the woodland to the south east. Our client actually owns a further strip of 4 metres beyond the adjacent allocation boundary and fence, which is where the woodland starts. Most of the nearest trees are regenerated birches which have not reached maturity. Even allowing for a 20 metres holdback from the fence nearest to the woodland there is still enough room (24 metres) to site a house on a plot with a depth of 40 metres without encroaching upon the amenity of existing and future houses in a development of 7 plots. We also note that SEPA will not object subject to the Council supporting their requirement for flood risk assessment. In this regard we seek clarification of what the potential flood risk might be as no part of the site appears to be in a 1 in 200 year flood risk area. There may be some field drainage issues relating to adjacent land but some clarity would be appreciated. To illustrate the above we attach the following: - (1) An over-marked copy of the Culbokie Inset Map with the change sought to reflect uncommitted land only. (2) A drawing of the access and Glascairn road improvements, draft plot layout plan and maximum tree holdback from adjacent woodland.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01042 Name Ms Lesley Grant Organisation Scorrielea Self Catering

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph Para 2.3

Reference Special landscape areas Type Change

Comment Changes

the Special landscape area from the Sutors of Cromarty to Fortrose should include all the area between Fortrose and Rosemarkie bounded by the A832 trunk road, Ness Road in Fortrose and the village of Rosemarkie down to the coastline. The part omitted at the corner of the A832 and Ness Road should be included in the SLA

Representation

The land omitted from the SLA is exactly the same as the rest of the land between Fortrose and Rosmarkie, South of the A832. it is important to retain this land for agriculture, maintain the separate identity of the two villages and provide habitat for endagered birds such as skylarks and starlings.

Allocated to Special Landscape Areas

Customer Number 01042 Name Ms Lesley Grant Organisation Scorrielea Self Catering

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Para 4.59Fortrose & Rosemarkie

Reference Site FR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

The Housing development proposed for Rosemarkie should not be approved

Representation

The land for this development is prime agricultural land. and should be retained for that purpose, in accordance with Highland Council and the Scottish Government policy not to build on agricultural land. It will encourage commuting by car to Inverness and the areas to the north of the Black Isle. It will increase traffic on the high streets of Fortrose, Rosemarkie and the villages between there and Inverness that are not capable of dealing with existing traffic flows let alone further increases in traffic.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The land zoned for a primary school should be retained for that purpose. If the education dept decide that it is not required for a school the land should not be used for commercial development. It should be returned to agricultural land or used to provide allotments for the local community

Representation

This land should not be used for commercial development. It is prime agricultural land and should revert to that if the school is not required. If this is not possible it whould be used to provide allotments for the people in the Ness Gap development or the town whohave such small gardens that they cannot grow there own produce. A commercial development would detract and harm the shops in the existing town center, it would be out of place surrounded by houses. it is on the highest part of the Ness Gap Development and would be extremely obtrusive. A meeting held with the community with this proposal was overwhelmingly rejected by the community.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Site FR2 Ness gap This site should not have an increase in house numbers over that agreed in the deeply locally resented plan. The increased housing density is not transparent in the plan and has been inserted with no local consultation or agreement. The local infrastructure is inadequate to support it. Then effect on Fortrose High street traffic management is that there is no management, and indeed there is no practical traffic plan that can be implemented. Increasing the housing density will contribute to this problem to the detriment of both locals and tourists. There will be further increase in commuter traffic. The potential primary school site should be retained indefinitely even if there is no immediate requirement is identified. Demographic projections have not been accurate regarding the school rolls in the past and the increased population encouraged by more housing that the local plan and developers wish to bring about in Rosemarkie, Fortrose and Avoch will have a cumulative effect resulting in inadequate school provision sooner or later. The land should not be developed for commercial or retail or housing use but should be retained as agricultural land available as allotments to increase sustainability until there is a requirement for school use. The area has been identified as being a popular tourist destination and of high agricultural value. Neither of these attributes are being served by the increased density proposed for this suburban type developement. Where is the swimming pool site? It is not identifiable on the map.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Site FR1 Greenside farm This site is good agricultural land and should be retained as agricultural land, which is a fundamental requirement for sensible and sustainable developement and is also highland council and scottish government policy. There is no overwhelming requirement or justification for building additional housing on it. The proposed development is outwith the village area. The road access is dangerous and unsuitable. The infrastructure of the area does not support the increase in population with regards to local services, schools, traffic. The majority of work is in Inverness and the increased commuter traffic is not sustainable and is detrimental to all the villages along this route.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Site FR2 Ness gap This site should not have an increase in house numbers over that agreed in the deeply locally resented plan. The increased housing density is not transparent in the plan and has been inserted with no local consultation or agreement. The local infastructure is inadequate to support it. Then effect on Fortrose High street traffic management is that there is no management, and indeed there is no practical traffic plan that can be implemented. Increasing the housing density will contribute to this problem to the detriment of both locals and tourists. There will be further increase in commuter traffic. The potential primary school site should be retained indefinately even if there is no immediate requirement is identified. Demographic projections have not been accurate regarding the school rolls in the past and the increased population encouraged by more housing that the local plan and developers wish to bring about in Rosemarkie, Fortrose and Avoch will have a cumulative effect resulting in inadequate school provision sooner or later. The land should not be developed for commercial or retail or housing use but should be retained as agricultural land available as allotments to increase sustainability until there is a requirement for school use. The area has been identified as being a popular tourist destination and of high agricultural value. Neither of these attributes are being served by the increased density proposed for this suburban type developement. Where is the swimming pool site? It is not identifiable on the map.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01331 Name Ms Naomi Lloyd Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Sites AV3, AV4, AV5 This is prime agricultural land and it is shortsighted and unsustainable to build on it without making a valid case to do so that outweighs its agricultural use.

Allocated to Avoch AV3 West of the old Manse

Customer Number 01331 Name Ms Naomi Lloyd Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Site FR1 Greenside farm This site is good agricultural land and should be retained as agricultural land, which is a fundamental requirement for sensible and sustainable developement and is also highland council and scottish government policy. There is no overwhelming requirement or justification for building additional housing on it. The proposed development is outwith the village area. The road access is dangerous and unsuitable. The infrastructure of the area does not support the increase in population with regards to local services, schools, traffic. The majority of work is in Inverness and the increased commuter traffic is not sustainable and is detrimental to all the villages along this route.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number 04337 Name Ms Newton Organisation Bell Ingram

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development

Paragraph 2.26

Reference Policy 3 Other Settlements

Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Background

Fairburn Estate owns land at West Brae, Marybank which is allocated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (As Continued in Force) (April 2012) as a 2.7 hectare expansion of the settlement for up to 25 houses (Policies, Proposals and Opportunities 4 (b)). The Local Plan identifies the need to replace the communal septic tank with a sewage treatment works as an infrastructure constraint in Marybank. This infrastructure constraint we understand is being addressed by the provision of a new WTW by Scottish Water. The provision of structural planting scheme and 25% affordable housing contribution are also mentioned in the Written Statement.

The current Local Plan allocation at West Brae, Marybank is supported by the Highland Council's Planning Department and the local community to meet demand for housing. The most recent Highland Council's Housing Land Audit 2010 lists West Brae site as programmed for development within the 10-15 year period. Our client's plans to develop the site have been delayed by the downturn in the housing market.

Representation

The Proposed Inner Moray Firth Local Development would remove all existing allocations for identified small villages/settlements, including West Brae, Marybank. Development proposals within or adjoining a number of smaller settlements would instead be assessed against a set of policy criteria in Policy 3: Other Settlements. Our client objects to the criteria based approach in Policy 3 which would provide less certainty for the landowner, any future potential developer and the community. A mapped based approach to all settlements which identifies suitable development within or adjacent to existing settlements would better reflect the requirements of SPP. Development plans should provide clear guidance on what will and will not be permitted, which should be clear from the proposals map (SPP para.14).

Windfall sites provided an average of 244 homes per year between 2000 and 2012. Given the significant contribution that windfall sites are required to make to the delivery of new housing it would seem logical to carry existing acceptable site allocations with known capacities through to the replacement plan rather than relying on further unknown windfall sites.

The removal of the existing allocations from 'other settlements' would appear to be procedural in order to allow for a streamlined plan that concentrates on larger settlements, rather than good planning practice. It does not allow for the allocation of a generous supply of appropriate and effective housing sites to meet all housing needs and demand in accordance with the Scottish Governments aspirations (SPP paras. 70— 76). Not all rural areas would have a range of effective sites to meet demand and support local services and amenities.

Conclusion

The proposed approach would fail to support landowners in bringing sites forward to provide an effective supply of land and ensure that sufficient land is available to meet housing requirements for the area. The

'Other Settlements' policy should ensure existing undeveloped allocations are therefore taken forward and remain effective to allow Fairburn Estate and other developers to confidently plan for the future.

Allocated to Policy 3 Other Settlements

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Changes to area

Representation

Until Craig Road becomes a cul de sac at No.1 level crossing we cannot support any development here. Craig Road is wholly unsuitable now for the HGV's and other heavy vehicles that use it now.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Changes to area

Representation

The present roads which now serve the residential areas of Dingwall are barely adequate during the twice daily "rush hours", namely Old Evanton Road, Kinnairdie Brae and Craig Road. Until Craig Road becomes a cul de sac at No.1 level crossing, we cannot support any further houses. Drivers must be forced to use wider, safer Newton/Relief road

Allocated to

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Grey land in centre of villageadjacent to CU5 Type Change

Comment Changes

This land should be green

Representation

The 'grey' land along the burn in the centre of the village should be green. This land could be an important and picturesque part of a future path network offering a potential link from the centre of the village into Culbokie Woods

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CU6 North of Schoolcroft Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We welcome the identification of land at CU6 as suitable for 'Business, Retail, Office and Community uses'. This site provides some flexibility for additional community facilities at the north east end as the village grows

Allocated to Culbokie CU6 North of Schoolcroft

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.144

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We agree with the need to protect the views to the north and west of the village (particularly the land directly opposite CU5) and the proposal for longer term growth towards the east.

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.146

Reference Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We strongly welcome the recognition of the need to deliver enhancements to the path linkages between developments, to village services and to the forest network (4.146)

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Grey land north of CU6 Type Change

Comment Changes

Grey land should be green

Representation

Land north of CU6 is currently a SUDS and landscaping area and should be shown in green.

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CU5 South of Tir Aulin Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We welcome the identification of land at CU5 as suitable for Community and Business, Retail and Office. In the long term, this site will be essential to the unification of the village and the provision of a real village centre

Allocated to Culbokie CU5 South of Tir Aulin

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Village Boundary Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We agree with the proposed village boundary and exclusion of large housing developments beyond this boundary.

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CU4 South of Village Store Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We welcome the continued safeguarding of land at CU4 for 'Community and Retail, Business and Office'. Given its 'safeguarded' status we have prioritised this site for a community partnership project to develop a larger shop and additional community facilities

Allocated to Culbokie CU4 CU4 South of Village Store

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CU7 East of Old Primary School Type Change

Comment Changes

We would like to change the time required for marketing from 6 months to three years

Representation

We welcome the preference at CU7 for 'Community and Business, Retail and Office' over housing. However, we request that there should be at least a three year period for marketing this site. We believe that this is justified on two main grounds: 1. Firstly, the community itself has expressed an interest in purchasing the site for community facilities and this has been discussed with the current owners. However, the community is at an early stage of organising community development and it would need time to bring such a project to fruition 2. Secondly, the current market is not conducive to a rapid commercial private sector investment

Allocated to Culbokie CU7 East of Old Primary School

Customer Number 00446 Name Ms Penny Edwards Organisation Culbokie Development Group

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Grey land at north and south edges of village Type Change

Comment Changes

Grey land at north and south edges of village should be green

Representation

The grey land to the north of CU3 and the grey land on the southern edge of the village should be green. This land is required to achieve the objective stated in the plan (para 4.144) of defining the village edge on its northern and southern approaches by securing structural tree planting

Allocated to Culbokie General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Allocation of additional site at Tomick House

Representation

The subject site at Tomich House, Muir of Ord should be specifically allocated within the Local Development Plan for up to 4 live/work residential units. The area to be developed would be restricted to the existing clearing in the central section of the site (refer attached plan) thereby retaining the existing woodland and its contribution to the character/amenity of the surrounding area. The Proposed Local Development Plan, as written, makes no provision for such beneficial development within the rural area (where such uses are best suited in light of their sustainable character/local employment potential, the required land take, etc) and, as such, the emerging Plan fails to address the full extent of housing need within the area including the well documented and increasing demand for such live/work arrangements and the related environmental/community/economic benefits that can arise. SUPPORTING CASE - The approach set out in the adopted Highland Wide Local Development Plan (Policies 35 and 36), in the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, and in Highland Council's Housing in the Countryside and Siting and Design Supplementary Guidance (March 2013) in terms of the separation of countryside policy between hinterland areas and the wider countryside is noted. While the general approach to "presume against housing in the open countryside of the hinterlands around towns as defined on the Proposals Map", as set out in Policy 35 of the Highland Wide Local Development Plan, is noted it is patently clear that these restrictions would prevent beneficial residential/employment related development (live/work units) in these more accessible, and ultimately sustainable areas (with greater access to physical and social infrastructure) being delivered. At the national level the Scottish Government is committed to increasing the supply of new homes and requires the planning system to assist this process by identifying a generous supply of land for the provision of the full range of housing needs across all tenures, from affordable housing to executive housing. Local development plans are required to allocate land on a range of sites which are effective or capable of becoming effective and to ensure a minimum of 5 years effective land supply at all times. In addition to meeting housing need, Scottish Planning Policy recognises that the planning system has a significant role to play in supporting sustainable economic growth in rural areas. By taking a positive approach to new development, planning authorities can help to create the right conditions for rural businesses and communities to flourish. The aim should be to enable development in all rural areas which supports prosperous and sustainable communities whilst protecting and enhancing environmental quality. Again, it is envisaged, as per Highland Council's present approach, that most development to meet these needs will occur in and around existing towns and villages albeit an inflexible policy approach will undoubtedly deter potentially beneficial development and therefore would, in turn, not satisfy the overarching aim of supporting diversification and growth of the rural economy. Scottish Planning Policy clearly places an onus on local development plans to promote economic activity and diversification in all small towns and rural areas, not simply based on somewhat arbitrary geographical distances/zones which in themselves will contain a wide range of individual characteristics, constraints and opportunities. Scottish Planning Policy also seeks to maintain and improve the viability of communities and to support rural businesses. It is fully accepted that in more accessible and densely populated rural areas most new development should be in or adjacent to settlements. The local development plan and related policy framework has to be flexible to the extent that beneficial development outwith designated settlements, particularly development that may not readily be delivered within such areas, can still be delivered through the plan led planning system. In short, it is clear from Scottish Planning Policy that far greater flexibility, while retaining necessary safeguards, is required in order to meet the wide range of housing need generally required (from affordable housing to executive housing - which should reasonably include provision for bespoke live/work units) and to support local employment/the local economy. Indeed, it is clear from Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 94 that, in addition to a generous and effective land supply, the creation of high quality places and residential environments, and deliverability, that "Development plans should support more opportunities for small scale housing development in all rural areas, including new clusters and groups, extensions to existing clusters and groups, replacement housing, plots on which to build individually designed houses, holiday homes and new build or conversion housing which is linked to rural businesses or would support the formation of new businesses by providing funding". Live/work (home-work) units are considered a particular opportunity to deliver a form of sustainable development suited to retaining/increasing economic activity within rural areas, meeting specific business needs in some employment sectors, while also providing for housing needs. The plan, as written, seeks to provide flexibility to some extent but patently fails to provide for the form of beneficial/bespoke development being proposed. Clearly, development which unacceptably impacts on landscape quality and rural services should be resisted and a presumption against such development appears an appropriate land use planning response. However, there are circumstances where sites on/adjacent to main arterial

routes, which are readily accessible to nearby services and where a strong landscape framework exists, could add to deliverable development and in doing so increase the effective housing supply within an area, in effect delivering an appropriate form of sustainable development with related economic spin-offs while having no conflict with the underlying vision, spatial strategy, aims and objectives of the local development plan. It remains the case that most development should be directed to existing settlements and, as indicated, this approach is fully supported. However, the approach proposed by Muir Homes Limited requires an additional degree of flexibility which may be addressed by specific land allocations within the plan and/or a criteria based policy framework setting out an assessment methodology for proposals through the Development Management process. In all cases it is envisaged that additional development within the hinterland around towns area would be small scale (not more than 3 to 4 units), easily accessible in all respects (access to the site/local services etc), and contained/absorbed within a landscape context in order to protect the visual amenity/integrity of the rural environment. In this case, the terms of established policy in the district wide Local Development Plan appears restrictive with respect to applying a different policy context for the emerging LDP. This is a matter that could be address within the related Highland Council’s Housing in the Countryside and Siting and Design Supplementary Guidance (March 2013). However, it is considered that there is a case based on the specific characteristics of the subject site for an allocation based on the bespoke use proposed. The landscape containment, available land and infrastructure, accessibility, and lack of alternatives in the area (and indeed elsewhere in the LDP area) all point to the need for this allocation in order to meet this niche requirement. LAND AT TOMICH HOUSE, MUIR OF ORD: THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS - The identified site at Tomich House (refer attached plan) lies immediately to the south of Muir of Ord (opposite Windhill) and directly adjacent to and accessed from the A862. It is within an area generally punctuated/characterised by development outwith the defined settlement boundary albeit the site is almost entirely, if not fully, obscured from public view by established landscaping. The site is largely surrounded by established woodland with a central clearing where the proposed development would occur, the existing trees would be retained with additional planting also proposed (areas annotated on attached plan). The site is accessible (to the A862 and to local services in Muir of Ord), is fully contained within a long established landscape framework (which, as indicated, would be retained and enhanced as part of any development), and would represent an attractive and deliverable development that would contribute positively to increasing sustainable economic growth within the area and meeting a form of housing not provided for elsewhere in the plan area. The development would comprise low density bespoke units containing residential and related business space designed to facilitate home working (live/work units). They would meet a particular market niche for this type of development within local (and wider) the area. Development of the site in the manner proposed would have no negative impacts on local services or on local landscape quality, the stated rationale for resisting development in such areas set out within Highland Council’s present policy. Rather, the development would be of high quality fully integrated within a landscape framework and making a positive contribution to meeting housing/employment needs in a sustainable manner while responding positively to the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy. It cannot be stressed enough that this form of supported development cannot readily be delivered within established settlements. Pragmatically, and the planning process requires be pragmatic especially in the present economic climate, the delivery of such development and the economic benefits that can arise will only be achieved in a truly sustainable/acceptable manner in areas close/assessable to services and transport. It is clear that this is a niche market but Scottish Planning Policy requires for all housing needs to be planned for as part of the local development plan process. For all of the reasons set out it is respectfully requested that the identified site be identified for a sympathetic and fully justified form of bespoke development addressing an unmet need within the area and in a truly accessible/sustainable location, all in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy while having no conflict with the underlying vision, spatial strategy, aims and objectives of the emerging local development plan.

Allocated to	Muir of Ord	General	General	
--------------	-------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number 04470 Name Murdo Gordon Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IV55 Type Change

Comment Changes

1. Retain site back to Green Wedge of as a trust with a buffer between the A9 and Inshes Retail Park. 2. Department is aware of our concerns about a possible East Link on our home and land.

Representation

1. A vista in the City from the A9 down to the Raigmore Interchange. This site is not suitable as a retail centre as this will have a long term damage on this our area or a change for any other use.

Allocated to South Inverness IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes

Customer Number 04450 Name Murdo MacLennan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN19 Type Change

Comment Changes

Rear part of site to be left as it is for wild-life. Front part could have seating and a garden area

Representation

The are two Thomas Telford Cottages opposite the site. They are Category "B" listed therefore new modern build is inappropriate in the area. I would also like it noted that the site is on a dangerous bend and I do not think that it would meet current visibility standards for traffic coming from the right, ie out of town. We had a child injured there a few weeks ago.

Allocated to West Inverness IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

2,000 houses to go up,without new roads ,additional Dr./dental/schools is ridiculous. Already we are overstretched ,waiting times are terrible. You cannot just throw up houses and bring +/- 6,000 people in without addressing our ,already, hopeless roads and services. For Farmers Field ,see below.

Representation

Re Farmers Field and building houses there with NO NEW ROADS - the tiny Lodgehill Road would have to be used (no pavements on that side) going into West bury ,also tiny and with a terrible junction at its Cawdor Rd. end OF 5 ROADS where there already terrible traffic jams. AND it is used by ambulances going to and fro from the hospital AND by Fire Engines also rushing down to fires. We can hear their sirens going all the time as they try to get through and you are creating a potential disaster with talk of more houses and people in this already overstretched area. ALSO, the people of Nairn wish to keep their few GREEN AREAS and Farmers Field is well used. You should :- 1. See about taking some of those stupid traffic lights that are cluttering up the main road and resite some on that dangerous junction of Cawdor/ Westbury/Millbank / Station roads. 2. Get our Bypass first before thinking of any more schemes here - our town cannot stand to have any more people/ traffic without attention to our infrastucture and services. AND without destroying our green spaces.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The proposed plan takes insufficient account of the resultant serious impact on traffic and pedestrian safety. The developer should therefore review the Transport Assessment and fund traffic management solutions (eg traffic lights or speed-calming measures) specifically near the Drummond Road/Stratherrick junction.

Representation

This development will inevitably increase traffic on the surrounding roads. Since the completion of Sir Walter Scott Drive, traffic has increased on Drummond Road: drivers wishing to avoid the numerous roundabouts, use Drummond Road as a short cut to Westhill and environs. The road is difficult to negotiate – a sharp left-hand bend incorporates a right hand junction at which visibility is seriously reduced. There have already been 3 incidents of cars knocking down garden walls, including my own, sustaining serious damage on the Stratherrick Road side. In addition there is pavement on only one side of Drummond road necessitating many pedestrians to cross an increasingly busy road in order to walk safely. Increased numbers of speeding cars creates an unacceptable risk to pedestrians, especially those walking to the nearby local schools.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04255 Name Murray Campbell Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN42 IN45 Type Change

Comment Changes

Too many houses on the area which is 4.6 Ha not 6.7Ha as previously stated. The site would be considerably overdeveloped and in fact for this area and in consideration of the sloping ground the allocation should be a total of 92 houses.

Representation

We have enjoyed a peaceful country setting for many years and to over develop this area, which would encroach in the privacy of both our front and back garden, would be immensely detrimental to our peaceful living and to the value of our property. There has already been extensive development in our area and to try and over develop would be completely detrimental. Because of all the recent developments we are feeling totally and utterly enclosed within new developments which we have never wanted and now the proposal is for us to be "overlooked" and have completely no privacy. The only solution we could possibly see to us not being affected immensely by this awful proposal would be to have a large "tree lined screened green area" separating West Road from a considerable distance to the development.

Allocated to South Inverness IN44 Inshes Small Holdings (north)

Customer Number 00491 Name Myra Carus Organisation Highland and Islands Green Party

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 82

Reference FR1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reconsider the development. In particular the density of housing to be built.

Representation

In the original proposals for housing at this site, a figure of 30 – 35 houses was mentioned. Now “up to 50” are included in the IMFLDP. This is an unacceptable increase of around 40% in density for this site. There are also serious issues regarding drainage on the site and the impact on Courthill Road.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR1 Greenside Farm

Customer Number 00491 Name Myra Carus Organisation Highland and Islands Green Party

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 82

Reference FR2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reinsertion of Primary School, Insertion of Swimming Pool, and major problems regarding suitability of the A832 for the development.

Representation

Site FR2 Proposed Primary School The Primary School was a major part of the development of FR2 in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 Quote: 11. A site of 1.8 ha. shall be safeguarded adjacent to the Deans and Ness Roads for the provision of a primary school with playing field, serving the Fortrose and Rosemarkie area In the new IMFLDP it states "No development of site identified for a primary school on masterplan prior to the Sustainable Schools Estates Review" Surely the site has to be identified prior to the Review and then if the review finds there is no demand for a new school only then should it be removed from the masterplan. Indeed, with all the planned new extra housing and the ageing primary school in Avoch there might well be a demand for a primary school in Fortrose. Site FR2 Black Isle Swimming Pool Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states 10. Land is reserved for expansion of Black Isle Leisure Centre to provide a swimming pool, a project being led by the community. An area of approximately 0.6 ha. is reserved for this purpose and for additional community/leisure facilities to meet local needs. Incredibly, especially to those of us who have campaigned for a new Pool for many years, the swimming pool does not even get a mention in the new plan. Road Infrastructure relating to FR1 and FR2 Again the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 states "The need to reconstruct the dangerous A832 route between Fortrose and Avoch is a major concern." Many people in Fortrose and Rosemarkie believe that the infrastructure for the proposed developments, particularly the A832 between the Fairy Glen in Rosemarkie and Avoch is totally unsuitable for large scale increased housing, and before any further development is approved something must be done about it. Having attended various meetings organised by the Council to discuss improvements to Fortrose High Street, it has also become clear that any changes made here can only be minor and cosmetic. The very nature of the naming of FR2 - The Ness Gap - is a very suggestive one, implying that there is somehow a "need" to fill this "gap". I am concerned that a lot of development here and on the Black Isle is led by developers and not by community needs.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR2 Ness Gap

Customer Number 00491 Name Myra Carus Organisation Highland and Islands Green Party

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Page 38

Reference IN13 Type Change

Comment Changes

Withdrawal of proposal to allow an Energy from Waste Plant on the Longman Landfill Site

Representation

As a resident of the Black Isle I am very worried about the possibility of an incinerator being built on the Longman. I have followed developments at the proposed incinerator in Invergordon very closely and have read a lot about the negative aspects of incineration. The whole Black Isle will be affected from the north by the Invergordon plant and from the south by the proposed incinerator at Inverness. There is considerable scientific evidence showing that air pollution must be seriously considered, and if an energy from waste plant were to be considered it should use an anaerobic digestion system. In any case, one would hope that there will be detailed consultation and an inquiry before the building of an incinerator is allowed.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN13 Former Longman Landfill

Customer Number 04120 Name N Pead Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

NAIRN: Response to letter sent to residents NA5: Dwellings to the North of Montgomerie Drive and immediately south of Kingsteps should be single story. This is in keeping with the build design of the current homes (formely known as Kylauren). Springfield have proposed double story properties to be erected in this particualr area and is not with keeping with current design

Representation

NAIRN: Response to letter sent to residents NA5: Dwellings to the North of Montgomerie Drive and immediately south of Kingsteps should be single story. This is in keeping with the build design of the current homes (formely known as Kylauren). Springfield have proposed double story properties to be erected in this particualr area and is not with keeping with current design

Allocated to Nairn NA5 Lochloy

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I am writing to object to the the proposed land use in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP), specifically the Dell of Inshes site, IN55.

Representation

The new IMFLDP proposes this site to be developed for class 10 usage, which would include community, retail (bulky goods only) and non residential institution, as adopted by the Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP). I have not receiving any neighbour notification in relation to the proposed IMFLDP or HWLDP even though I live within 20m of the site IN55. To date I am also aware of 4 other neighbours who have not received notification. Any development on this site will increase traffic flow to the area which is already struggling, especially at peak times. The traffic loading at the Inshes roundabout has been at capacity for some time now as discussed at previous community consultation meetings in relation to the east – west link road, to help alleviate the congestion. As part of the 'Safer Routes' initiative there is yet to be provision for pedestrians and cyclists on and around the Inshes roundabout. The land currently acts as a buffer zone between the A9 and the houses in the Woodgrove/Briargrove housing scheme. This buffer zone allows for the reduction of road noise, vehicle fumes, light from car headlights and general lighting pollution, as well as providing a visual barrier. Development of this site would increase noise pollution from retail, delivery and servicing traffic, not to mention the increase in light pollution any development would bring. The recycling centre in Tesco car park already creates unacceptable early morning noise, development of this site would only compound this. The effects of lighting from Tesco shop frontage and it's car park can be clearly seen from my garden and bedroom windows. A development in direct line, would produce more significant noise and light pollution. As yet the Inshes area is still to be provided with a health/medical centre or day care centre as recommended by the current plan. The proposal for class 10 use will not guarantee any further services for community use as this allocation could simply just provide retail (bulky goods only). All such retail services required at a local level are already provided for by the current Inshes Retail Park. There is an alternative brown field site at Harry Ramsdens/Blockbuster location which is at best an eyesore as it stands. This would benefit from development of such required community services – namely a medical/health centre and at worse, would be better suited for retail use due to its further proximity to the local Dell of Inshes housing scheme. Milton of Leys is yet to be developed for local services and as yet has only been provided with a primary school and just this past week a Coop. This area would be better suited for further development as they are in desperate need of more local amenities and services than Inshes. I would urge the council to carefully consider the proposal for class 10 use of this site and encourage them to leave it as a buffer zone between the existing housing development and the A9. However, as the HWLDP shows this site is to be used for class 10 use, I would direct and encourage the council to develop this site for community use. For example, as allotments which are much sought after in the area. This would allow the land to remain as a buffer zone, be used for community use and reduce the effects that retail development would bring.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 04375 Name Neil Strachan Organisation Muir of Ord Golf Club

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.75 Housing

Reference MO3 Ardnagrask Type Change

Comment Changes

Amendment of LDP so area MO3 is not zoned for residential development of any kind. If residential development does go ahead, contractual guarantees written into any developer agreement to protect the club against: 1. Flooding/drainage issues caused by the development. 2. Potential litigation against club and golfers through injury & damage caused by golf balls. 3. Any such pre or post development remedial work required to be carried out entirely at the cost of the developer.

Representation

As Club Manager at Muir of Ord Golf Club I am responsible for the ensuring the well-being of the club on behalf of its members. It would be remiss of me, therefore, not to raise a number of concerns we have with the proposed Local Development Plan at the specific site MO3: • The club has invested a significant sum of money rectifying drainage problems throughout the course. Given the topography and proximity of the site to the course, how will the Council and any developer ensure we are not subjected to increased risk of flooding and /or drainage problems re-occurring or indeed worsening? • How will the golf club and individual golfers be protected against the increased possibility and cost of litigation should any damage occur to persons or property within a new housing development at this location? • Should these concerns not be addressed at the outset, who will bear responsibility for the cost of any remedial work required to rectify either, or both, of these issues? • The golf club are slowly becoming land locked by housing, if the club ever wish to expand this would be an ideal site. In terms of the effect of the development as a whole, we would also highlight the following potential concerns: • Density of housing seems over ambitious when taking the local build fabric into consideration. If you look at an aerial image (gmaps), the existing 12-15 private houses adjacent to the site would potentially fill the whole site if superimposed onto the proposed area. • Is this the correct location to adopt another high density Cairns style development? • The topography of the site runs towards the golf course, creating a hydrological issue and sewage connection issue. • There would be a visual impact for existing home owners and additional noise from the road would be created. • An existing green corridor would become urban sprawl which would in turn create a precedent for further expansion of development in the rural landscape in the future. • Corrie Road is mostly single track with only the first mile or so from the village being two lanes. We consider ourselves to be the social hub of the community, for golfers and non-golfers alike and having been established in 1875 can lay claim to being the oldest golf club in the Highlands. As such, we have a rich history intertwined with that of the village itself and thus feel that such an important resource within the community should be protected against the 'urbanization' of the immediate surrounding area. We do understand there is always a need for the provision of housing, especially that classed as 'affordable', however we feel there are alternative sites available around the village which are far more suitable for development. Should residential development indeed be permitted here, the club must be protected against all costs associated with installing the necessary safeguards as highlighted above. To not do so would be a failure on the part of both Local and National Governments, especially given the current delicate financial climate in which we find ourselves.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO3 Ardnagrask, Corrie Road

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The College wishes to retain flexibility regarding potential future uses for the IN4 site and as such requests that retail (food and non food) use is specifically referred to in the list of uses in the LDP. We understand that the Council is seeking to promote mixed use development across the wider Longman Core area and consider it important that the opportunity exists for retail to be included as part of the mix of uses on the IN4 site.

Representation

Inverness College wishes to make representations on the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, specifically in relation to site IN4 on Longman Road. This site is currently owned and occupied by the College and will become surplus following the College's relocation to its new facilities at Beechwood, as part of a major investment strategy in Inverness. The uses currently indicated for IN4 in the emerging Inner Moray Firth LDP are business, industrial, community and leisure. The Highland Wider LDP 2012 identifies the site as being within the "Longman Core" and makes reference to the relocation of the College to Beechwood, resulting in the potential for a wide range of different retail, commercial, business and office opportunities to be attracted to the area. It indicates that across the area the Council will support the development of office, leisure, service and retail uses and that SPG will be prepared, within which there will be an updated development brief or masterplan. The site also sits within the City Centre boundary, which allows retail uses. Several nearby sites within the "Longman Core" include reference to retail (amongst other uses) in the emerging Moray Firth LDP (e.g. IN5, IN6 and IN14). The College wishes to retain flexibility regarding potential future uses for the IN4 site and as such requests that retail (food and non food) use is specifically referred to in the list of uses for IN4 in the LDP. We understand that the Council is seeking to promote mixed use development across the wider Longman Core area and consider it important that the opportunity exists for retail to be included as part of the mix of uses on the IN4 site. We trust that these comments will be taken on board and that their substance will be given effect in the emerging Local Development Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The density of housing for the site is stated to be 50 which is considered to be a gross over development of what is an open rural area immediately adjacent to open farmland and countryside of conservation value. While 50 residences may be an appropriate density for a town or city it would be more appropriate for a density of 20 to 30 residences of no more than one and a half storey in the detailed location.

Representation

The proposed density for the area of the plan should be reduced to 30 residences of no more than one and a half storey

Allocated to

Customer Number 04302 Name Nicola Macpherson Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 17-19

Reference IN49 Type Change

Comment Changes

DO NOT BUILD ON THIS LAND.

Representation

Detrimental impact upon residential amenities. We believe that the posed development will harm the character and appearance of our area the amenities enjoyed by local residents. In particular, the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe environment. The proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community love and enjoy and use regularly ski-ing. Our school utilises this are a as well, The area should be protected for current and future for a range of outdoor activities ranging from walking, cycling, jogging and cross country generations. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04315 Name Nicola Morrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following recreational factors.

Representation

Recreational - Milton of Leys lacks any sort of recreational facilities and as such the paths from Bogbain Wood into Daviot Wood are well used by all sorts of people. It is not just the dog walkers (who often travel by car from other parts of Inverness) but the mountain bikers, horse riders and runners who use this space on a daily basis. The footfall in Bogbain Wood is really high and how would this be replaced? We have little space or areas for kids to play/exercise and this is an important part of Milton of Leys that compensates for lack of walks or kids activity areas. Indeed, this area is more important than a play park for kids as it caters for all ages and disabilities.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following education / amenity issues.

Representation

School/Local Amenities - there would be a significant impact on the school role if further housing was permitted. The ratio is apparently 0.2/0.3 kids per home (which I think Milton of Leys far supercedes!) but even this is approximately 15-20 additional kids which in reality is half to 2/3rds a class. The school cannot cope with the existing school roll and with the new developments on the link road also pointing into Milton of Leys Primary instead of Inshes Primary then it will soon not big enough again despite the new classrooms being built this summer. With more housing comes the need for more amenity areas and shops. Whilst Tullochs have been unable to fill the site opposite the school with shops etc this is more by lack of planning support etc rather than lack of demand. This area should be preserved as well for additional shops with and more encouragement or incentives for businesses to consider this area for their business first rather than creating a new area that could become an empty shell like the current Carse Industrial Estate. Residence in Milton of Leys would be encouraged to see more shops in our area but not spread out across two sites but under the one we already have space for. If any land became free then it should be used to provide additional amenity land for Milton of Leys rather than being lost to even more new housing. The school is already the largest Primary in the Highlands and making it bigger is not the answer. We will no doubt see issues like this years P6 class become a regular feature. The size of the school & teacher coverage has been an issue in my eyes over the last 2 years and this would only get worse with a higher school role.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following environmental factors.

Representation

Environmental - this is an area of outstanding natural beauty on the outskirts of Inverness. Previous developments, including where I now live in Milton of Leys has pushed wildlife into a smaller space. I see more deer on the roads around Milton of Leys now and on the A9 than ever before so where do they go if this land is developed? Umpteen people walk in Bogbain Woods daily and there is a multitude of wildlife that would be affected. In the last few months I have spotted pheasants, birds of prey, red squirrels, herons, frogs, newts, I could go on. Have SNH & RSPB been consulted for their views? There is also a lot of young trees planted in this site that would need to be relocated/replaced and where would this go? There are also many paths in this area, not just the main one through the middle but others further up which are well trodden on a daily basis. How are these going to be replaced for the people who use this area daily? When we moved to the area we were in fact told that the pond behind the houses in Redwood Avenue is a Site of Scientific Interest due to the wildlife if homes in and around it - this should remain completely untouched.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I wish to object to the construction of housing and/or businesses in IN49, which appears to be the destruction of Bogbain Wood to the south side of Inverness, on the basis of the following housing impacts.

Representation

Housing Impacts - there are other areas inside the current city boundaries that should be built in first before expanding Inverness outwards like this. Case in point is how long did the houses in Castleton Village sit before being brought into Milton of Leys and this could be created again. The area directly behind the housing in Redwood Avenue is prone to flooding. What assurances do we have that developing this land will not make the natural drainage & water table worse, subjecting us to ongoing flooding issues and increased insurance costs. Also, with many houses south facing, what impact would a development of this size have on natural light given any housing/buildings would sit higher than those currently there. With additional housing brings additional roads and with that people using existing built up areas as short cuts to their home/business. There are already examples of speeding in the area and this would only become worse with further development. The Milton of Leys Distributor Road is supposed to be a 30mph zone and a recent speed check survey conducted by Highland Council for the Milton of Leys Parent Council highlighted average speeds in excess of 30mph outside the school and surrounding roads, even during school drop off & pick up times. Some speeds were in excess of 50mph which highlights the dangers of this road. Any development here would require crossing of this busy road that is regularly used as a short cut / rat run to the A9 from housing and businesses to the South West of the city.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04092 Name Nigel Collins Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 49 Type Change

Comment Changes

Access routes not through Redwood Avenue As stated in 2.3 this should be a SLA. Infrastructure 2.16 Flooding/drainage Policy 3 other settlements Quality of life

Representation

The access routes to the site should not be via Redwood Avenue as this is a residential area with children. The extra traffic would reduce the quality of life and pose a danger to residents. The area is used by most of Milton of Leys as a dog walking/recreational area and due to the lack of facilities would be a great loss. As stated in 2.3 this should be a SLA as there are deer, pheasants and a multitude of other wildlife which enhance the enjoyment of residents. Also compromises 3.6 The green infrastructure would be destroyed thus going directly against para 2.16 The infrastructure and lack of facilities such as a decent play park plus the fact that Milton of leys school is full need to be addressed before any more houses are built. The area incorporates two burns, a large pond and large areas of boggy land. These house wildlife and should be protected. Also with the increase of hard surfaces runoff will increase due to the removal of topsoil which could cause the burns to overflow (these are regularly at maximum capacity as it stands)flooding Redwood Avenue. Policy 3 would be compromised on bullet points 5&6 Milton of leys has a rural quality of life feel due to the extensive woods, heather areas etc and the fact that we have established boundaries. The expansion due to more housing would destroy this.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number 04274 Name Nigel Hanlin Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph no We object to housing on Showfield

Reference no housing-showfield Type Change

Comment Changes

no housing on showfield NAIRN.

Representation

NO HOUSING ON SHOWFIELD

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 04274 Name Nigel Hanlin Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph importance of green recreation space & keeping it

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

that it should not be used for development, but left as a green area for recreation.

Representation

Nairn citizens

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 04037 Name Nigel Jones Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph

Reference Tn2 Type Change

Comment Changes

The proposal for 170 homes is excessive compared to the number of properties in surrounding similarly sized areas. I'm most concerned about the potential loss of playground space for the primary school. We should be encouraging our children to be active and this is best achieved by the provision of outside space The number of homes should be reduced in number and the playground area safeguarded

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to Tain TN2 Land to rear of Craighill Primary School

Customer Number 04428 Name Owen Sweeney Organisation Glenhaven Ventures

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable) Roy Stirrat FRTPi Stirrat Planning Consultancy

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.9 – 4.12

Reference West Inverness, Housing

Type Change

Comment Changes

• Opportunity at Woodside Croft, a redundant grazing site of 3.3 ha, to add a windfall housing group of 15 houses (1 existing and 14 proposed) and a substantial new woodland on the city's urban edge. Woodside Croft sits within the IMFLDP proposed reduced green wedge focussed on Craig Phadrig but which excludes the intervening area of grazing land and sporadic housing south of Leachkin Brae to Craig Dunain previously defined in the Inverness Local Plan. • Woodside Croft is but a small part of this intervening area. Many houses, all accessed by Leachkin Brae, are visible on this city-facing slope and landscape ridge, with many also located over the ridge. • Development of the group, with woodlands and paths over one third of the site, will strengthen the area's landscape role. Proposed houses will be sited below 125m, utilise existing infrastructure, be served by an access road from Leachkin Road South, and will extend public recreational access. • Development of this housing group and woodland will contribute to housing need, city boundary landscape strengthening and environmental diversity.

Representation

The following Representation justifies Woodside Croft being designated as a Housing site within Section 4 West Inverness. The IMFLDP notes that the Highland wide Local Development Plan, Supplementary Guidance and the retained parts of the Inverness Local Plan (ILP) will guide future development; once adopted it will join both in determining planning applications. Representation recognises relevant planning policies and development guidelines. Reasons are submitted, however, to support positive consideration and a justified exception THE INVERNESS LOCAL PLAN (ILP)(adopted 2006) 1. The ILP described the role of 'green wedges' and the priority of the city's setting including protection of its distinctive skyline and bounding ridges; and that the City should sit comfortably within the frame of the Great Glen. It noted that the Council will safeguard, and seek to open to public access, six major "green wedges" of strategic importance to the setting of the City where there will be a presumption against development likely to prejudice the intended purpose and function. 2. The setting of Inverness is regarded as an integral part of the City's structure with major "green wedges" preventing coalescence of the built up area and offering scope to create commons, urban forests and parks. They will provide for recreation and public access, wildlife and landscape enhancement together with amenity "buffers". Development should be held well below the bounding limits of Craig Phadrig and land above 125m should not be intensively developed. 3. The Green Wedge at Leachkin/Craig Phadrig comprises the Craig Phadrig Forestry Commission Scotland woodland and footpaths, designed landscape at Craig Dunain, and croft land at Leachkin Brae; and is earmarked for Great Glen Way, other footpath improvements, landscape management and interpretation of the hill-fort. 4. Although not described or measured, the Green Wedge includes three areas: i. the extensive forested hill of Craig Phadrig rising to 170m ii. Leachkin Brae to Craig Dunain, including Woodside Croft - sporadic housing and grazing land, with the chambered cairn on Craig Dunain at 200m (this area noted in the Representation as the "intervening area" – see below) iii. Craig Dunain complex (80.9ha) - the former hospital, a magnificent 19C Listed Building set in mature "parkland", promoted for hotel, educational, business/office and residential use or appropriate mix. Upgrading of Leachkin Brae and other distributor roads could be supplemented by public transport, cycle and pedestrian links. 5. In and beyond the western part of the wedge area, between the A862 along the Beaully Firth and Leachkin Brae, there are also numerous detached houses in large grounds within open countryside. Many are situated above 125m and all are accessed by the extensive winding cul-de-sac of Leachkin Brae. HIGHLAND WIDE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – HINTERLAND POLICY 6. Policy guidance presumes against new housing in the Highland hinterland countryside outwith existing Settlement Development Areas. Exceptions relate to maintaining rural business, affordable housing, use of 'brownfield' sites and expansion of housing groups. Where exceptions are justified, all proposals should still accord with the general policies of the Plan and the Policy 35 Housing in the Countryside/Siting and Design : Supplementary Guidance: • do not impact detrimentally on existing trees and/or woodland which are important to the character, setting, amenity and/or containment of the housing group or surrounding landscape • do not conflict with adjacent land use • do not impact detrimentally on natural, built and cultural heritage; protected species and scenic quality and are compatible with landscape characteristics • do not impact to the detriment of other services and utilities and are serviceable by the local road network and relevant junctions • are compatible with existing servicing infrastructure, or acceptable arrangements are made • do not impact on the economic viability of service delivery • demonstrate a consideration of siting principles and layout, building design and residential amenity • accord with all applicable policies of the Development Plan. 7. More significant proposals must be promoted through the formal Local Development Plan process providing it does not: • constitute ribbon/linear development along a public road, result in the coalescence of the housing group with a nearby settlement/another housing group or constitute the unplanned extension of a defined settlement • impact detrimentally on existing trees and/or woodland • create an

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments.

Page 767 of

The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

946

inappropriate intrusion into a previously undeveloped field or open land or overwhelm their landscape setting 8. There is a presumption in favour of the redevelopment of previously used land and buildings where former uses have ceased, and the land has been significantly degraded to the point where it can no longer be used productively without significant investment and remediation. 9. The following native tree species, with relative heights after 12 and 25 years, are considered appropriate for landscape planting and would be selected for planting of the three proposed woodland blocks : • Large species, up to 25m (height) Common Alder, Ash, Aspen, Wych Elm, Pedunculate Oak, Sessile Oak, Scots Pine • Medium species, up to 20m (height) Downy Birch, Silver Birch, Bird Cherry, Rowan, Goat Willow THE INNER MORAY FIRTH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IMFLDP) 10. The IMFLDP notes the City of Inverness local plan policy of safeguarding green spaces for people and wildlife and improving their accessibility. It also notes that Inverness’s physical geography determines that there are only a few sensible places to expand the Highland capital; and that higher land and steep slopes to the west and south plus the firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to longer term eastward expansion. 11. Proposals close to the City boundary will be expected to reinforce the distinction between urban and rural, and better define a defensible City edge; and greenspaces will be safeguarded where it contributes or will contribute to public amenity. 12. The Central and West Inverness map presents a green wedge of reduced size than that in the Inverness Local Plan, but notes the continuing need to safeguard the steeper wooded slopes at Dunain and Craig Phadrig for amenity and recreation. The significant difference is deletion of the central part between Craig Phadrig and Craig Dunain. This “intervening area” of sporadic housing and croft grazing land (which includes Woodside Croft) comprises only 10% of the ILP formerly designated wedge area. It is also important to note that Woodside Croft is situated in the northern ‘corner’ of this “intervening area”, being bounded to the north by Criag Phadrig forestry woodland and to the east by Leachkin Hill estate housing on the lower slope. 13. The following points are thus relevant for re-considering the future role of Woodside Croft : • It lies within the HwLDP designated Hinterland, where development proposals will be assessed against Policy 35 (Housing in the Countryside). • However, the area is not included within a HwLDP designated Special Landscape Area, although Policy 61 requires that any development proposal considers the impact on the landscape, irrespective of whether or not it is within, near or outwith a designated landscape. • New homes built on land not allocated in the development plan are ‘windfall’ in terms of housing land requirements, with 244 homes contributing to the area’s housing stock in the period 2000 to 2102. REPRESENTATION FOR CHANGE 14. It is submitted that Woodside Croft is a suitable site for development. See Site Plan as Proposed. Situated in the corner of the “intervening area”, an exception should be made to policy restrictions to allow creation of a cohesive small housing group set within a substantial new screening woodland landscape. In practical terms it is located within the urban fringe and able to be connected to existing public infrastructure; and with easy by foot, cycle and car including public transport on Leachkin Road. 15. Woodside Croft has neighbouring forestry woodland and sporadic housing: North: Forestry woodland, with public paths and access to Craig Phadrig South: sporadic housing and grazing land, accessed by Leachkin Road South East: Leachkin Hill housing development, to croft boundary West: extensive sporadic housing, all accessed by Leachkin Brae 16. Ten old and new houses and a major housing development surround Woodside Croft within the following distances: 100m Woodside Cottage, detached house, Leachkin Brae Tigh na Grain, detached house, Leachkin Road South 51 houses and apartments, just completed, Leachkin Hill 210m 2 detached houses, Leachkin Brae 6 detached houses, Leachkin Road South 17. Woodside Croft sits centrally within the site, which was de-crofted many years ago, and has not been worked agriculturally or maintained since. Much investment would now be needed to bring it back into any productive use. It is essentially redundant land, has not been subject to re-use enquiry by other parties, and has no active use or prospect. It is essentially a ‘brownfield’ site, although not strictly complying with standard definition. 18. Proposed development at Woodside Croft of a housing group within containing woodland does not therefore prejudice the integrity of the “intervening area”. The majority of the area would remain its present landscape character. It does not add further sporadic housing across the hillside, with day and night-time visual impact. The proposed housing group would be seen as cohesive, and landscape contained by both existing Craig Phadrig forestry and three shelter belt screening planting blocks within the site. 19. Public footpaths would be integrated within the major shelter belt woodland block, hopefully also link with the neighbouring housing estate at Leachkin Hill and extend the Craig Phadrig recreational footpath network. 20. The house at Woodside Croft is located centrally within the site and would form the focus of the proposed group of 15 houses. Eight houses with large gardens are proposed on the upper part reflecting the character of neighbouring houses, and six semi-detached affordable houses are located on the lower part close to the Leachkin Hill estate. 21. As access to Woodside Croft presently has sub-standard visibility sightlines to Leachkin Brae, it is proposed for road safety reasons to close this access. Alternative access is proposed from the new housing group access to Leachkin Road South, where a junction compliant with design standards can be created. 22. It is thus submitted that, in policy terms, the proposal has the following attributes : • Strengthens the city’s edge • Protects its distinctive skyline • Reinforces the distinction between urban and rural • Housing is below 125m • Three substantial screening woodland blocks within the site • Extends the area of existing Craig Phadrig woodland • Does not impact detrimentally on existing landscape • The site is essentially ‘brownfield’ • Low density development • Affordable housing is included • Relates to a neighbouring housing estate • The entire site would be landscape managed • Increases public access 23. The Site should therefore be added to identified site, as follows : Site : IN 20 Woodside Croft, Leachkin Road Area(ha): 3.6 Housing Capacity : 15 Requirements: Landscape plan focussed on woodland establishment and management. Access.

Allocated to	West Inverness	General	General	
--------------	----------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number 04342 Name P and D Wortham Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph 4.26-4.31

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

We are seeking to make changes to paras 4.26-4.31 with specific reference to sites BE1 and BE2 as highlighted in our representation below.

Representation

We are objecting to the Plan in relation to the proposals for Beaully as outlined below: Trees and Woodland: The plan recognises the importance of protecting and enhancing the historic, vibrant centre. In contrast there is almost no recognition of the important contribution that trees, and the small pockets of woodland, make to the overall amenity and environment of Beaully. The tree lined roads as well as areas such as the Priory grounds and Cnoc na Rath make a huge contribution to Beaully being such an attractive place. The plan should recognise this and build upon this heritage so that it continues to be an attractive place to live, work and visit. Recreation: The plan also fails to recognise how popular walking is within and around the village. The walks down Ferry Road to the old Ferry, along the Cnoc and up towards the Braes are well used by locals and visitors. The importance and benefits of walking in and around Beaully must be recognised and provision made for walkers. Proposals BE1 / BE2: The amount of housing proposed for BE1 and BE2 is out of proportion to the current size of the village. The population of Beaully Community Council area as shown on the Highland Council website is only 1,429. We recognise the need for a certain amount of further housing in Beaully, but an extra 423 homes seems excessive, especially given the amount of recent housing development in the village. What evidence is there of a demand for over 400 new homes in Beaully? The 423 homes proposed for BE1 and BE2 will have a big impact on services within the village but this impact does not appear to have been considered very carefully. For example, there is no mention of the current parking issues in the Square and the amount of new development proposed is only likely to make matters worse. There is reference in the Plan to a 'link road' but it is not clear what status this has and where it would go. This must be clarified. The proposals for BE1 and BE2 identify the need for a flood risk assessment and a landscape plan. The fields covered by BE1 and BE2 are very wet in the winter and there is a history of flooding in Croyard Drive. Any flood risk assessment must address the impact of flooding from any new development on neighbouring properties such as in Croyard Drive. In the event of the proposals being taken forward the neighbouring properties should be consulted on any flood risk assessment or landscape plan since they would be directly affected by the consequences of development. It is essential that any landscape plan for BE1 and BE2 includes tree planting to ensure that the rural character of Beaully is maintained. The lack of tree planting in some of the recent housing developments is regrettable and, if this is allowed to continue, it is likely to result in Beaully being a much less pleasant place to live, work or visit. It is not clear from the plan how the existing proposals for BE1 interact with the "land covered by the 'minded to grant decision' 08/00430/FULIN"? This should be clarified. Are the current proposals instead of, or in addition to, the earlier proposals?

Allocated to Beaully General General

Customer Number 04308 Name Paddy Maher Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site NA1 Former Showfield East Type Change

Comment Changes

That the Farmers' Showfield in Nairn (Site NA1 Former Showfield East) should not be zoned for development.

Representation

I wish to comment on the possibility of housing development at the Farmers' Showfield in Nairn (Site NA1 Former Showfield East). Such development would deprive Nairn of badly needed green space, which is highly valued by the local community for sport and recreation and as a 'breathing space' for an increasingly developed and populated town. It is also said by people with long family histories in Nairn to run counter to the 1920s covenant under the terms of which the Farmers' Society originally acquired the site. Development at the site would also be inappropriate in that it would exacerbate the traffic problems particularly at the already dangerous junction of Lodgehill Road with Waverly and Westbury Roads which is on the walking route for many pupils attending Nairn Academy and Rosebank Primary School. The possibility of a potential excambion of land ownership for land at Sandown for a new showfield should be seriously considered.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 04293 Name Pamela Macintyre Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59

Reference FR2 Ness Gap Type Change

Comment Changes

No retail units, supermarket or tourism on proposed primary school site

Representation

Leave the site for primary school use in future or for agriculture or allotments in short term. Road access inappropriate for retail development.

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie FR2 Ness Gap

Customer Number 03942 Name pamela miller Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

to leave land south of the high street i.e the football pitch and play area alone and not have it for housing and development.

Representation

This is the only free piece of green area that anybody from the community can use as a member of the local ladies football team we use this area and also the local kids football club use this it is a well used area and why would you sell it off for housing and redevelopment also the kids use the play area i hope you will reconsider this diabolical decision

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 01012 Name Pat Wells Organisation Strathearn Against Windfarm Developments

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph 2.6

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Inclusion of land at Moy in Drynachen, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area.

Representation

INNER MORAY FIRTH LDP: SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS - Drynachen, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. This representation is written on behalf of Strathearn Against Windfarm Developments (SAWD) and relates to the above-noted SLA. We welcome the inclusion of the Streens area but are very disappointed that the suggested exclusion zones (detailed in the first draft Spring 2012) have remained, despite a request that they should not be excluded. Please see our earlier response (July 2012) attached. We believe there are strong reasons for not excluding the areas and request that this issue is re-visited before production of the final plan. The area close to Glenkirk (which has not been included in the SLA) was removed at the request of Eurus Energy because it interfered with its plans to construct a large wind farm in the area. The development was refused following a Public Inquiry and the area should be re-instated as part of the SLA. Incidentally, even the large-scale map on the website is very unclear and makes it difficult to determine boundaries.

Allocated to Special Landscape Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

The area AL13 should be preserved in its current state.

Representation

The area AL13 should be preserved in its current state. It is currently bordered by signed footpath network. This network is currently used by walking groups and families alike. Their area for recreation should be protected. The area is used by wildlife such as roe deer, owls, buntings and, recently, polecats. Work in this area could damage the protected trees of Teaninich. The current planning permission for this site is for a hotel. The necessity for another hotel in this town must be queried as the owner of Teaninich Castle has raised concerns re the detrimental effect this will have on his business. Any industry here would encourage vehicles to use the private access road to the nursing home which is used by vulnerable persons, sometimes in wheelchairs. Finally the approach to Alness would be visibly impacted. Currently the green field and view of Teaninich Castle would encourage visitors. This part of the plan would have a negative impact on this.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Deletion of site CB3

Representation

Conon Bridge, a rural community, only has a very small area in which to support sporting activities....and this now under treat of "take-over" to provide more housing. In this age of encouraging young people (and not so young) to take more exercise, this development proposal seems to defy the odds. The loss of our village hall, now a private residence, I believe, is another sad instance. The town of Strathaven (So. Lanarkshire) where I used to live, boasted two public parks (Geo. Allan/John Hastie) which were a great joy to the town in full use: I do appreciate it is not possible to compare a town of at least 10,000 to Easter Ross Village (whose population is ever increasing)

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I write with reference to the above plan but relate in main to the grass area in front of Burgage Court, Tain. I have lived in Burgage Court for over 30 years and bought my house some 12 years ago. The grass area in front of my house has been of great benefit to the area for many years as there is no other sizeable safe play area in the site. My own family have enjoyed using this area over many years as have many other families and in recent years it has become an even more integral part of this neighbourhood. Families use it for picnics, playing with their children and children playing safely themselves as the houses facing the area (Burgage Court, Burgage Drive, Seaforth Road) can keep an eye on what is happening which is an asset for children's safety in this day and age. Furthermore I did not buy my house to have its value destroyed by having houses nose to tail at the front of my house and having my privacy shattered with houses backing into my livingroom window and also the peace in the area destroyed. There are 7 Trees situated in front of houses 10-16 Burgage Court, Tain which are classed as listed trees and are therefore protected so are unable to be removed. This fact does not seem to have been taken into account in your present plan. I am registering my views and hope they will be taken seriously and the fact the trees are protected will be reflected in future plans.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I would also like to say there is I feel more need for businesses to be encouraged to come to Tain to fill the already empty shops/units. Without employment what future has Tain - plenty of houses with even many more people unemployed and nothing else. There are already more than enough unemployment without more. In the last 50 years Tain has gone from being a busy thriving town full of shops and businesses to having not a lot to offer. I believe more time and effort should be put to bringing more to the heart / centre of Tain rather than building more houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04453 Name Patricia Toshney Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph 4.76

Reference TN5 Type Change

Comment Changes

Area within TN5 in front of Burgage Court earmarked for more housing – change should be made to account for the 7 protected trees in front of houses 10 – 16 Burgage Court grass area. No allowance has been made for this in the plan. Being protected the trees cannot be removed.

Representation

There are so little grass areas within housing sites these days and trees are part of the beauty of this area. Building more houses on one of the last grass parks within easy reach of the many houses within this site would destroy my living area and privacy and would take away a play area for the children around here. The Links is certainly outwith most children’s reach unless accompanied by an adult. It would be more condusive to landscape and put some play equipment on the area.

Allocated to Tain TN5 Knockbreck Road

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

[redacted] OBJECTION LETTER NUMBER THREE 10 December 2013 Dear Sirs I addressed fluvial flooding at the south west/rising groundwater in my "objection number one". I now wish to draw attention to additional flooding problems where Tower Brae Burn runs adjacent to the North Eastern boundary of the Resaurie North site. **TIMELINE** When the Resaurie North site was allocated in 1994, another site a very short distance away was also allocated for new development and what is now Cranmore Drive was built there. Tower Brae burn has twice flooded homes there, in 2002 and again in 2006. Therefore, given the close proximity of Tower Brae burn to the Resaurie North site, and rainfall in Inverness tends to be localised, the presence of this burn introduces an additional issue where flooding risk is not limited to the southwest or from rising groundwater. It should also be noted that this burn is not mapped by SEPA, pointing up the limitations of the SEPA indicative flood mapping in development planning, and thereby their restricted input. Tower Brae burn is a typical moorland burn, steep in gradient with a fast response time. As the land flattens out, such a burn will typically dump its sediment/boulders as it slows down and spills out as the land flattens. That should have been fairly obvious in 1994 when these sites were allocated for development, but it was omitted entirely. The land is quite clearly flattening out at this point. I attach "Screen capture TBB" and also "Screen capture site". These are low resolution screen captures from a 2011 video clip. I cannot upload the video to the IMFLDP as the upload limit is 10MB, and the video is 19.7MB, but I can supply a copy of the video clip on a cd if required. The position is when the Tower Brae burn blocks up with sediment and boulders (as it has done for many years) it floods into the Resaurie North site. The depth of flooding on the Resaurie North site I estimated at the time of filming to be over a foot which is in broad agreement with the video clip which shows the water level above the base of the Heras fencing. I also have a video of groundwater under pressure bubbling at the land surface. What is clear from all this is that during times of flooding, groundwater and Tower Burn seek relief on the North site/there is a clear fluvial relationship at this boundary. Whereas under "no restriction" about a dozen houses, hard standing and car parks would replace this open land, therefore groundwater could not seek relief, and any water presently taking relief over the land surface will be impeded by development, said water will be repelled, thereby 'reloading' the burn/adding directly to the flood risk in the wider catchment toward Cranmore Drive. Further, this demonstrates the philosophy adopted around 2007 is flawed:- The inclination of the Tower Brae burn during times of flooding is to flood out to the North site. Whereas, The philosophy of the North site development will direct surface water generated by the development toward that burn. Therefore the two are acting in opposition, further amplifying the risk. Unfortunately under the "no restriction" approach, such matters are simply not important I agree land should be allocated to meet development requirements, but only land with the least environmental or amenity value. In the instant case, one of the worst possible sites to allocate for development is Resaurie North. People and the water environment will be at increased risk with more and more building, right on top of areas that already have acknowledged flooding problems. In terms of the local plan process, these are significant matters arising but not considered and the principle for development in this area cannot be relied upon to support an allocation for housing, and the reliance upon consent 09/00231/FULIN in the IMFLDP is in the wrong context. I adhere to my previous comments. Paul Bova

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Challenge presumption for use allocation of IN75 please see my representations, the site is not suitable for the use suggested.

Representation

[redacted] OBJECTION LETTER NUMBER TWO 6 December 2013 Dear Sirs I adhere to my previous comments in "OBJECTION LETTER ONE" and in this letter I challenge further the "rolling over" of above site in the local plan. BACKGROUND The Local plan 1994 explains the 4.8 hectare site 6.1.3(c) site was not free of major constraints. Paragraph 6.1.3 advises to develop the site constraints need to be resolved. Access is a problem. "Local Access Roads" at 6.4.4 prescribes in order to develop the site, Resaurie Road (Caulfield Road North) must be widened, along with the provision of footpaths. This work was to be conducted by the Council at a cost of £194,000 in 1996-98. Therefore, given matters were to be addressed by the Highland Council (whereas development of other sites in the area required cost of any road improvements to be met by developers) this highlights the Council had a keen interest in development of this particular site. 2001 A significant change arises where under the Local plan consultative draft, the larger 4.8 hectare site was subdivided in two, Resaurie North and South sites. In order to develop the North site, the Resaurie Road must be upgraded, or alternatively access could be taken from the South site. This is therefore the first time the site, as it is now (IN75) appears in the local plan allocated for development. 2004 The North site did not have any planning permission. However, there was permission for 32 Houses on the South site. Despite that, Barratt built 68 houses on the South site, which they labelled their "phase 1" scheme. 2006 There is not any suggested number of properties for the North site. 2007 Highland Council report PLi 124/08 speaks to a Barratt Planning Application 07/00542/FULIN submitted June 2007 in respect of North site, where permission for 107 houses was sought. At 4.1 "Area Roads wish to see the fenceline on Caulfield Road North set back by a minimum of 2.5 metres to allow for future improved provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Caulfield Road North is part of the National Cycleway Network the Local Plan identifies it as a cycle route. On Caulfield Road North Area Roads suggest the formation of 2 passing places with one located at the emergency exit and the other further south opposite Ashville (this passing place would be funded by the Council)." MY COMMENT The wish for Road fence line set back to allow footpath/improvements demonstrates under sub division of the site, there is continuing requirement to upgrade the Resaurie Road - even when alternative access is offered from Phase 1. The suggestion of passing places demonstrates even with a 2.5m setback to provide additional land, there will be insufficient space on the road for vehicles; if passing places are proposed, vehicles will be stopping and reversing (against the flow of traffic) giving rise to increased safety risk on the road. Further, will housing constrain the National cycle route? These represent matters arising material to the local plan status of the site. Your presumption for housing means road safety issues and loss of amenity are imposed on the local residents and the wider public. At 7.3 "The Local Plan identifies the site for residential purposes in terms of Policy 97 (V) with no restriction on the number of residential units to be developed on the site." MY COMMENT How can you justify "no restriction" when the original larger site suggested 72 Houses, and the South site already produced 68 Houses? "No restriction" meant high density (picked out from a generic table guide) is considered acceptable and driving the approach, where development is spread out as far as possible - compounding existing local issues. Further, I doubt this report was the first time the approach for "no restriction" and high density was considered, given the report carries a recommendation for approval. Prior support must surely have been provided to drive the feasibility of the North site. "No restriction" facilitates development of a site with numerous constraints. Moreover, in this context, "No restriction" is effectively a development planning decision:- If say 10/20 houses had been considered acceptable then it is not realistically buildable, overdevelopment is required because significant number of properties would be required to overcome the various constraints. Perhaps unwittingly, the land was 'unlocked' contributing to resolve the ownership problem which, at that time was after all, a noted constraint in the local plan Housing Land Audit. At 7.8 "The access onto Caulfield Road North is for emergency purposes only and is not to be used for other traffic, which will take access off the existing road in Phase 1. Construction traffic would have to use the existing access off Murray Road and not the existing access to the site from Caulfield Road North." MY COMMENT It should be obvious the North site and Phase 1 are separate entities, there is no common access connecting the two. Further, there is a comprehensive land drop between the two sites. Therefore, there is not any "access off the existing road in Phase 1" - there is no relationship between that road in phase 1, and the North site. Nor is there an "existing access off Murray Road" - the road leading off Murray Road into Phase 1 - terminates in phase 1. "Access" linking the sites would have to be established via an act of construction. However, as the agreement is construction traffic must enter the site from Murray Road (which is not possible) there is therefore no access into the North site, other than from Resaurie Road. Development of the North site continuing on this basis would not be possible because the local plan (explicitly) makes development dependant on the matter of access being resolved. Whereas, the only way to resolve this according to the local plan, is

to upgrade Resaurie Road to deliver development, which is a matter material to the local plan status of the site. 7.8 continues “The housing layout does not provide for any houses to have access direct to the road, but this can be covered by condition.” MY COMMENT Requirement for such condition further examples the issue of road safety is attributed to the increased use of the Resaurie Road arising from the development. At 7.10 “The exit onto Caulfield Road North is necessary but restricted to emergency purposes.” MY COMMENT Again, even under sub-division where access can now be taken from Phase 1, access from Resaurie Road is still a necessity in any development to make up for shortcomings of that sub division. Indeed, the site does not represent land capable of being developed from phase 1 without safety issues arising. Condition 16 states No development shall take place unless details of the emergency barrier/bollards onto Caulfield Road North are submitted... It shall be designed to allow for access by emergency vehicles only and not by normal vehicular traffic which shall take access from Murray Road at all times. Reason: In the interests of road traffic and pedestrian safety and in recognition of the need to allow emergency access for fire engines and other emergency vehicles. MY COMMENT While “normal” four wheeled vehicles perhaps might not be able to use that emergency access, bicycles, motorbikes mopeds and pedestrians can access the site to and from Resaurie Road compounding the road use. This is compounded if we consider since 1994 there has been additional development in Cradlehall, Resaurie. There are approximately 200 car movements per day and a significant increase in cycling, pedestrians (both commuters and recreational) horses and care in the community all using the road (without factoring any increase generated by development of the North site). HOUSING AUDIT 2007 The “Housing Land Audit 2007 Local Plan Sites” used to identify housing needs over the Local plan period at page 8 explains the North site now carries the notable new aspiration for 107 units on site by 2012. MY COMMENT The development planning promotion of the North site is clearly driven by the philosophy of that application 07/00542/FULIN intention to develop the site. IN SUM Under “my comments” above I explained the local plan approach is contrary to the principle of development. In addition, there are significant changes in circumstances arising material to the local plan status of the site where the sub division of the site failed, there is no access from phase 1 and to compound that, there is a continuing requirement to improve Resaurie Road, pointing up the shortcomings of the local plan alternative access solution.. If the site was “rolled” forward on this basis, a presumption for housing is at best a detriment to the area where existing local issues are made worse by “no restriction” on development. I have therefore highlighted the problems arising. However it is necessary to list the events which followed as these are also in context, relevant to the decisions above in the local plan:- 2008 ONWARDS 07/00542/FULIN was refused in December 2008. Barratt submitted application 09/00231/FULIN approximately three months later. Planning report relating to that application explained the matter of access to the North site was addressed during the phase 1 development (2004). Once consent was granted in 2010, Barratt wrote 23 June 2010 stating access to the site was required from Resaurie Road until the new access from phase 1 was completed. Indeed, in subsequent emails Barratt repeated the only way into the site was from the Resaurie Road. They explain (for example on 1 September 2010) they looked at other options, but that was the only way in. Planning officials in response confirmed they were aware of and sympathetic to, this problem. Barratt did take access from Resaurie Road for 18 months – but did not upgrade the road. Actually, during this time they frequently blocked the Road loading/unloading plant impeding people getting in and out of Resaurie. Residents complained to Highland Council. In reply the Council advised they had no ambit to intervene. VERBAL AGREEMENT In subsequent letters to me and my MSP, the Chief Executive of Highland Council disclosed something else was actually happening:- A “verbal” agreement was in place with Barratt to cover this access from Resaurie Road until such time as the new access from Phase 1 was constructed. The Chief Executive describes this verbal agreement as “regrettable”. While he does not reveal when that agreement was made, we know access was addressed in 2004. In 2010 all parties confirmed this had already been looked at. There was no access, apart from Resaurie Road. MY COMMENT This deliberate act (even retrospectively) condoning access from Resaurie Road defeats the land allocation. It is a misrepresentation of the site status, given the Resaurie Road is the only way in to deliver development, and must be upgraded in that regard. This is material to the principle of development. It is reasonable to presume this “agreement” is relevant from 2004, suggesting further matters material to the Local plan status have not been considered. IN CONCLUSION Sub-division of the larger site appears to have been notified via “leaflet summarising nature and purpose of local plan being displayed at public places” sub-division actually executed during the time period between the consultative draft 2001/adoption of the plan 2006. In any case, that, along with all the issues detailed under “my comment”, represent significant changes in circumstances, calling into question the continued “rolled over” site allocation in the local plan. The principle of development cited from 1994 allegedly providing the basis for the continued allocation of the site IN75 for housing can no longer be relied upon. I am affected directly by all issues raised under “my comment”. All this is contrary to the convention that Local plans need to take local circumstances into account. Whereas in the instant case some issues are circumvented, while others are compounded through “no restriction”. Setting aside if they should or not - the ends do not justify the means. Paul Bova

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I challenge your presumption for use allocation regarding IN75 according to the matters raised in my representations.

Representation

[redacted] OBJECTION LETTER NUMBER ONE 6 December 2013 Dear Sirs INTRODUCTORY COMMENT You served the above notification on me inviting comments on the "Highland Council proposal for development of the above for the following use; 64 Homes... We have previously asked for peoples' views on the possibility for allocating the land for development." While you may previously have asked for views, that was through the placement of notices in selected public places, not serving notice alerting those adjoining the land, explaining the proposals. You also directed me to the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, which states that for site IN75; "Development is to be in accordance with 09/00231/FULIN" - which is a detailed permission for 64 houses. Therefore, there was a conflict:- Your Local Plan notification seeks comment on the proposal to allocate land use for housing, but the IMFLDP is constraining development so it must adhere to the merits of a planning permission for housing use. I had to trace your process; The PED meeting 18 January 2012 approved the Main Issues Report "Appendix 1 (1) draft". The site IN75 is included in that proposal, but NOT specifically allocated for same use as in the previous plan. It is stated in that report the site is a natural infill site and close to facilities, and these are the stated significant "pros". The loss of Woodland and local access are stated "cons". Therefore, the PED arrived at a well settled view in January 2012 without any apparent reliance or influence from planning consent referred to in the IMFLDP. From all this your instruction that development must be in accordance with consent 09/00231/FULIN, conflicts with both the terms of your notification and your PED Committee approval timeline, where consultation was clearly intended without reliance on a planning permission. The reference to "local access" problems is noteworthy in that regard. COMMENTS The site was allocated as part of a larger site of 4.8 Hectares in 1994. The problems at that time were local access issues. That larger site was subdivided into two sites, Resaurie North and Resaurie South beginning around 2001. DISCUSSION RESAURIE SOUTH The Tulloch Homes drainage strategy for the South site (dated 2002) observed surface water run -off and appropriate drainage is required to develop the site. Test pits were dug which recorded minor seepage of shallow groundwater. Therefore, the South site is affected primarily by surface water - in broad agreement with its slope characteristics. Around 2002 planning permission was in place on the South site for 32 Houses. DISCUSSION RESAURIE NORTH In 2005, the site was "constrained". In 2006 the Local plan at Policy 97(v) did not provide a suggested number of houses for the site. However, by 2007, the site had changed to "effective" coinciding with a 'new' desire for development of the site/delivery of 107 houses by 2012 materialised at this same time:- This was embodied on page 8 of the "Highland Council Local Plan Housing Land Audit Local Plan Sites (used to identify housing needs over the Local plan period). This in agreement with application 07/00542/FULIN submitted for 107 houses, also submitted at this time. It appears from this the local plan process is being driven by this application and any development philosophy attached. Bore holes were inserted at fairly equal separation across the site to a depth of 7.0 metres. Subsequently these filled up from that depth in winter of 2007, generally speaking achieving the level of the natural ground surface. It is noteworthy that the subsequent planning report speaking to that application advises at "Policy" 7.3 "The Local Plan identifies the site for residential purposes in terms of Policy 97 (V) with no restriction on the number of residential units to be developed on the site." I will discuss that statement in detail later. While it is not mentioned in that report, an amphibian survey noted evidence of a large water body immediately adjacent to Resaurie Road, at the Northwest boundary, a watercourse/culvert pipe was however noted discharging into the southwest boundary of the site leading from beneath the railway. Under explanation, that is water flowing from the direction of Cradlehall - where the SEPA flood map indicates an area of fluvial flood risk. Prior to the creation of that SEPA flood map, a plentiful supply of water is recorded in the area:- On the historical Ordnance Survey maps the Resaurie area has numerous water markers, drainage ditches, artesian wells and issues to the rear of our property. There is also a watercourse in the same location as the culvert that discharges into the southwest of the site. On the 25 inch to a mile OS map from 1868 there are two permanent ponds at Cradlehall. While the depth is not stated, the surface area of one pond scales off at approximately 75 square metres. The other sluice pond at 1100 square metres. There is a further sizeable pond southwest at Castlehill, which scales off at approximately 600 square meters, as well as numerous springs and issues. Given the numerous different types of water features present such as watercourses, ponds, springs and issues a complex hydrology exists in the area; there is groundwater under pressure (springs and issues) and fluvial waters. It is particularly noteworthy Roy's Military Map of Scotland of 1747, referred to as the "great map" (recording Scotland prior to the significant road building and development that ensued shortly thereafter) details a river tributary branch flowing into Castlehill. According to the scale, that branch would extend into Cradlehall/Resaurie/Ashton. DRAWING THIS TOGETHER The North Site, on flatter land would appear to exhibit different features than

the South site where the North site has rising groundwater levels from depth and water flowing toward the site from the direction of an area of fluvial flood risk. The aquifer/fluvial based flood water and natural drainage inclination for the area appears to flow through Castlehill, Cradlehall, Resaurie, Ashton Farm towards the Firth. Therefore, building on that North site could well affect the wider catchment. FURTHERMORE A river tributary contributing to flooding through the area represents a considerable flood risk which, at any point in time, could become even more active than it is now and overwhelm the area. This has already caused concern in 2002 when following heavy rainfall (notably to the southwest of our property) our neighbours garden, pavement outside their property and the driveway of our property all burst open under force of water. It is noteworthy that the historical areas of ponding at Cradlehall are on the approximate land height as our street. FROM THIS PROBLEM'S ARISE WITH THE "ROLLING OVER" OF IN75. (i) Flooding is a problem on the Resaurie North site IN75. However that was not previously considered or noted as a constraint in 1994, therefore it is a significant matter arising. Further, the philosophy introduced in the planning report PLi 124/08 for "no restriction" on the amount of development is also a new matter introduced into that process, the local plan did not suggest a number of dwellings. Further in that report, reference was made to a generic guide as to what constituted "high density". Taking that guidance, density proposed was in line with the maximum in the guide, and therefore deemed acceptable. Therefore under "no restriction" the land (where there is considerable volume of water movement and storage) will have buildings and extensive hard surfaces covering and inserted into it. The land must accept whatever density is desired. There is a notable disconnect between the Local plan aspirations/development of the site, and the local conditions, where the latter are apparently not really important of there is "no restriction" and high density are the desire. This means that no matter what part the land (or any part of the land) plays in the wider catchment, the presumption must be for high density housing. The approach adopted can, at best, be concerned solely with the acceptance of any risk arising on the site. Whereas, SPP7 required that "Planning authorities must take the probability of flooding and the risks involved into account during the preparation of development plans and in determining planning applications...." Actually the local plan position was being influenced by the philosophy in 2007, where the targets were set for the amount of housing that was allegedly needed, and that the site would produce. That is however not considering any risk in the wider catchment, arising from that presumption for "no restriction" as required by policy under development planning. (ii) There is a further failure:- By 2007 water flow noted from the culvert appearing on one corner of the site would be 'managed' to make way for development. Whereas SPP7 at that time required more than that; the probability of flooding from all sources and risks involved from the placement of the development in the wider catchment (where the risks are present and there is considerable water movement) was omitted. (iii) A further shift in Planning Policy took place when SPP (adopted in January 2010) advocated the new requirement for the restoration of natural flood risk management, avoidance of developer based flood management and avoidance of development in areas prone to flood. Flood waters are dissipating on the North site, and also, filling up below ground. Under the "no restriction" extensive concrete foundations, roads, pavements and car parks are built on that green space, comprehensively reducing volume of green space - for example, intention to build over former water body in the amphibian survey. Highland Council will probably say something like "no problem", because there may still be green spaces following development. However, SPP was changed imposing a requirement where natural flood management be restored - whereas the approach adopted is a reduction of that natural capacity where green space and bog land is replaced with concrete. Even the out of date SPP7 acknowledged the cumulative effects of development, especially the loss of flood storage capacity, should be factored in. Under the approach adopted, development on land prone to flooding cannot be avoided. Your Local plan presumption for allocation of the land for housing use is therefore contrary to SPP and your own policy of flood avoidance. (iv) The IMFLDP SEA in respect of IN75 notes the site adjoins an area where flood risk is an issue and requires a flood risk assessment/DIA. However:- Any such requirement carries a presumption for the land use suggested (housing). Under the requirement imposed, the developer need only consider the risks relevant to any development so proposed, which does not consider the suitability of the land use in the development planning process. In the circumstances as you are proposing, the development planning decision is moved out of the hands of the authority. The question being asked is - how can we build on this land? Whereas the right question is SHOULD that land be built on? (v) Historically people settled in areas where aquifer production is high because there was a plentiful supply of water, either from watercourses/artesian wells. (That should be patently obvious from the late Neolithic and early Bronze Age settlements noted on Ashton Farm and by the features in the area). However in general terms, populations have converged/expanded around original settlements, whereas the need generally speaking no longer arises to obtain water in that historical manner. However continuing to specifically target development/growth into such areas has loaded the natural environment to the point where now this is a serious problem – as exemplified by the flooding problems here in East Inverness. CONCLUSION Reliance on a 20 years old principle of development is in error because the sub division, matters which came to light, changes in Scottish Planning Policy and the consideration of wider environmental issues represent significant changes in circumstances. The development plan/Local plan land use approach from 2001 is misdirected, explained above (i) – (v) and you are obviously exposing my property to increased risk. Paul Bova

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number 04490 Name Paul Gallagher Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN24 (Northern Section) Type Change

Comment Changes

More detail on uses and layout. A greater proportion of retained/new greenspace.

Representation

My area of interest is the north section of IN24 Kinmylies to Kilvean. I would like to comment on the proposed plan in relation to this but lack sufficient detail with which to do so fully. The only maps that i have managed to find only show the area boundary, not the precise plan relating to this. Unless it is made clear where exactly various developments are to be located then any response from me can only be very general and i will lack any assurances that the planning is sound. (Fore example, i have considerable concern about the implications to existing green space, and in particular further provision of public green space.)

Allocated to West Inverness IN24 Torvean & Ness-side (Northern part)

Customer Number 04490 Name Paul Gallagher Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Introduction Paragraph

Reference West Inverness Type Change

Comment Changes

Better consultation methods on detailed matters

Representation

The planning process appears to have been turned on its head in that the finer details were adopted by Highland Council (with minimal consultation as i received nothing through the post to indicate that this was being consulted upon) before presenting the more general document (this time announced by post to each individual household) which offers no opportunity to influence much more than the general wording and structure. Surely the most important part of the consultation must have been when details of individual areas were being considered, and surely that should have been the point at which each individual household was consulted

Allocated to General Comments

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Objection

Representation

In ref to NK1 I have no wish for you to turn site opposite my house into an industrial site. It will be looking straight into my bedroom and sitting room and I can't understand how you propose to build petrol station on top of high pressure gas main.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Having just recive your letter about IN26 Im unsure what to proposed plan is at the back of my house. Building houses? If it going to a homeless training program my shed was broken into 3 time last time and lots of people hanging around that aera late at Night. Is there a plan in place so this doesnt happen again? Regards Paul

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I strongly object to the development of the railway line and would like this proposal to be stopped.

Representation

Whilst I personally like steam trains, I do not believe that this scheme is a viable one. My main concerns are as follow: 1. We have our heating oil delivered via the old railway line (between our house and the offices below us), and would still need access for this purpose. We have been granted a letter from the Council for right of access across this land. Should this scheme be granted and achieve its ultimate goal of extending into the station, this access would be cut off. 2. Noise levels from steam engines - Having experienced steam trains in the past, I know that they are extremely noisy and we do not wish to have our peaceful area shattered by the noise of steam engines, whistles and general industrial noises of delivering coal and building up a head of steam in the engine early in the morning. 3. My two sons and I all suffer from asthma and I am greatly concerned about the amount of sulphurous coal smoke and soot from the engine, as this does cause breathing difficulties (I can provide certification of our conditions from our GP). Not to mention soot deposits landing around the property and on washing hung out to dry. 4. A blight on the landscape - This is a conservation village and I do not believe that fulfilling a small number of people's dream of having a big toy train set with all of its accompanying industrial paraphernalia will add anything to the village. 5. A waste of money - I do not believe that this will be a viable proposal. If it gets planning permission and is actually built, it will not attract enough tourism to survive and we will end up with a lot of rusting scrap metal on our door steps as a lasting legacy. 6. Foot and Cycle Path: The old railway track, I believe was proposed as being developed as a cycle track linking Strathpeffer to Dingwall. This surely would be a much better prospect, promoting clean environmental and safe transport for school children and commuters alike. The road between Strathpeffer and Dingwall is a terribly dangerous road to cycle and a cycle path along the old railway line is the best solution. It would benefit many more people than the rail proposal.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Lower housing density

Representation

50 new homes on Courthill Road will bring at least 50 new cars to the area. Courthill Road is a deeply unpleasant road, and the lower exit on to Bridge street is dangerous due to the restricted visibility. I am also worried about the impact on the community as a whole. Rosemarkie is a very small community, and I feel that 50 new homes will have a large impact on the village, and combined with the proposed levels of new homes being built in Fortrose, the impact on local services could be disastrous.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03807 Name Paula Sime Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference FR2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reduction in housing density/assurance that room for school expansion remains

Representation

FR1 and FR2 will bring 130 new families to our community. This will have a huge impact on local transport and services, however my biggest concern at present is school provision. The plan mentions the primary school site and the review that is currently being undertaken, but it doesn't seem to take the secondary school into consideration. The current S1 intake at Fortrose Academy is closed as the school is full. What is going to happen once all these new homes are built and even more children move into the area? Where is there room for the high school to expand? Are our children going to be bused to Dingwall or Alness because new homes are more important than local services?

Allocated to Fortrose and Rosemarkie General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

This is not a change to the proposed Plan, but an objection. We believe that the impact with respect to the potential for flooding of our property has not been adequately addressed or communicated in a satisfactory manner. We would therefore welcome a site meeting with a member of your team to discuss your Hydrology Survey Findings / Report and understand how you propose to disperse run-off water to the North East of the proposed development area, in a satisfactory manner. We would be interested to understand what your overall Drainage Philosophy is and how you intend to deal with the substantial increase in surface water generated by your development.

Representation

We believe that the impact with respect to the potential for flooding of our property has not been adequately addressed or communicated in a satisfactory manner. We would therefore welcome a site meeting with a member of your team to discuss your Hydrology Survey Findings / Report and understand how you propose to disperse run-off water to the North East of the proposed development area, in a satisfactory manner. We would be interested to understand what your overall Drainage Philosophy is and how you intend to deal with the substantial increase in surface water generated by your development. The basis of our opposition to the proposed development is that we strongly believe that no consideration has been given to the dispersal of run-off water from the high ground to the South West of our property, 10 Provost Ferguson Dr. We have invested a considerable amount of money to ensure adequate drainage to our property and are concerned that housing adjacent to our property will overload this and cause flooding. Having reviewed your plan our property lies at the foot of Craighill with no natural drainage other than through our property and those adjacent properties on Moss Road. Currently no natural drainage exists to the area which lies to the North of the proposed development, moreover with this being at the base of Craighill and the boundaries to the North East and North West having already been fully developed with no available space to install drainage, our concern is that there is no where for water to run other than through the existing properties. The attached <<10 Provost Ferguson Driv1.doc>> is the copy of the latest of a number of letters submitted to you and from which we have still had no response. We would urge you to reconsider your proposal and wish to take this opportunity to formally advise you that we will be lodging this representation with our insurance company. Should your proposed development proceed and in the event that our property suffers flooding or water damage, which can be attributed to your proposed development, we will be seeking compensation for damages caused.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

We chose to live in Croy for the country aspect and a village environment. The prospect of a large development over the next 20 years directly in front of our property along with the other properties lining the B9006 is quite bewildering (a building site for 20 years).

We have no real problem for 30-40 (not 150) houses built adjacent to the previous development. As long as there is a demand for housing with all the other developments in planning, that should cater for the influx of new residents.

Such fertile agricultural land should be kept in tact, it will be needed in years to come.

No turing back once built on. There must be other land that is desirable to build on, not rich agricultural land.

I can not see where all the employment is going to accommodate new residents on this scale. The area is quite unique to Scotland. Please don't spoil it.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Prevent any change of use or variation of existing planning consent on IN15 site

Representation

Chap Has been developing the IN15 site for the past 5 years this is despite it being a relatively small area which could have been completed during this timescale, it remains unfinished and largely abandoned. Over the past 5 years normal site working hours, site deliveries and conditions set out as part of the planning consent have largely been ignored, site noise, dusts and site drainage issues have gone unresolved and no reinstatement activities, tree planting or provision of the new playpark equipment has been fulfilled. It is unreasonable to expect neighbours and residents to live on a building site for an indeterminate period. Please do not allow this or any other developer to make any changes to this site before first resubmitting a complete planning application

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I was under the impression that, due to a main gas line near my house area, that no further expansion would be possible for NK1 or NK2 near the A9 carriageway. Moreover, I am unsure what impact more residential areas will have on the local facilities such as the school and Surgery. Finally, regarding the proposed Golf Course, as long as it's not being built by Donald Trump and I don't get any broken windows, I have no objections there. I also have few objections to business development.

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04241 Name Peter Greig Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Area CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

The remaoval of the proposal for area CB3 from the Inner Firm Developement Plan.

Representation

I would like to register my objection to the proposal to build houses in area CB3. My objection is to the proposed removal of the local playing fields which is used by the local community. I understand that this piece of land was gifted to the village and it remains in the hands of the village and cannot understand why there would be a need for this area to be developed when there a far more suitable areas shown in the plans that has less of an impact on the local community and centre point of the village

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 04303 Name PETER MACPHERSON Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 17-19

Reference IN49 Type Change

Comment Changes

DO NOT BUILD ON THIS AREA OF LAND

Representation

Detrimental impact upon residential amenities. We believe that the posed development will harm the character and appearance of our area the amenities enjoyed by local residents. In particular, the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe environment. The proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community love and enjoy and use regularly ski-ing. Our school utilises this are a as well, The area should be protected for current and future for a range of outdoor activities ranging from walking, cycling, jogging and cross country generations. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Whilst it is considered to represent only a minor issue, concern is expressed as to the use of the term "safeguard" within the narrative, which forms part of the text, which relates to the allocation of Site TN8. The term safeguarding is most often taken to indicate that the land in question is being protected from inappropriate alternative uses, thus ensuring that at some point in the future, it will be available for its preferred use. This carries with it an implied suggestion that the land in question is not, or may not be, required for development at this time, hence the need to safeguard it so that it is available in the future. In light of my clients projected short term business requirements, it is likely that this land will be required for development much earlier than had been previously expected or anticipated. As a consequence of this, it is submitted that the Plan should make clear that Site TN8, the extent of which should be extended in line with the terms of Representation 1 above, is available for immediate development, should it be required by my client.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04429 Name Peter Nelson Organisation The Glenmorangie Company

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Andrew Bennie Bidwells

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Paragraphs 4.76 – 4.83.

Reference Site Reference TN8. Type Change

Comment Changes

“ To extend to area of land covered by this land use allocation in order to ensure that the short to medium terms development requirements relating to the continued expansion of the Glenmorangie Distillery are not inhibited in any way.”

Representation

The importance of my clients business is recognised within paragraph 4.80 of the Plan, where it acknowledged that this business is both a significant employer and a large tourist attraction. The requirement on the part of my client to extend the area covered by land allocation reference TN8, arises directly as a consequence of a recent review of their short terms expansion plans. As a result of this review, a number of planned developments, such as the provision of the additional warehousing and the improved access arrangements to the site, have been brought forward from their programmed implementation date as originally envisaged. The acceleration of these projects is in direct response to the continuing strong performance of the Scottish whisky industry within the global market place. The importance of the food and drink industry to the Plans Vision for the Ross-Shire Growth Area is set out at paragraph 3.10 of the Plan, where it is stated that by 2031, the economy of the are will have further diversified, with there being a renewed focus on food and drink manufacturing. In order to facilitate the continued development of my clients operations at Tain during the period to 2031, and hence to enable them to contribute towards the realisation of the overall Vision for this part of the plan area, it is vital that a sufficient supply of land, which can be brought forward immediately as and when required, is available to my client. The provisions of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) are clear in terms of their support for economic development. At paragraph 45 of SPP, it is advised that planning authorities should respond to the diverse needs and locational requirements of different sectors of the overall economy and urges the adoption of a flexible approach to ensure that changing circumstances can be accommodated and new economic opportunities realised. Paragraph 45 of SPP further advises that: “Removing unnecessary planning barriers to business development and providing scope for expansion and growth is essential.” It is respectfully submitted that when taken together, the various factors set out above provide sufficient justification for an increase to be made to the area of land which is available to my client, in both the short to medium term, for the further and continued expansion of their business interests. This will ensure, in line with the terms of SPP, that there are no unnecessary barriers put in place which could inhibit the continued growth of my clients business. To this end, it is submitted that the extent of area covered by land allocation TN8 should be extended to include the additional area of land highlighted on the plan, which is attached to and forms part of this Representation.

Allocated to Tain TN8 Glenmorangie

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

“ To extend to area of land covered by this land use allocation in order to ensure that the short to medium terms development requirements relating to the continued expansion of the Glenmorangie Distillery are not inhibited in any way.”

Representation

The importance of my clients business is recognised within paragraph 4.80 of the Plan, where it acknowledged that this business is both a significant employer and a large tourist attraction. The requirement on the part of my client to extend the area covered by land allocation reference TN8, arises directly as a consequence of a recent review of their short terms expansion plans. As a result of this review, a number of planned developments, such as the provision of the additional warehousing and the improved access arrangements to the site, have been brought forward from their programmed implementation date as originally envisaged. The acceleration of these projects is in direct response to the continuing strong performance of the Scottish whisky industry within the global market place. The importance of the food and drink industry to the Plans Vision for the Ross-Shire Growth Area is set out at paragraph 3.10 of the Plan, where it is stated that by 2031, the economy of the are will have further diversified, with there being a renewed focus on food and drink manufacturing. In order to facilitate the continued development of my clients operations at Tain during the period to 2031, and hence to enable them to contribute towards the realisation of the overall Vision for this part of the plan area, it is vital that a sufficient supply of land, which can be brought forward immediately as and when required, is available to my client. The provisions of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) are clear in terms of their support for economic development. At paragraph 45 of SPP, it is advised that planning authorities should respond to the diverse needs and locational requirements of different sectors of the overall economy and urges the adoption of a flexible approach to ensure that changing circumstances can be accommodated and new economic opportunities realised. Paragraph 45 of SPP further advises that: “Removing unnecessary planning barriers to business development and providing scope for expansion and growth is essential.” It is respectfully submitted that when taken together, the various factors set out above provide sufficient justification for an increase to be made to the area of land which is available to my client, in both the short to medium term, for the further and continued expansion of their business interests. This will ensure, in line with the terms of SPP, that there are no unnecessary barriers put in place which could inhibit the continued growth of my clients business. To this end, it is submitted that the extent of area covered by land allocation TN8 should be extended to include the additional area of land highlighted on the plan, which is attached to and forms part of this Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 04429 Name Peter Nelson Organisation The Glenmorangie Company

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Andrew Bennie Bidwells

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Paragraphs 4.80 – 4.81.

Reference Site Reference Tain Inset Map (page 93). Type Change

Comment Changes

“ The identification and allocation of land lying to the west side of the A9, to the immediate west of the land presently occupied by them, for the purposes of safeguarding land to accommodate their long term development/expansion requirements.”

Representation

The requirement on the part of my client to have an area identified and allocated to take account of their long term development/expansion requirements arises as a direct result of the present and ongoing development of their facility, which is advancing at a pace that hitherto had been unexpected. As a consequence of the this level of ongoing activity, it is likely that the land presently allocated to accommodate the expansion of the site will be utilised within the short to medium term, and that accordingly, no land will remain which is able to accommodate the longer term development requirements of the business. My client controls an area of land lying to the west side of the A9, as identified on the plan, which is attached to and forms part of this Representation. Although this land lies on the west side of the A9, the settlement of Tain has already seen development take place on the west side of the A9, with it being noted that further residential development is planned to take place on the west side of the road through the allocation of Site TN4. Through the proper master planning, landscaping and design of this area, it is submitted that it will be possible to successfully bring it forward for development without giving rise to any adverse environmental or landscape impacts. Whilst this suggested long term land allocation is not required for development at this time, and can be identified only as a long term development site within the terms of the Plan without it actually being made available for development, there are significant benefits to be gained from formally identifying the future development potential of the site at this stage. Most notably, by confirming the future development potential of this site it will provide a high degree of certainty as regards the future of the land. By confirming and making clear the long term future of the site, it will be possible to provide my client with the level of certainty and confidence that is required to enable them to take forward the preparation and implementation of advanced programme of landscaping and site infrastructure works. The implementation of advanced landscape works, well in advance of the actual construction of the development to which they relate, is of particular relevance and importance to environmentally sensitive locations and can assist significantly in ensuring the successful assimilation and integration of the development into the surrounding countryside. For the reasons set out above, it is respectfully submitted that the land identified on the plan attached to this representation should be identified as a site for the long term expansion of the Glenmorangie Distillery.

Allocated to Tain TN8 Glenmorangie

Customer Number 04429 Name Peter Nelson Organisation The Glenmorangie Company

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Andrew Bennie Bidwells

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Paragraphs 4.80 – 4.81

Reference Site Reference Tain Inset Map (page 93). Type Change

Comment Changes

“ The identification and allocation of land lying to the west side of the A9, to the immediate west of the land presently occupied by them, for the purposes of safeguarding land to accommodate their long term development/expansion requirements.”

Representation

The requirement on the part of my client to have an area identified and allocated to take account of their long term development/expansion requirements arises as a direct result of the present and ongoing development of their facility, which is advancing at a pace that hitherto had been unexpected. As a consequence of the this level of ongoing activity, it is likely that the land presently allocated to accommodate the expansion of the site will be utilised within the short to medium term, and that accordingly, no land will remain which is able to accommodate the longer term development requirements of the business. My client controls an area of land lying to the west side of the A9, as identified on the plan, which is attached to and forms part of this Representation. Although this land lies on the west side of the A9, the settlement of Tain has already seen development take place on the west side of the A9, with it being noted that further residential development is planned to take place on the west side of the road through the allocation of Site TN4. Through the proper master planning, landscaping and design of this area, it is submitted that it will be possible to successfully bring it forward for development without giving rise to any adverse environmental or landscape impacts. Whilst this suggested long term land allocation is not required for development at this time, and can be identified only as a long term development site within the terms of the Plan without it actually being made available for development, there are significant benefits to be gained from formally identifying the future development potential of the site at this stage. Most notably, by confirming the future development potential of this site it will provide a high degree of certainty as regards the future of the land. By confirming and making clear the long term future of the site, it will be possible to provide my client with the level of certainty and confidence that is required to enable them to take forward the preparation and implementation of advanced programme of landscaping and site infrastructure works. The implementation of advanced landscape works, well in advance of the actual construction of the development to which they relate, is of particular relevance and importance to environmentally sensitive locations and can assist significantly in ensuring the successful assimilation and integration of the development into the surrounding countryside. For the reasons set out above, it is respectfully submitted that the land identified on the plan attached to this representation should be identified as a site for the long term expansion of the Glenmorangie Distillery.

Allocated to Tain General General

Customer Number 04429 Name Peter Nelson Organisation The Glenmorangie Company

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Andrew Bennie Bidwells

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph Paragraph 4.80.

Reference Site Reference TN8.

Type Change

Comment Changes

“ To remove reference to ‘safeguard’ as it appears within the narrative which forms part of the text which relates to the allocation of Site TN8.”

Representation

Whilst it is considered to represent only a minor issue, concern is expressed as to the use of the term “safeguard” within the narrative, which forms part of the text, which relates to the allocation of Site TN8. The term safeguarding is most often taken to indicate that the land in question is being protected from inappropriate alternative uses, thus ensuring that at some point in the future, it will be available for its preferred use. This carries with it an implied suggestion that the land in question is not, or may not be, required for development at this time, hence the need to safeguard it so that it is available in the future. In light of my clients projected short term business requirements, it is likely that this land will be required for development much earlier than had been previously expected or anticipated. As a consequence of this, it is submitted that the Plan should make clear that Site TN8, the extent of which should be extended in line with the terms of Representation 1 above, is available for immediate development, should it be required by my client.

Allocated to Tain TN8 Glenmorangie

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Last week I received from you a notification of publication of the above plan, including a supposed proposal to allocate TN4 for 23 homes. In fact far more houses have already been built than are shown on the map you sent me, the whole of the area around Rowan Drive/Birch Place being now filled up apart from maybe 2 or 3 plots that have not yet been built on. The area around Benview Road has 10 properties in process of construction along Benview Road and Jackson Drive, so the only area within the red box still available for building is alongside the south-east boundary of TN4 behind Benview Road/Jackson Drive. As the corresponding area along Jackson Drive/Benview Road has only had space for 10 properties which are just about completed, there is no way there is space for another 23 behind them, only a maximum of about 10. Here are my general comments on construction in this area: 1) The Tain Active Travel Audit identified a possible through bus route from Benview Road to Rowan Drive, which appears to have been blocked off by private house gardens now. 2) The Tain Active Travel Audit included the need for improvements for the considerable number of people crossing the A9 at Quarry Road or at Scotsburn Road rather than using the underpass half way between these two roads. Nothing has yet been done despite major construction works at the junction of Craighill Terrace and the A9. As yet more houses have been built or are going to be built within the orthern part of TN4 and there is a new Health Centre and Old People's Home in process of construction at the top of Craighill Terrace, a considerable increase in pedestrians crossing the A9 at Quarry Road/Craighill Terrace would be predictable over the next 1 to 3 years. 3) The Tain Active Travel Audit identified a future pedestrian route behind the A9 from the new Asda to LIDL, so that people do not have to walk alongside the A9 as they do at present, at least they can often be seen on the boggy grass alongside the A9 between Craighill Terrace and Morangie Road. The Highland Council appears to have no clear strategy for implementing this, but seems to be relying on individual members of the public pushing it through as each individual planning application along the route comes up. This is a ridiculous approach to town planning, as people who do not live immediately adjacent to future properties have no easy way of knowing when new planning applications are coming up. So far as I know there is no automatic email notification system, for instance, and neighbour notifications are waived in the case of major developments in favour of adverts in the local paper, despite the neighbour notification fee still being charged to the developer - I know this because we built an extension and our neighbours were not notified. 4) There are no community facilities in TN4/Jubilee Drive/Viewfield Road area apart from a hotel/restaurant/bar (Carnegie Lodge Hotel). A convenience store and a post box should be available to the growing population outside the A9.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

for reason noted in section 5, there must be recognition of need for continued use of major part of site dr3 by farm owner.

Representation

site has always been recognised as farmland and as area separating drumnadrochit and Lewiston. site has only one access and egress to balmacaan road for connection to mains services making whole site uneconomic for development. for this reason, any development would have to be limited and allow for continued farm use.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Move the whole site to an area with good main roads not in the middle of a village where people spend there lives. The road between Mulochy and Avoch has good flat land without homes around and the land is owned by the same company that own the industrial site. Then the existing industrial site could be redeveloped, if necessary, for homes or leisure use.

Representation

At present there seems to be 4 businesses at Avoch industrial site. It is positioned at the end of 2 approach roads, both of which are single lane with passing places. The approach from Avoch fishtown is via Henrietta bridge which has a weight limit or Long road which is a series of strips of tarmac with ridges, holes, and narrow bends. Terraces Ormonde and Henrietta are narrow with some properties opening out onto the road. Some of the businesses based at the site use there premises as a dumping ground for rubbish which is not taken away but is unfortunately burned, and quite often the windows have to be closed to keep out toxic smoke and smells that envelope the area. We have seen oil in road drains and at the moment the Council grass cutting team has a boat cradle dumped on the grass verge they have to cut around. So judging by the proposal we could end up with 3 times more mess, 3 times more toxic clouds, 3 times more heavy vehicles, and the lives of the folk who live in the area, environmentally, 3 times worse off. The whole area of this end of Avoch is a beautiful place we get many visitors walking around Ormonde Hill and Hill Woods and admiring to views to the firth, to say this proposal would degenerate the area is an understatement. So if we get a larger site the whole area would lose its village feel as it would turn into another Longmans or Harbour roads.

Allocated to

Customer Number 02212 Name Peter W Christie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 1.Introduction Paragraph Other Settlements are not included/indicated.

Reference Contents page: Other Settlements are not included. Type Change

Comment Changes

Correct the presentation of the document to include reference to Other Settlements in the contents pages.

Representation

I am a Director of Strathnairn Community Woodlands. We made representation following the first consultation but have no comment to make regarding the latest wording. My comment relates to the presentation of the document and the difficulty in locating the section on "Other Settlements" because it is not listed on any of the contents pages.

Allocated to Policy 3 Other Settlements

Customer Number 04213 Name Philip Burgin Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference MB2 Type Change

Comment Changes

Reconsideration given to the actual site of proposed buildings.

Representation

There is a stream running through MB2 which would require to be "redirected" away from its natural course. The attendant disruption this would have on the immediate area would require a considerable amount of time to establish itself before any building plans could be drawn up.

Allocated to Maryburgh MB2 Maryburgh Expansion site (South)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Reconsideration to be given to allocation for house building.

Representation

There have been numerous clinical studies carried out worldwide on the increased risk of paediatric leukaemia associated with living in close proximity to electricity pylons. There are two high voltage power lines running through MB2 with supporting pylons. It would be morally, and it could be argued if one were clinically qualified to pass comment from this perspective, irresponsible to deliberately expose minors to the increased risk of developing a childhood cancer. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2007/apr/28/health.science> <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/1202453.stm> <http://www.greenhealthwatch.com/newsstories/newsmobilephones/powerlines-double-leukaemia.html> <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-28385/Pylons-linked-leukaemia.html> <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-451238/Dont-build-schools-homes-near-pylons-warn-experts.html>

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The area designated FR1, at Greenside Farm in Rosemarkie, has been noted as an area for 50 homes. I do not agree that this area should be developed for houses. It should remain as green space, with NO houses built here.

Representation

I am firmly against the proposal that 50 homes may in future be built at Greenside Farm in Rosemarkie. I have lived in Rosemarkie since my very early childhood (over 30 years), and feel that the character of the village would be irreparably damaged by such a development. The ratio of proposed new to existing houses is too high - Rosemarkie has already been well built up over the years with the new houses at Ryebank, and another 50 is simply too many. The quantity, and then the inevitable 'new-build' style of modern houses, will both contribute to damage the historical atmosphere of the village, I fear to such a point that it will no longer feel like the safe, friendly place that locals are accustomed to. The loss of green space will also have a negative impact on the village. I am also concerned that the area in question is just too small for 50 houses. This seems like gross over-development of a small parcel of land. I live very near to the proposed development site, and worry about what road access would be taken to the new houses. I have young children, and the main road is already busy enough. Courthill Road is not of a suitable state to take increased volumes of traffic, and neither is the junction. I am extremely uneasy about the thought of a huge increase in traffic right outside my property. In more general terms, traffic is also a significant concern. I feel that residents of these new houses would be commuters - there is no work locally for this number of persons, they would have to find employment outwith the vicinity - and the build-up of traffic at peak commuting times would result in chaos in Fortrose, Avoch and Munloch High Streets. These are already cluttered with vehicles and a bottleneck when busy. More commuters will increase this problem, and add danger to the school routes. Cycling, and perhaps even walking, to school would become much more dangerous. We should be encouraging children to do this and making routes safer for them, not increasing the potential for accidents. It is also a large number of new residents for local facilities and services to cope with - will we lose water pressure? Are there enough primary and secondary school places? Can the GP's cope with the additional number of patients? Are local recycling facilities enough? If these new houses come to be built, will my children end up in overcrowded classes, and with a long wait for medical appointments because the local infrastructure cannot cope? These things need to be ascertained. I want my children to know village life as it has been for years here - I fear that if these houses are allowed to be built, then Rosemarkie will cease to be a proper village anymore.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The inclusion of the Site NA2 is premature in the context of the ex1stmg infrastructure constraints in the location, particularly vehicular access. Not only is there little, if any, capacity at the Lochloy Road/ A96 junction, the section of Lochloy Road between Montgomerie Drive and the Site is currently inadequate and unable to accommodate additional traffic flow. That section of the road would be unsuitable for the provision of emergency access for further development on NA5 Lochloy without significant and costly improvements. The Proposed LDP does not include a commitment or programme of improvements to the local road system, nor does the Transport Appraisal or other related documents provide any degree of certainty that the requisite works will be implemented in the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. 1.2 The Proposed LDP states that the focus is on "where development should and should not occur in the Inner Moray Firth area over the next 10-20 years." Nonetheless, in terms of Scottish Government policy and guidance the IMF LDP should be in place for a period of 5 years only, although it is required to take a longer term view of potential development. In addition, in terms of the Scottish Government guidance and advice (regarding the allocation of housing sites and the inclusion of such sites in the housing land supply) only those sites which meet the criteria required to render a site as "effective" should be included in the housing land supply. Road access 2.1.1 The site is landlocked save for the narrow strip of land extending northwards to the Lochloy Road at the north-eastern extremity of the site. The stretch of Lochloy Road from that point westwards to the junction with Montgomerie Drive is narrow, has a number of tight bends and is without pavement provision. It is currently severely constrained in terms of the road geometry and the topography; consequently current traffic levels give rise to safety concerns. Additional traffic on the stretch of road would exacerbate those road safety concerns for all road users: vehicle drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. 2.1.2 The Transport Appraisal for the IMF Proposed LDP acknowledges that the level of cycling in Nairn is well above average (7%). The stretch of Lochloy Road referred to above forms part of National Cycle Route 1 and Eurovelo 1. These factors alone are sufficient to prevent access to the site being taken from Lochloy Road without significant and costly improvements to the stretch of the road referred to above. 2.1.3 The proposed LDP refers to a notional capacity of 90 housing units. In the absence of an alternative access, Site NA2 is ineffective and should not be included in the housing allocation as there is no prospect of development within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. 2.1.4 Site NAS Lochloy has potential to provide an alternative access to Site NA2. However there are significant constraints affecting the effectiveness of Site NAS, not least the existing traffic congestion experienced at the Lochloy Road A96 junction. It is considered that it is premature to allocate NA2 until it has been demonstrated that Site NAS is effective. 2.2 Flood 2.2.1 There is a history of flooding on the site. No evidence is available to demonstrate that the Site would be capable of development in accordance with both the current Scottish Planning Policy and the emerging Scottish Planning Policy. In the absence of evidence demonstrating that Site NA2 can be made capable of development during the lifetime of the Proposed LDP, all in accordance with current and emerging Scottish Planning Policy on flooding, the Site ought not to be included in the Proposed LDP. 2.3 Drainage 2.3.1 There is evidence that the existing Treatment Plant is at capacity and will require to be upgraded in advance of further development. Acknowledgement of that status is included in Policy 4 in the Strategy for Growth Areas. 2.3.2 This factor, along with the existing constraint on site access, serves to further diminish the prospect that Site NA2 is capable of becoming effective within 5 years. Policy Documents: Comments In addition to the specific factors set out above it is considered that in allocating Site NA2 the planning authority has failed to take proper account of the extant policy, guidance and advice.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

As the Highland Council turned down an application for building on this site a few weeks ago due to insufficient infrastructure in this area we don't see how you could possibly go ahead with a plan for an even larger development in the same place. We attach a letter sent to you in both 2011 and 2012 stating the reasons as to why this plan should not go ahead and the reasons remain the same only the situation has got worse. Since this letter was written changes have been made to the area under the bridge and the health centre has been relocated and the hospital enlarged making the traffic situation on the Cawdor Road much busier. There have already been accidents in the area due to the amount of traffic stalled under the bridge, and should these plans go ahead things will only get worse. There are no jobs in the area, shops are closing down in Nairn and the economy is not improving. Surely it would make more sense to build homes closer to Inverness where maybe jobs could become available. We had read that a new town would be built at Tornagrain consisting of 10,000 homes so we don't see why you would give approval for 500 more to be built so close by in a small town which is already overcrowded. I am writing with reference to the proposed development by Scotia Homes and Robertson Homes for over 300 homes and flats on Cawdor Road, Nairn. As you can see from my address I live directly opposite the proposed development and am very much opposed to it. My husband and I moved to Firhall Village for peace and quiet, which we have at the moment, but if this development goes ahead it will ruin our life completely. Cawdor Road is a small country road and not fit for the amount of traffic that would be using the road while the building takes place or after the development is complete. Large builders lorries would find it difficult to access the site from the A96 due to the railway bridge. There is already a problem at the junction of Cawdor Road and the B9091 junction, which is extremely dangerous with the smaller amount of traffic that currently uses both roads. It is an accident waiting to happen, and we can't imagine what it will be like when there is a large amount of traffic trying to access the new development from the A96 or the B9091 junction. Maybe this project should be moved to an area closer to the A96, or at least postponed until the financial climate improves. A number of people walk into town daily from this area and at the present time this is a pleasant walk. If this project goes ahead there will be too much traffic and too many car fumes to make walking feasible. As well as affecting the people living here it will affect the wildlife which has made this area home. We have numerous birds including woodpeckers, doves, ducks, pheasant and owls, not to mention the endangered red squirrels. They will no doubt lose their peaceful habitat too when the builders move in and the traffic begins to rival that of a motorway. As reported recently travel conditions for a project of this size in Cawdor Road are unsatisfactory, and it would be unsuitable for housing to be built to the south of the town because of deficiencies in this area. Planning approval was granted on 29 April 1999 for Firhall Village Development providing an environment for people of middle age or older but once again older people's wishes would be completely disregarded if this development goes ahead. We feel strongly that we would be 'sold out' by the planning people who originally authorized that homes could be built in Firhall for older people to enjoy their later years. Obviously we are very much opposed to these plans as we will be adversely affected, but so will the people of Nairn and visitors who come to this area to enjoy the countryside. We have already lost too many green areas in Nairn, and this proposed development would lose many more. We have many runners and people on bikes using this road to raise money for charity, but that will become a thing of the past if planning permission is granted. While we may have a special interest in the outcome of the Scotia Homes proposal, so do they, and the person or company who is selling the land. Their interest is to make money and they obviously aren't bothered by the fact that they would be ruining many people's lives. Most of us would probably leave the area and move to a similar quiet community elsewhere as peace and quiet are our main requirements. We love our life in the Highlands and in particular in Nairn so we hope that this development does not go ahead and ruin a quality of life that would be difficult to find anywhere else.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

(i) Together with the huge number of Nairn residents who demonstrated their views on September 18 last, we remain totally opposed to any housing development on site NA8 (Nairn South), or indeed, site NA9, until Nairn has a by-pass. In that regard we can only hope that the Highland Planning Committee's decision regarding site NA8 after their visit on September 18 - a commendable acknowledgement of local democracy - will hold fast and be respected by all who have an interest therein. This opposition to development at site NA8 is based largely on the already critical traffic situation at the Cawdor Road railway bridge, where serious accidents are narrowly avoided daily. Any increase in traffic entering Nairn by that route as a consequence of increased residential development south of Nairn prior to the easement which would come from a suitably routed by-pass would inevitably - and, in our view, irresponsibly - greatly increase the threat at the Cawdor Road bridge to both vehicle occupants and pedestrians. Members of the Planning Committee saw the bridge situation for themselves on September 18. Many of those who then demonstrated against South Nairn development prior to a by-pass experience the hazards every day. Nor will minor adjustments at this point provide any credible resolution to those hazards. Re-aligning kerbs, altering pavement widths, traffic lights? None of those would reduce traffic volumes, and, at times, traffic lights would only serve to increase congestion. So, we would urge those responsible for the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan to unequivocally emphasise that there will be NO development at site NA8 prior to Nairn's acquisition of a by-pass. (ii) Further grounds for that stance relate to Nairn's tourist and holiday centre potential, and the proposed development at Tomagrain. With regard to the former, surely the Development Plan should lay far greater emphasis on the benefits to be derived from further exploitation of Nairn's great assets: three excellent beaches ... two first-class golf courses and numerous others within easy reach ... a location adjacent a fine, modern airport ... close proximity to the Cairngorms ... straightforward travel to the West Coast, Skye, the Northern Highlands and Aberdeen, and the near availability of all that Inverness has to offer as a regional centre. These are surely both natural and man-made features which give Nairn's holiday resort potential advantages far beyond those of many better-known locations elsewhere in the UK. One would urge, therefore, that a document such as the Development Plan would have more relevance to and, potentially, more impact on Nairn if it involved more specific proposals for the expansion and development of the tourist centre potential. Expansion of the holiday/tourists business in Nairn by a precise effort to encourage appropriate investment would create jobs in Nairn. Those jobs would reduce the need for people based in Nairn to travel elsewhere in search of employment, with consequent benefits regarding traffic levels and 'Green' issues. Those jobs would also contribute to a revival of Nairn's town centre prosperity. While the need to reverse the town centre decline is acknowledged in the Report precise measures for achieving that urgent and much-desired progress are conspicuously absent. Thus the proposal that Nairn should have a massive residential expansion tends to vaguely imply that a solution to all Nairn's other needs would flow from progress with that aim. As the people of Nairn vigorously demonstrated when the Highland Council Planning Committee visited the town on September 18 last, however, it is a staunchly held local view that housing alone is not the answer and will merely serve to greatly exacerbate the problems (iii) Furthermore, a substantial deferment of development at site NA8 could support and assist matters at Tomagrain. Given the location concerned, the proposal for the Tomagrain new town is logical and highly commendable, especially if it can be developed in conjunction with the expansion of employment opportunities adjacent to Inverness airport. Indeed within these two aspirations lies an opportunity for the Highlands to acquire a flagship development which would say much about the energy, vibrancy and further growth potential to be found in the Highlands of the future. The development of Tomagrain, with its essential services and facilities, should therefore be an unequivocally-expressed priority. Its development should not be impeded by projects elsewhere likely to compete in any way.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The area on the Site CD 6 Cawdor expansion shows the southern boundry as splitting my house, Kirksyde Cottage, in two and placing two thirds of my land withinn the CD 6 area designated as being for residential and business development. Obviously the house cannot be split so please correct your plan to reflect that my property, including the land, is not included in the site, CD 6, highlighted for development.

Representation

Other than the sites CD 1; CD 2; CD 8; CD 9; CD 10 and CD 11 there is no need to have any other site developed. The sites I have detailed are more than enough to cater for expansion of the village. Any further development would expand the village out of all propotion and totally lose is unique character. The areas CD 3; CD 4; CD 5; CD 6 and CD 7 are currently farming and should remain so.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of player feild and carpark from site CB3 and IMFDP

Representation

Playing field has been gifted to the community and is the only green field site in the village. It is used for local fetes, football training and recreational use. With all the development proposed for Conon Bridge there is no need for this development.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change the option for allowing Ness Road gapsite currently earmarked for Primary School to be made available for retail use if school does not go ahead.

Representation

My children attend Avoch Primary. It would serve the growing population moving into Fortrose and Rosemarkie's new housing developments, many of whom are young families. I urge planners to retain this proposed site and, although they would not benefit from a new primary school in Fortrose (as they would be too old), I would be very unhappy for the allocated site for a potential primary school in Fortrose to be made available for other uses such as retail development. I feel a primary school is far more important than more retail developments which would only add to already congested High Street. For families in Fortrose and Rosemarkie, a new school would allow children to walk or cycle to school more easily and safely. Traffic would thereby reduce. A modern school building could improve learning and teaching, as well as run more economically and ecologically for future primary school, and not allow it to be made available for retail or other use. Many people work and shop in Inverness, therefore there is little need for further supermarket/retail development in Fortrose.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to change the proposed identification of land for 130 new homes.

Representation

The population has increased greatly in recent years and the results of this are congested roads, parking issues, dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. My husband and I have both nearly been hit by cars in Fortrose High St in the last year, due to the difficult, cramped driving conditions and the lack of provision for cyclists. I am concerned that 130 new homes will create unmanageable levels of traffic and result in accidents for drivers, cyclist and pedestrians. There needs to be more consideration of and provision for cycling in the plan. The number of new houses should be less, in my opinion, because of the problems of increased traffic as already mentioned, but also because this scale of development will contribute to loss of character, with the dominant housing in the villages being modern and repetitive rather than historic/vernacular - the character of the area, which is what draws so many people to visit, is in danger of being lost forever. The fields area of the Ness is important for the beautiful open views to the sea and across the firth, and the spread of housing to fill these gaps changes the character and visual beauty of the settlement. I urge planners to reduce the number of proposed houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Redco Milne welcomes the acknowledgement that Dingwall plays a significant role as a service centre for Ross and Cromarty and that the LDP aims to strengthen its role as the county town. Redco Milne also particularly supports to identification of site DW8 as a mixed use development opportunity. The company is one of the main landowners within DW8 and looks forward to working with the council to bring forward retail and/or related town centre development at this location. This should take account of Redco Milne's extant planning permission as well as the Riverside Development Brief and the LDP. It is noted from the Action Plan that the council intends to re-visit the development brief during 2014 and to seek its formal adoption as supplementary guidance. There is no objection to this proposal but as a key stakeholder Redco Milne would wish to be actively involved in any review. Similarly it is noted that the Dingwall Developer Contributions Protocol is to be updated and adopted as supplementary guidance. Redco Milne would also wish to be consulted and actively involved in this process.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Redco Milne welcomes the identification of the Ross-shire Growth Area and supports the proposal that Dingwall should continue to be a key service centre and a focus for development activity. It also welcomes the fact that the LDP notes that a key component of the Growth Area will be well integrated town and local centres with accessible services and facilities. Redco Milne owns development land within Dingwall town centre and looks forward to working with the council to bring forward retail and/or related town centre development in line with the extant planning permission, development brief and LDP development allocation.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Clarification in relation to the proposed development plan for site IN21-Muirtown Basin with amendments to be made to any business or residential developments which would impact upon the social balance of the community, the transport network in particular the Kind Brude Road Junction (A862).

Representation

NOTIFICATION OF PUBLICATION OF INNER MORAY FIRTH PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN SITE IN21-MUIROTWN BASIN Further to the letter sent out seeking people’s views for the development of the Muirtown Basin I wish to state that I have numerous concerns in relation to these proposals. The letter sent to residents in October 2013 states that the area is to be used for Business, Community, Tourism, Leisure and 30 homes, however, it is not stated where within the red boundary these are to be placed. The proposed plan accessed online does not make this any clearer. I would like to see further clarification detailing what form the proposed homes and business are to take, where they are to be positioned and how they will impact on the local area. In particular I would like to know how they will impact on the already stressed road junction on King Brude Road (A862) which is used heavily during morning and evening commutes. This junction often renders the traffic backed up for a considerable distance coming down King Brude Road and along Clachnaharry Road. I would have serious concerns in relation to any further homes and businesses in this vicinity that would place additional strain on this junction with the potential for accidents during peak times. I would also like further clarification on how any business and residential developments in the area will impact upon the character and social balance of the community. Having lived in Muirtown Terrace for over a decade I am deeply appreciative of the tranquillity of the surroundings and as a resident I would like to know how any proposed development is likely to affect the character of the area. The canal itself offers local residents and tourists alike an opportunity to enjoy an area of important local heritage and any proposed development should take this into account. I would welcome the development of the former retail space of B and Q which has been mentioned in the local press as being an area of potential future development within this plan should compulsory purchase be possible. I would wholeheartedly support the development of existing sites such as this one within the proposed plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The access to this development should not be through Kingsteps onto Lochloy Road. It would be more appropriate to have a direct connection from the development to the A96.

Representation

At present Lochloy Road, especially the section through Kingsteps, is unfit for the extra traffic that 90 houses would generate. I feel there should be no more housing development in the Lochloy/Kingsteps area until the potential traffic problem is looked at and a new road is built to service these developments. Currently the line of the road before and through Kingsteps is narrow with several bends. In addition the visibility splays of the current houses are limited and further traffic would increase the risk of accidents for vehicles and pedestrians alike. The developers should have to agree to finance and construct a new road prior to any planning permission being given. The current road network through and around Nairn is already heavily congested and I don't think any more planning permission for houses in Nairn should be given, until the congestion problem is solved, by means of a bypass or removal of several sets of traffic lights.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

1. This is good arable land, it always yields a good crop, you know that the demand for field increases every year. People are starving all over the world and you are planning to sell off the field for housing. 2. The field is nice and flat, perfect for you, it didn't get like that by itself, hundreds of hard work made the field flat, my own family tree goes back hundreds of years in Alness and surrounding area, many of the men were plough men, many days of blood sweat and tears have been put in to that land, why cant you build put the proposed houses in a rough, hilly area of land, you have not considered the effect on the heritage landscape. 3. I can't even go to my councillor (Caroline Wilson) because it is her father who is selling the plot, he is selling off his land bit by bit, it is a disgrace when more appropriate plots should be sought, that do not impact the heritage landscape and the view of current residents. I wonder what his ancestors would say? 4. I bought my council house in 2005. If I knew I was going to be boxed in, I would never have bought it, Come and see the lovely view I have at the moment, nice and quite, the reasons I bought the place. The last time (a few years ago) when they tried to build, their was suppose to be an Archaeological survey over 10 percent of the field, I should think that it still applies? I think you find that in current archaeology they are considering the landscape impact surrounding archaeological sites, I consider your plans to encroach on Cairn Lithe too close, furthermore I don't not want to see that site disrespected by youths as is likely when you surround it with 67 houses rather than leave it be, the isolation in the field protects the site for good conservation. 5. If it did go ahead, which I sincerely hope it does NOT. what would happen about the devaluation of this house, I might end up owing more than it would be worth. I cant live here being boxed in (my current house having been upgraded for disabled living), you would have to help me find some where else to live.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I am writing to you to register my objection to the above section of the plan. Allowing houses to be built on this land would be to destroy one of the more pleasant features at the heart of our village. I found out at the meeting on 25th Nov. that the playing field does not belong to the Council but is in fact in community ownership. There are other areas that could be developed including the old fish factory and the site of the filling station which have been eye-sores for years. Is it not a better idea to make this entire area into a park for the benefit of all residents? The present rush to build houses in Conon Bridge has been at the expense of good farm land and there seems to be little intention to add the extra amenities to support this expansion.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of change of land use to Tourism and village with Caravan Site

Representation

This land is currently used by the community in Ardersier and forms part of Ardersier common. The land is under water for a considerable amount of the year and is under water table. This provides an ideal environment for wildlife which is unique to this area and any development would ruin or severely disrupt it. The business proposed is a caravan park which would most certainly require the ground level to be raised to provide dry standings. The area in question is old woodland made up of alder, willow, birch and hawthorn and supports an enormous quantity of wildlife, notably invertebrates that feed the great quantity and variety of birds that inhabit it. This ecosystem relies totally on the high water table and this is what makes it unique. Any change to the water levels by for instance road building or hard stands for caravans which will certainly be required will be of great risk to these trees and the wildlife that relies on them throughout the entire common. It would also be a great shame to lose this unique and very beautiful woodland, both for the residents of Ardersier and for visitors that come to admire it and this could be greatly enhanced by re-opening the paths through it that were fenced off a few years ago. Such a caravan park would additionally require amenities such as toilet block and warden's house spoiling the beautiful beachline and the views both to and from the fort. The same developer has already been refused planning for a house in the same area where the reasons are listed as: 3.1The application is unsupported by any detailed information or case demonstrating compliance with Highland Structure Plan policy H3 Housing in the Countryside, therefore development as proposed would be contrary to this policy. 3.2The application site lies within an area identified susceptible to a 1 in 200 year flood risk and therefore development as proposed, in the absence of remedial measures would be contrary to Scottish Planning Policy 3.3Development of a house on the proposed site would result in reduced standards of amenity available to local residents, specifically those of Cromal Terrace and Ardersier in general; contrary to principles upheld through Structure plan Policy G2. 3.4Development of a house as proposed could encourage further housing applications on this area of unallocated land which in turn would weaken approved planning policy and erode the Council's wider development strategy.compliance Based on the above I would deduce the developer intends to profit from this land, no matter the cost to the community, without regard to the conditions under which the land was sold to him. One of the arguments for changing the land use to business is to encourage positive tourism to the village. The village currently has a large amount of tourist traffic going to and from Fort George and sharing the wonderful natural beauty of the common in its current natural state with them is much more appropriate than ruining it with an unsightly caravan site. There are plenty of empty fields around the village that would be much more appropriate for business use. Additionally the picnic spot in Ardersier common has been voted one of the best picnic spots in Scotland. The area proposed for business use is immediately adjacent to that picnic spot and would most certainly spoil it if not completely ruin it. As a resident adjacent to this site my children and I are frequent users of Ardersier Common and the beach as are all my neighbours. The common and the amenity it provides were an important factor when we decided to move here and I know the same can be said for a great number of the people I meet on their daily walks. The site in question is visible from a long way in both directions from the path along the beach and development of this area will spoil both the look and feel of our beach side path. A caravan park will create noise throughout the day and evening in what is a quiet area where we can enjoy the bird life on the beach and within the common, and where our children can play safely. I believe there is in existence a control of woodland removal policy which states that anything over 0.1 hectares should not be removed from existing woodland when there is public benefit. This woodland falls squarely within those parameters for the reasons stated above and the development would certainly result in more than 0.1 hectares being lost. I sincerely hope these points will be taken into consideration when you review this submission.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04172 Name Richard Mobey Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.41

Reference NA1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Showfield to remain as greenspace.

Representation

The proposal to erect up to 30 houses in this area is not necessary and the area should remain as greenspace. With the potential of up sixty additional cars using Lodgehill Road and Waverley Road for access to the A96 this would cause unacceptable traffic problems at peak times and probably throughout the day. This is a quiet residential area and further housing close to the town centre is not needed. This is the only greenspace left in this area and needs to be preserved for the future.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 03936 Name Richard Reese Organisation Roman Catholic Church

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IG5 - 32 Homes, Business and Tourism Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Whatever is planned for Invergordon, I trust that ample attention will be given to car parking. As I write, and in regard to the Catholic church on High Street/Station Road, we have seen a quite serious depletion of parking in that area. Maybe this is short-term, but the town as a whole is not well supplied with parking for cars. More development means more cars etc etc.

Allocated to Invergordon IG5 Former Railway Sidings

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Full support is given to the housing site allocation reference IN31 - Ness Castle on Page 42 of the Plan. However, the reference to a requirement for a minimum of 2.5ha of playfield area adjacent to the primary school is incorrect.

Representation

The figure for the playfield should be 1.5ha to be consistent with the figure contained on Page 5 of the signed Section 75 Agreement which accompanied the planning permission reference no. 04/00585/OUTIN.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like to make my representation clear that I am against this development in its current form and feel it will have a detrimental impact on the hamlet of Kingsteps and a negative effect on the Inner Moray Firth area.

Representation

Notification of Publication of Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan Reference: Your letter Ref IMFLDP/PP/NN, October 2013 This is our first official notification regarding allocation of this land for development. I would like to make my representation clear that I am against this development in its current form and feel it will have a detrimental impact on the hamlet of Kingsteps and a negative effect on the Inner Moray Firth area. Kingsteps is a historic rural settlement in its own right and any development adjacent to this area needs to be sympathetic to ensure that Kingsteps retains its individual and special identity. I have noted our objections to specific points laid out in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP) below. IMFLDP Wording: Developments are similar in terms of its spacing, scale and density to development within or adjoining that existing settlement, including consideration of and respect for whether the local facility serves a wider dispersed rural settlement or concentrated village. Objection: The plan for 90 houses in an area of 6.3 hectare (15.75 acres) is completely out with the current housing density for Kingsteps and equates to a density of 0.07 hectare / house (0.1750 acres / house). The current Kingsteps property density is 0.20 hectare/house (0.5 acre/house plots therefore the proposed NA2 site should be restricted to 31.5 houses to be the same spacing, scale and density of the adjoining and existing settlement. IMFLDP Wording: Safeguards and developer requirements for a network of green spaces, corridors and path networks to protect habitats and species but also to allow people and wildlife to travel through these spaces and to co-exist. Objection: We feel the current development at NA5 bordering Kingsteps has not created a network of green spaces, corridors or trees as per the approved planning permission. We continue to suffer from noise and light pollution; associated crime and environmental destruction due to this ever increasing development adjacent to Kingsteps. The NA2 development with an additional 90 houses will reduce even further any existing network of green spaces, corridors for wild life and natural habitat. The entire area is quickly becoming an enormous suburban area devoid of natural green spaces. IMFLDP Wording: Green infrastructure consists of existing green spaces, walks, woodlands, other habitats, paths and cycle routes. Taken together these help form the Green Network which helps to create a sense of place by providing spaces to meet friends and neighbours, take part in sport, recreation and play while also making a significant contribution to the biodiversity of an area. There needs to be a buffer between the ever increasing number of houses built in Nairn such as NA-5 and the hamlet of Kingsteps. The NA5 development has an additional plan for 200 more homes and education and community buildings. The current NA2 proposals calls for Transport assessment; open space provision; primary school land safeguard; footpath/cycleway connections and linkages to wider area; landscaping and woodland replacement; Flood Risk Assessment; with avoidance of any adverse effect on the integrity of the inner Moray Firth. We have not seen these points being addressed in the current development. Currently the only attempt in forming a buffer between the two developments is earthworks being erected not trees as stipulated in the planning permission. IMFLDP Wording: New development allocated in this Plan must contribute to the delivery of more efficient forms of travel The planned devolvment at NA2 shows a single entrance / exit onto Lochloy road. In its current format Lochloy Road is incapable of servicing a development of its current requirement plus 90 additional houses. Any attempt to widen or improve this road would completely disrupt the harmony of the historic Kingsteps hamlet. The single access point will cause a traffic bottleneck and serious noise and traffic related pollution in Kingsteps where the total number of houses will increase from circa 20 to 110. The pressure on local transport will also be felt at the junction of the A96 where the increased traffic from the NA5 and other development in Nairn will cause that junction to be greatly congested. IMFLDP Wording: Green infrastructure consists of existing green spaces, walks, woodlands, other habitats, paths and cycle routes. Taken together these help form the Green Network which helps to create a sense of place by providing spaces to meet friends and neighbours, take part in sport, recreation and play while also making a significant contribution to the biodiversity of an area. In discussions with the Landowner prior to submission of the site for inclusion in the IMFLDP it was intimated that no house building was proposed north of the Kingsteps burn which dissects the NA2 site. We would insists that this is a condition of any future Planning consent to create a divide between any new building and Kingsteps to ensure Kingsteps retains its identity as a settlement in its own right.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00163 Name RM Morrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.134 Provision of recreational facilities.

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to build houses in the area designated as CB3 in the IMLDP for the village of Conon-Bridge. The area should remain as a recreation area for the village as there are no other designation facilities other than the new Wyvis School facilities which are not available for open use. The car park is in constant use for people using the recently opened Conon Railway Station. Where are these people going to park if this area is allowed for housing?

Representation

The land in question is at present owned by the local Amenities Association and the part to the west of the playing field to the railway is in the ownership of Gairloch and Conon Estates. The land forming the playing fields was gifted by the then local Laird in association with other land holders of the 'village acres' to form a recreation area for the residents of the village. This was formalised in 1952 to form the Amenities Association with a properly constituted committee of trustees. The car park area adjacent to the Church of Scotland was sold to the Highland Council in the 1970's

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number 00163 Name RM Morrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.134

Reference CB3 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

As probably the only existing family still living in the lower part of Conon-Bridge who were involved in the granting of the village acres to the Amenities Association, and I have on behalf of my family have very strong objections to the proposal of developing CB3 as a housing development. The land was granted to the association with the specific proviso in the feu title that it be used solely as a recreational area for the use of the villagers and excluded it from being developed for housing or any other commercial use.

Allocated to Conon Bridge CB3 Land to South West of High Street

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The swimming pool given planning full permission in May 2009 (Ref. 09/00202/FULRC) and the consent purified in November 2010 by the construction of a section of building with the following plaque, "BLACK ISLE SWIMMING POOL FOUNDATION This plinth built in November 2010 herewith purifies the Planning consent granted by The Highland Council on 29 May 2009 in perpetuity. FUTURE COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOL" should be recognised and zoned in the new local plan. Photo graphic copies of the aforementioned construction and plaque were submitted to the Council Planning Department at the time.

Representation

The Black Isle Swimming Pool Foundation has been in existence for many years and has been well received by the community, Sport Scotland and the Highland Council Planning Department in their desire to have a pool built for the local community. It is clear, however, that at this point in time the pool will have to await better economic conditions in which to be realised, in this it shares the same financial constraints as many other housing, community and commercial facilities. Its location next to the existing Leisure Centre is key to its management and use by the community to enable diverse family activities to happen under the one roof. It clearly needs the additional parking specified at planning stage and we would strongly propose that an adequate space continues to be allowed for future community facilities in the same area. We hope also that the currently identified future public footpath to the south east of the swimming pool site leading from Academy Street to Greengates is also part of the land zoned for community use.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

It would appear that sites available for individual houses have been removed from the Local Plan. Not everyone wants to buy a house built by a developer in a housing estate, in fact, the villages have a history of one-off houses and add a greater sense of diversity to the character of the villages.

Representation

I propose that sites for individual and small groups of houses be re-instated in the proposed Local Plan. The housing recently developed at the top end of East Watergate and leading to Wards Farm have now become part of the village structure and I see no reason why this area could not be further reinforced with a small additional number of houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Requirement to link two boundary roads and make access to the A9 by Milnafua the main access to the quarry.

Representation

Regarding the Inner Moray Firth proposed local development plan, I note that there are proposals relating to site AL16 - Caplich Quarry in Alness the major access to the site at present is via Caplich road, linking from Obsdale road. Although improvements were made to the junction between these two roads some years ago, its has become a serious safety issue in recent years with the use of increasingly heavier and heavier vehicles, often with trailers. Some travel along the road with up to 3 loaded waste skips and low-loaders carrying heavy construction vehicles. On the narrower section of Caplich road above the Springfield terrace/Perrins road junction, Caplich road is quite narrow and more often vehicles are having to negotiate the section very carefully: In the original Jack Holmes report for Alness a distributor road linking Shilinghill boundary road with Obsdale Estate boundary road was proposed. This road would pass through the existing quarry. If there is now provision for re-development of the quarry site, it would be opportune to re-visit the original plan and take almost all of the heavy traffic away from the Caplich road/Obsdale road/ High street area by linking the two boundary roads as originally proposed and making access to the A9 by Milnafua the major means of access to the quarry the would not be detrimental to the proposed development and would make a very significant contribution to the safety of other vehicle users on Caplich road.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Under Restrictions - Provide more information in line with those provided for other port developments

Representation

The requirements Highland Council have identified for IG11 on page 87 are broadly reflected for both Whiteness and Highland Deephaven but not for either Inverness Marina / Waterfront or more importantly Nigg. Indeed the lack of information on the development of Nigg is quite incredible considering the introduction in 4.24. A very brief summary of the "Nigg Master Plan" should be incorporated here for public information.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Legend provided in page 171 should be incorporated in all relevant maps or at least signposted on the maps.

Representation

This would make the maps more use friendly. Currently it is not obvious when looking at a map what the different colours mean.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

'Ports' in reference to Invergordon and Nigg in line 8 should be changed to 'Facilities'.

Representation

Both Nigg and the Invergordon Service Base are much more than 'Ports' this should be recognised appropriately.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

IG11 Requirements: Noise Mitigation Plan, should be clear that this is in-air noise with the purpose of minimising disturbance to birds. IG11 Requirements: Pilling method Statement (in accordance with JNCC guidance). This should be removed. IG11 Requirement: Demonstration of no adverse effects on integrity of the Moray Firth Special Protection Area through disturbance effects of increased marine traffic in combination with other proposals. See model in 'Dolphins and Development'. - Remove this requirement. IG11 Requirement: Demonstration of account being taken of the Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation Management Scheme. Flood Risk Assessment to ensure site will remain operational during flood conditions or if non-port related development is proposed; Transport Assessment (must demonstrate that adequate parking can be provided. The first sentence should be removed. The second sentence is unclear and needs reworded. Specific reference to adequate parking should be removed.

Representation

This mitigation measure is identified in the HRA, with particular regard to the SPA and RAMSAR. As such it related to in-air noise disturbing birds. This is not made clear within the proposed IMFLDP. This requirement is very specific to a given construction technique, and as such is a level of detail too far for the IMFLDP. This level of detail would be considered during the assessment of a proposed development. If it has been included due to the potential for piling during Phase 3 then this requirement and others in IG11 have already been identified and are likely to be incorporated by Marine Scotland in license conditions. As such there is no benefit of including it here. There is an 'Inner' Moray Firth Special Protection Area (SPA) this is designated for various bird species, and as such marine traffic is unlikely to impact upon it. There is a Moray Firth SAC which the HRA has identified potential in-combination effects however the most recent studies cover more than traffic in consideration of in-combination effects. The link to the 'Dolphins and Development' model no longer works, presumably this was the work commissioned by SNH in 2012 that has since been superseded. This is a fast moving area of research hence it would make be preferable to remove this requirement and include in-combination effects in the first point in requirements as per previous comment. Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation Management Scheme is voluntary, hence although it should be encouraged, it should not be listed as a 'requirement' as this is not in the spirit of the 'voluntary' nature of the scheme. It is noted that parking is not identified as an issue in the Transport Assessment supporting the IMFLDP. The focus as discussed in Section 2 of the document should be to focus on efficient forms of travel, including public transport services and the active travel network. This approach is welcomed by CFPA. The provision of additional parking does not align with Highland Councils stated vision to 'have more efficient forms of travel'.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Appendix 2 should include definitions of: • Business • Industry • Public Realm Improvements

Representation

These terms are utilised within the document but are not clearly defined.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

IG5 requirement for Public Realm Improvement should be removed. IG5 include car parking and laydown within the use definitions.

Representation

No definition of what this means is provided. It is the only area with this requirement. It is unclear as to why it has been included. Part of the area is utilised currently as laydown. As there is no definition of 'Business' and 'Industrial' it is unclear whether laydown would be acceptable in the future. This ambiguity should be removed. There is a potential that part of the area could be utilised as parking in the future to alleviate issues elsewhere in Invergordon and to address requirements stated for IG11. As such it should be clear that parking would be considered an acceptable use within this area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The name of IG11 is currently Cromarty Firth Port Authority, this should be changed. Suggested alternative would be - Invergordon Harbour Area. IG11 the 'Requirements' title should be changed to 'Requirements/Issues for Consideration'. Alternatively move the boundary to exclude the area covered by CFPA permitted development rights. IG11 Requirements: Dependent on the nature of the development the following may be required to ensure there is no adverse effect on the Cromarty Firth Special Protection Area/Ramsar and/or Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation (SAC): Remove mention of the Moray Firth Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Alternatively include Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC, but make it clear that for these two SAC need considered for in-combination effects only. IG11 Requirements: Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (including pollution prevention). Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (including pollution prevention). Remove OEMP, this could replace with appropriate Environmental Management System (EMS) for Operations

Representation

No other areas are identified by the name of a land owner. It is inappropriate to do so. It is also misleading as area IG11 includes land not owned by CFPA, please see attached map. The CFPA Land within IG11 is subject to permitted development rights under the Harbour Act as such Highland Council has no mechanism to impose any 'requirements' (see attached map). They can 'request' things are put in place or considered by making representation during consultation processes with Marine Scotland for example if a licence is required under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010. It is misleading to suggest that they can place requirements on the whole area. Many of the requirements listed relate to ecology, pollution and flood the lead agency for these issues are Scottish Natural Heritage and the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency, both of whom are statutory consultees to Marine Scotland and as such the inclusion of the requirements is duplication. The Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) does not identify significant effects on the Moray Firth SAC if developments are considered in isolation. In-combination effects are however identified for Moray Firth SAC and the Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC. Hence there is an inconsistency in the identification of sites within the plan. OEMP and CEMP are identified in the HRA, Highland Council have produced guidance on CEMP's which CFPA have utilised recognising this as best practise. As per previous comments with regard to permitted development Highland Council have no mechanism to 'require' the production. The term OEMP is not recognised by CFPA, operations would normally be managed from an environmental perspective via an appropriate EMS. Hence request to remove/change the requirement. If this is request cannot be accommodated, then guidance on the content of an OEMP would need to be provided if 'requested' by Highland Council in the future.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Section 2, Table 1 Title should be changed from Housing Land Requirement to Number of Houses required.

Representation

Currently it is ambiguous as to whether the number refers to an area or number of houses.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Removal of site CB3 from the plan - make area a park

Representation

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to build houses in the middle of Conon Bridge in the area which includes the playing field. This is marked on the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as CB3. At the meeting on Monday evening we were told that the playing field is owned by the Amenities Association who were given the land in the 1950s. Rather than getting rid of the green area in the centre of Conon Bridge, it has been suggested that this area could be used to make a park which all ages can enjoy.. With the village expanding, we need this land to be maintained as a centre and focal point for the village

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The housing capacity of 40 seems excessive for this 2.3 ha of land, considering that much of the site is currently amenity woodland. Also there is a need for recognition of Hedgefield House as a former war memorial hostel, and not just as a Category B listed building.

Representation

40 houses, unless flats, would almost certainly mean the destruction of some of the woodland currently on the site; also the amount of traffic generated, and requiring access to Culduthel Road, would provide an additional hazard, even with an improved or widened gateway. At present traffic requiring access to the Mackenzie Centre, etc., or leaving the Centre, is frequently subject to vehicles travelling at excessive speeds on Culduthel Road: this led to the reinstatement, a year or so ago, of the traffic island close to the site entrance, partly in an attempt to reduce dangerous overtaking, especially of buses using the bus stops at and opposite the entrance/exit. Culduthel Road in this section consists of a series of quite short straight sections between fairly sharp curves. A major improvement of access to Muirfield Road, at the east side of the site, would also be required. Hedgefield House is also, in a sense, a War Memorial, as it was used for many years as a hostel for girl pupils from the outlying parts of the former Inverness-shire County, who were attending Inverness Royal Academy. Funding for this was provided from money collected by the Royal Academy's Old Boys' Club (as it was to become known) in 1918/1919. The hostel (originally housed in the old part of the Highland Council HQ in Ardross Street) was moved to Hedgefield in the 1930's, when a boys' hostel was moved from Hedgefield elsewhere. The only current evidence of this former use as a War Memorial hostel is the plaque on one of the gateposts looking out onto Culduthel Road. Many years ago, this plaque replaced an arch over the gate, which had to be removed as it was too low for the entry of lorries, fire engines, and other emergency vehicles. It is to be hoped that some recognition of this War Memorial could remain as and when the site is developed. Further information on the use of Hedgefield House as a hostel can be obtained from the archivist at Inverness Royal Academy.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I would like to raise an objection to the request of the Scottish Government to have Site IN32 at Knocknagael Farm re-zoned for a housing development. A previous application by the owners in February 2013 received opposition from the local community and was subsequently withdrawn. There was no contact with the local community when the previous housing development plan was lodged which showed the Scottish Government's total disregard for the local residents. They obviously tried to submit their plans 'under the radar'. I am well aware of and totally agree with the local community's wishes to see this land remain for agriculture and community use. These wishes must be taken in to account. The Scottish Government are arguing that the land is surplus to their agricultural requirements, but I would like to know what this is based on as the field has never been out of use for growing crops and grazing of sheep & cattle since I moved to the area in 2005. The Scottish Government only seem interested in recouping the £3,000,000 that was spent on the upgrade of the Knocknagael Bull Stud Farm. The south east side of the field is bounded by the South West Flood Alleviation Channel and as the field sits lower than this channel there is a possibility that the channel could flood the field in extreme conditions. The field as it currently is acts as a soak away for rainfall, but if development is allowed this could exacerbate flooding in the local area. To the north east side there is a section of mature trees, that I believe are protected, yet the Scottish Government's original plans would have meant felling these to make way for a community park. This would have been and is currently completely unacceptable. The Scottish Government also state in their own Land Use Strategy that they aim to get 'the best use from our land'. How can this be the best use for 'our' land when Scotland is crying out for prime agricultural land? The Highland Council also stated in their current Inverness Local Area Development Plan that the south side of Inverness should have green wedges kept to allow free access to the countryside and to stop over developing. Yet now it seems that the new theory to keep the countryside open to the general public is to close it off with yet more development. There are enough areas on the southern edges of Inverness already zoned for housing development and as no provision is shown for the addition of extra schools and community areas I strongly object to this request for IN32 to be rezoned.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I object strongly to the use of site IN47 for 16 houses as per planning application 07/00264/OUTIN and did so at the time of this application. This application was superseded by other applications and proposals and I was under the impression that the said application was withdrawn. Also this part of the District Centre at Milton of Leys was always set out for use as a site for a care home. The planning application plan which I have in my possession show this, with the said housing on land to the East, part of IN62. An application by the Community Council for a community facility was passed by committee. As well as that the planning application for Houses for Hero's was refused by committee but passed by the Scottish Government which stated if the application was for housing it would have been refused. There is also ongoing discussions with the developer as to the use of this land allocated in the previous development plan as amenity land use as Milton of Leys lacked any facilities. There was no mention of residential element in that development plan, this was slipped in a later date by the developer.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

There is a paucity of public recreational areas on the south side of Inverness due to the huge increase in building. There are very large and mature trees on the north aspect of IN50, including oaks, that must be preserved. I have got close to 3 long eared owls there. Inverness lacks public spaces due to the boom in house construction that appears too dense and impersonal to many people. Many local residents currently use IN50 for recreation as there is nothing else close by. Surely a modern and civilised city deserves more than just dense housing, unrelieved by open and pleasant spaces for children and adults to play and relax?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change sought to Section 4 Development Allocations Removal of the Site NA2 South Kingsteps from the Proposed LDP

Representation

The inclusion of the Site NA2 is premature in the context of the existing infrastructure constraints in the location, particularly vehicular access. Not only is there little, if any, capacity at the Lochloy Road/A96 junction, the section of Lochloy Road between Montgomerie Drive and the Site is currently inadequate and unable to accommodate additional traffic flow. That section of the road would be unsuitable for the provision of emergency access for further development on NA5 Lochloy without significant and costly improvements. The Proposed LDP does not include a commitment or programme of improvements to the local road system, nor does the Transport Appraisal or other related documents provide any degree of certainty that the requisite works will be implemented in the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. The Proposed LDP states that the focus is on "where development should and should not occur in the Inner Moray Firth area over the next 10-20 years." Nonetheless, in terms of Scottish Government policy and guidance the IMF LDP should be in place for a period of 5 years only, although it is required to take a longer term view of potential development. In addition, in terms of the Scottish Government guidance and advice (regarding the allocation of housing sites and the inclusion of such sites in the housing land supply) only those sites which meet the criteria required to render a site as "effective" should be included in the housing land supply. Constraints Road Access - The site is landlocked save for the narrow strip of land extending northwards to the Lochloy Road at the north-eastern extremity of the site. The stretch of Lochloy Road from that point westwards to the junction with Montgomerie Drive is narrow, has a number of tight bends and is without pathway provision. It is currently severely constrained in terms of the road geometry and the topography; consequently current traffic levels give rise to safety concerns. Additional traffic on the stretch of road would exacerbate those road safety concerns for all road users: vehicle drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. The Transport Appraisal for the IMF Proposed LDP acknowledges that the level of cycling in Nairn is well above average (7%). The stretch of Lochloy Road referred to above forms part of National Cycle Route 1 and Eurovelo 1. These factors alone are sufficient to prevent access to the site being taken from Lochloy Road without significant and costly improvements to the stretch of the road referred to above. The proposed LDP refers to a notional capacity of 90 housing units. In the absence of an alternative access, Site NA2 is ineffective and should not be included in the housing allocation as there is no prospect of development within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. Site NA5 Lochloy has potential to provide an alternative access to Site NA2. However there are significant constraints affecting the effectiveness of Site NA5, not least the existing traffic congestion experienced at the Lochloy Road A96 junction. It is considered that it is premature to allocate NA2 until it has been demonstrated that Site NA2 is effective. Flood - There is a history of flooding on the site. No evidence is available to demonstrate that the Site would be capable of development in accordance with both the current Scottish Planning Policy and the emerging Scottish Planning Policy. In the absence of evidence demonstrating that Site NA2 can be made capable of development during the lifetime of the Proposed LDP, all in accordance with current and emerging Scottish Planning Policy on flooding, the Site ought not to be included in the Proposed LDP. Drainage - There is evidence that the existing Treatment Plant is at capacity and will require to be upgraded in advance of further development. Acknowledgement of that status is included in Policy 4 in the Strategy for Growth Areas. This factor, along with the existing constraint on site access, serves to further diminish the prospect that Site NA2 is capable of becoming effective within 5 years. Other Factors Site NA2 is a greenfield site and there is no evidence to demonstrate that the Site can be developed within the required timescale. Accordingly the inclusion of the Site is not in accordance with paragraph 80 of the Scottish Planning Policy. In addition to the specific factors set out above it is considered that in allocating Site NA2 the planning authority has failed to take proper account of the extant policy, guidance and advice. Specific attention is drawn to the following elements and comments stated below as examples. Scottish Planning Policy Paragraph 15 - no likely sequence of development is set out in the Proposed LDP. Paragraph 38 - The decisions on new development are required to take account of a number of factors including the reduction of the need to travel, prioritise sustainable travel opportunities, promotion of sustainable travel opportunities and to prevent further development at risk from flooding. The inclusion of Site NA2 fails to do so. Specific policies on flooding are relevant to the inclusion of the Site in the Proposed LDP but are inadequately addressed in the overall context of Site NA2. Paragraph 77 - There is no context provided for development of Site NA2, particularly taking into account the access constraint and the need for improvement of the road network in the Nairn area generally. Paragraph 79 - In the absence of a satisfactory transport network including footpaths and cycle provision, the allocation of Site NA2 fails to demonstrate compliance with the policy. That failure is of particular significance given the constraints issues referred to above. Paragraph 80 - Site NA2 is a greenfield site and should not be allocated in preference to brownfield or other similar sites. There is no evidence that the Site can be developed within

the required timeframe owing to the current infrastructure constraints. Draft Scottish Planning Policy Principal Policies Paragraph 20 - The Proposed LDP does not provide any evidence to demonstrate that Site NA2 can be developed within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. Building Policy Principles Paragraph 80, 90 and 91 - Maintaining a 5-year Effective Land Supply The Proposed LDP does not demonstrate that Site NA2 will become effective and free from constraints and effective or capable of development within five years of the adoption of the Proposed LDP or the lifetime of that LDP. Paragraph 92 - The Proposed LDP fails to set out the key actions necessary to bring Site NA2 forward for housing development, or to identify the lead partner. Planning Advice Note 2/2010 Paragraph 55 - Site NA2 cannot be considered to be effective in terms of the Advice set out in the Note as a consequence of the existing constraints and the absence of an effective strategy which has the reasonable prospect of removing those constraints within the lifetime of the Proposed LDP. The inclusion of Site NA2 does not assist in providing a realistic picture of the available land supply. The Proposed LDP does not include specific commitments to the removal of the physical constraints affecting the Site.

Allocated to	Nairn	NA2	South Kingsteps	
--------------	-------	-----	-----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Background

HIE's purpose is to generate sustainable economic growth across the Highlands and Islands. Its vision is of a highly successful and competitive region in which increasing numbers of people choose to live, work, study and invest.

The Inner Moray Firth is the most populous of the eight HIE operating areas and is the key economic driver for the Highlands and Islands, so HIE is concerned to ensure that the land allocations in this area are appropriate and balanced to support its growth aspirations for the area. The key opportunities for growth have been determined to lie in the following sectors:-

Energy Sustainable Tourism

Life Sciences Finance and Business Services

Food and Drink Universities

Creative Industries

It is therefore essential that sites should be allocated to meet the development needs of these over the anticipated lifetime of the Local Development Plan, with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the variances which will inevitably emerge over time.

Throughout the plan it is important that the allocation of land is balanced between industrial, commercial, residential, recreational etc. in order that the development of the Inner Moray Firth area can be achieved and the growth aspirations realised. In this respect, it appears that throughout the plan the primary emphasis is on housing provision with commercial and industrial uses a secondary consideration. It is appreciated that political pressure and landowner desire will always be weighted in favour of residential use. Given this situation it is important that a visionary and imaginative approach is adopted in land allocation policy. All too often the sites chosen for industrial use in particular are those with access, flooding or contamination issues rendering them unsuitable for housing. These issues make them unattractive to industrial and commercial developers also, placing the area at a competitive disadvantage in attracting inward investment. Allocation of development land uses should be determined by an integrated development strategy and not driven by development proposals *per se*.

Growth Areas

It is pleasing to note that the Inverness to Nairn and Ross-shire have been identified as Growth Areas with integrated growth plans described in detail. Specific information of the timing of the developments would enhance these sections and give the document more weight as a marketing proposal for the area to present to inward investors looking for confidence in the region. The different elements, particularly those relating to infrastructure, interact with one another on a 'whole is greater than the sum of the parts' basis and need to be brought to fruition against a specified timescale.

Inverness Airport Business Park has a possibly unique set of attributes as a masterplanned business park with airside access, permitted rail halt and an SSCI exemplar new community co-ordinated in one place.

Both the Nigg and Whiteness sites feature prominently in the National Renewables Infrastructure Plan (N-RIP) as two of only four sites in Scotland suitable for integrated manufacture of offshore wind turbines, based on the sites' physical attributes. It is considered that this is worthy of mention in the Plan.

The Inverness Campus project is now well under way and will be a key economic and regeneration driver. It is felt that more narrative could be included to emphasise this and how it relates to other potential development sites in the East Inverness and A96 Corridor.

Likewise the major industrial land allocations at Delny and Highland Deephaven could perhaps with advantage be included in the East Ross Growth Corridor rather than tucked away in the Invergordon and Evanton sections respectively. In the absence of specific proposals for the Delny site, it is unclear why the notes on oil spill contingency and ballast water transfer are included.

Ports and Sites

It is now over ten years since Halcrow completed the Review of Ports and Sites in the Inner Moray Firth and in the context of spatial planning as well as economic development an update of this report would be useful.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We do not agree with this area being planned for development as I stated when the previous plan was issued some years ago. My letter and the other letters of objection from that time should still be on file.

Representation

This area is severely flooded for most of the winter months and is obviously a flood plain area. Any building work in this area would obviously have an effect on the water table levels in the surrounding areas possibly having a detrimental effect on our property. I would like some assurances that any work /development on this site would not have a negative effect/damaging effect on our property. There is also an issue related to the access/egress to/from this site as it would require to be immediately at the bottom of a blind summit hump back bridge. With the amount of traffic and speed of vehicles using this road this would be an accident waiting to happen. Access to the rear of the Railway Station would also be compromised. Currently to access or egress from the Railway Station yard vehicles and especially railway work vehicles require to sweep across to the other side of the road in order to get onto the bridge road. Again a dangerous situation which would only be made more dangerous with more traffic and additional junctions

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Lochloy Road concerns: It is obvious that Lochloy Road is already at capacity and perhaps even beyond capacity. To build an additional 90 houses with an average of 2 cars per household and have these cars run through the Kingsteps community seems not to have been thought through properly. A full transport assessment should have been taken before including this site in the plan. The road through Kingsteps is narrow and many cars still speed through that section of road. If the road was upgraded and widened I fear that this would encourage motorists to further speed through this essentially rural area. Some of the houses at Kingsteps have young children. I fear that at a time when roads are increasingly being planned to make them safer for children, Kingsteps may be made an exception. No access should be taken via Kingsteps. Housing Density Any sympathy I may have had for a development adjacent to Kingsteps (NA2) has gone. I feel 90 houses in such a small area, so far away from the town centre is not in keeping with the rural nature of the area. There are other areas in Nairn where housing density of this level would be more appropriate. Housing density should be consistent with the existing density at Kingsteps. I also have concerns regarding the increased run off that such a large development would create. The water would flow much more quickly into the small burn running between Kingsteps/though NA2. It would certainly increase the risk of the burn overflowing, potentially creating a flood risk for some homes. If any development was to go ahead I think that a buffer zone should be created north of the burn. It should be landscaped appropriately to allow Kingsteps to remain separate and retain it's identity.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I am concerned about the natural beauty of the area where the proposed houses are to be built. It is a well used area by joggers, cyclists, walkers and the school. To my knowledge it is the only local pond within Milton of Leys. The pond is full of frogs and toads, along with a great number of birds and other wildlife. Without a doubt any building work would endanger this wildlife and there may also be protected species within the pond. I was under the impression that the council was committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural local environment, especially those with most valued wildlife habitats (as per the Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1). I am also concerned about the number of houses being built in Milton of Leys at the moment, as the school is already at full capacity. Another 75 houses would surely add significantly to this problem.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04482 Name Ronald & Juliette Chisholm-Broomfield Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference BE1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Additional safeguards to protect neighbours privacy, views and risk of flooding.

Representation

Concerned about development because of risk of flooding, poor ground conditions, lack of sewerage capacity, loss of privacy and views and poor road drainage.

Allocated to Beaulieu BE1 Beaulieu East

Customer Number 04387 Name Ronald Tunstall Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Soth Kingsteps NA2

Reference NA2 Type Change

Comment Changes

This is an objection to the proposed plan on the grounds of: Density Infrastructure Wildlife conservation

Representation

The proposed planning application to develop NA2 South Kingsteps concerns us as the proposed density of houses (90) would be out of character with existing properties in Kingsteps. The infrastructure - The proposed development would generate a major increase in the volume of traffic (approx. 180 cars based on 2 per household on a 90 house development). The road is already seeing an increased usage from the development at Montgomerie Drive which is not going to get any less. The road would require widening which would affect neighbouring properties - is the developer going to bear this cost? The access road from the proposed development meets Lochloy Road on a blind summit and an alternative route should be considered. There is a burn on the site which would need managed. Mains sewer would need increased to cope with housing levels. It should also be noted that this site borders what is marked as a badger conservation area. How would the badgers and their habitat be protected? This is over development of what is essentially a rural area of historic interest and should be protected as such.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Site FR2 I am concerned that the primary school site in Fortrose is at risk of being developed for other purposes. I believe this to be an extremely short term policy with no regard for the possible future needs of the community, especially in view of the excessive new housing. I think this site should revert to agricultural land in the meantime for community use and be retained as a primary school site indefinitely. I do not think there should be an increase in density of the housing over that originally agreed as the increase in traffic congestion is detrimental to the town.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The extent of the proposed expansion of Cawdor Village is grossly excessive and requires to be scaled down. While a proportion of development in areas CD5-7 and CD11 could be viewed as desirable, other proposed development is not.

Representation

A six-fold increase in numbers of houses will ruin what is a historic village and an important tourist attraction in the area. I question the validity of the aspirational population growth figures for the IMF area in light of recent economic changes and suggest they be revised as in 2012 the annual gain from migration into the Highland Council area was only 87 as opposed to the IMFLDP projected gain of 1650. Planning permission already granted between Inverness and Nairn is for around 10000 houses and this should more than satisfy demand for the foreseeable future. The whole plan for the Inner Moray Firth Area requires to be reviewed. Proposed plans for Cawdor will result in the loss of a considerable area of prime agricultural land and create yet another dormitory settlement in the Inverness hinterland. There are very few employment opportunities in the local area which will mean incomers will have to commute to other locations causing even more pressure on the B9090 and A96. Problems of congestion on the A96 have resulted in the B9090 becoming an unofficial Nairn By-pass and further traffic on this road will exacerbate this situation. Areas CD9&10 should be preserved as agricultural land as this land is tenanted land and its loss will impact negatively on the farm business. There is an area of trees with special historic significance between CD9 and Newton Road and these will be compromised by development of this area. CD8 should remain as largely open space in what may, if a reduced level of development takes place, become the village centre.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Changes suggested: The Local Plan - should state that no development of the sites should take place without new road provision in the surrounding area (I would have thought it sensible to concentrate new development in the A96 corridors to the east and west of the town thereby reducing the necessity for traffic to be dragged through the town centre and adjacent residential areas such as Waverley Road with the consequential pedestrian/vehicular conflict and detriment to amenity). The Local Plan should - specify a maximum density for the site which should be low to medium in keeping with and appropriate for the area. It should require the need for a specific landscape and environmental master plan for the sites. It should establish the principal of new development being set back from the road (a building line) which should be similar to the one already existing adjacent to the Firhall Development. It should require housing of a high quality architectural design, careful control of building materials and a respect for the local vernacular. It should establish exacting design standards for the site directly adjacent to the high quality Firhall Development to which it should both compliment and be sympathetic to.

Representation

REPRESENTATION.....The Sites are semi-rural, abutting open countryside. The sites are fronting onto an important visual and environmental corridor which is a key entrance into the town for residents and visitors from the Cawdor area. Tourism is important to the town and preserving and enhancing the environment should be a key objective of the local planning authority. The sites are adjacent and opposite to the Firhall Development, a design of outstanding architectural and landscape/environmental quality of national significance, in my opinion, of which the town should be rightfully proud. The sites are close to other low density developments including "institutions" sitting in their own mature landscaped grounds. I should also add my grave concern regarding the planning application for 232 houses and 87 flats which was recently dealt with. Indeed when I first saw the scheme in the local newspaper my reaction was one of shock and complete disbelief. The proposal, in my opinion, demonstrated a complete contempt and disregard for its setting. In fact it is difficult to imagine any situation where such a high density unimaginative mean proposal would be appropriate. It resembles some sort of military/barracks development devoid of vision and humanity. In conclusion, the fact that such a proposal was submitted emphasises the necessity for the Local Plan to be specific. I consider that the Local Plan should be amended to provide an appropriate context and specific guidance for the preparation (prior to submission) and later assessment of planning applications. If such guidance were in place then hopefully such appalling proposals would never see the light of day.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04496 Name Ruth Boag Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AV7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Ensure sufficient attention is paid to access

Representation

I am not against development but simply want to make sure sufficient attention is paid to access routes. The road access at present into the development site is extremely poor. This applies both along Ormonde Terrace and also over the hill road (single track). I would have serious concerns for public safety if there were further development and access required without a major upgrading of access routes right back to the main road.

Allocated to Avoch AV7 South of Ormonde Terrace

Customer Number 04148 Name Ruth Hunter Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN67 Type Change

Comment Changes

A9 junction is currently unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles as was demonstrated in a subject matters experts report compiled by a local resident.

Representation

This would create an eyesore on the approach to the Highland Capital. The increase in traffic cutting through Milton of Leys to access this business site is a safety concern for a residential area with a large Primary school. The planned West Link road will exacerbate this issue, as vehicles already use Milton of Leys to bypass the struggling Inshes road layout.

Allocated to South Inverness IN67 Bogbain (East)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 04147 Name Ruth Hunter Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN47 Type Change

Comment Changes

Error in the plan, this should be Community zoned and not zoned for Housing.

Representation

This zone was originally zoned for community use. Planning permission was granted for a community park, this was overruled by the Scottish Government to allow charitable homes to be built. There is a clause in the Government ruling which states the only reason homes may be built on this community zoned land is because they are charitable. Therefore, as the charitable homes are not going ahead, this land should return to the community.

Allocated to South Inverness IN47 North East of Milton of Leys School

Customer Number 04147 Name Ruth Hunter Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Change

Comment Changes

Environmental assessment undertaken. Protection of existing pond and wetland. Reduced housing density

Representation

Environmental impact of such dense housing must be addressed before approval. This area is currently used extensively by the community as our only local, easily accessible open space. The only vehicular access point is wholly inadequate. The traffic from such dense housing will have a detrimental effect on road safety on the existing housing area. The existing school cannot support any further increase in the population of its catchment area. Housing will damage and pollute the existing pond and wetland area.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

There is a lack of usable open space in Milton of Leys. In the future this could become a hugely beneficial area, if access addressed.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

area referred to is a vital and necessary retail facility and adjoining industrial estate which has been allowed to become depleted. Local feeling that this should be promoted, revitalised & enhanced rather than taken over for housing.

Representation

area referred to appears to cover what is currently a vital and necessary retail facility on the west canal side of the city this should be kept with the emphasis on promotion, revitalisation & enhancement to the retail facilities rather than taken over for housing

Allocated to

Customer Number 01612 Name Ruth MacLeod Organisation Muirtown Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4

Reference IN13 Former Longman Landfill Type Change

Comment Changes

Whilst not opposed to 'energy to waste' - site detailed is completely wrong for such a development.

Representation

Placing such a development in such a prominent part of city on the edges of the city centre is the wrong site entirely. Such plants have tendency to malfunction and would be far too intrusive. A more appropriate siting for such a plant would be around the location of Ross' Quarry, Nr Daviot - outwith the immediate city, where it would be fairly unobtrusive to the general population. We consider a more appropriate use for this site would be for use as travelling persons site, rather than IN25 as proposed.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN13 Former Longman Landfill

Customer Number 01612 Name Ruth MacLeod Organisation Muirtown Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4

Reference IN25 Torvean Quarry Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove planned travelling persons site from the plan & transfer to IN13, away from the one of the main gateways to the city and off the main tourist route.

Representation

The area nearby is due to be enhanced & developed for West Link & the redevelopment of some leisure facilities. Having a travelling peoples site here is completely out of congress with the area, on the main A86, which is one of the most scenic entrances to the city and there is great feeling that this area should be kept public - land would be better put to use to enhance & improve the site for business & tourism. Travelling persons site should be strongly objected to - as per previous representation... it is felt IN13 Former Longman Infill - would be far more appropriate for such a development.

Allocated to West Inverness IN25 Torvean Quarry

Customer Number 01612 Name Ruth MacLeod Organisation Muirtown Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4

Reference IN29 Dunain Community Woodland Type Change

Comment Changes

Support any movement to keep this area. Strongly object to any other alteration or giving land over to housing.

Representation

This is a well used & well loved community area providing outdoor classrooms, forest walks and wildlife and nature trails and a considerable amount of time, effort and money have been put in by locals, community groups & schools in creating the woodland. This should be kept and protected at all costs. Assurances & action should also be taken to enforce the contractor to be more co-operative with local community and under no circumstances should any other consideration be given to incorporate any part of this area for development other than for protection/enhancement of the facility.

Allocated to West Inverness IN29 Dunain Woodland

Customer Number 01612 Name Ruth MacLeod Organisation Muirtown Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4

Reference IN21 Muirtown Basin Type Change

Comment Changes

For consideration in the preparation of Masterplan on any development of Canal / Muirtown Basin. Wholly support better canal crossing. Retain area as vital recreational/historical facility. No housing.

Representation

Improvement to the Muirtown canal crossing is vital for redevelopment of immediate area. Given it's unique & historic nature, it is essential that land should be retained and safeguarded to enhance existing recreational useage - also by safeguarding this would assist in improvements to improved crossing options at Muirtown. Any housing development should be avoided.

Allocated to West Inverness IN21 Muirtown Basin

Customer Number 01612 Name Ruth MacLeod Organisation Muirtown Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4

Reference IN19 16 Houses at Clachnaharry Quarry site Type Change

Comment Changes

Strongly object - remove from housing consideration & re-zone for green space / nature

Representation

In danger of over developing small village with limited potential to improve road infrastructure which is already problematic due to high volume of vehicular traffic passing & exacerbated with recent new flatted developments it is felt by locals & our committee, who represent the wider local area, that the village is already over developed at present. Strong feelings that the land should be retained and enhanced as much needed & vital green space / nature area where indigenous species wildlife can inhabit which would, compliment the nearby canal & would enhance village life.

Allocated to West Inverness IN19 Clachnaharry Quarry

Customer Number 04062 Name S Grant Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site reference - DW3 -141 homes - Type Change

Comment Changes

Do not consider the area suitable for such a development

Representation

The residents are already bothered with a lot of water accumulating in gardens and Scottish water have had to be called out on numerous occasions to unblock toilets due to rubble blocking drains after heavy rain . The fields are obviouly vey damp with bullrushes growing in them. More houses would exacerbate the problem. Winter conditions - Tulloch Castle Drive is extremely difficult during icy /snowy winter conditions and many cars have to be abandoned lower down the hill. Delivery lorries to Tulloch Castle and refuse collection lorries have both been seen to stuggle on numerous occasions, or have had to reverse back down the hill. More transport using this road in winter would add to the problem. School - not enough space forpotential additional pupils Wild life - these field are a haven for wildlife/birds. This would destroy their natural habitat.

Allocated to Dingwall DW3 Dingwall North

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Amendment to village boundary to enclose all of property ownership at "Torrison" and no safeguarding open space notation on this land.

Representation

Concerned that the modified Local Plan Boundary for Contin leaves my potential 4- House Site Development outside Contin and being in countryside, creating a major obstruction to any repeated Planning Application for this development. This rerouting, damages, if not destroys an asset. There must remain a boundary which contains all of my property and that of my neighbours. Copies of this 1 Local Plan should also go to individuals and bodies whose recommendations influence the final Local Plan My second Application would have been successful but for a reluctant chair person vote against. Both of the previous applications had at that time a Tree Preservation Order existing ignored by some of the planning councillors. Trees on proposed site had a maximum value of £50.00 felled. I invited the Forestry Officer to view these trees. He approved felling confirmed by the then Director of Planning. I expect the order to be rescinded by yourself and not demand of myself, or any other member of the public for that matter, to go, in effect cap in hand to any H.C official requesting cancellation of the order as your Department directs that I do. The proposed site development which is within my garden, you will note has over 60 residents signed support, reduced by one following a death. There is a population of 600 in Contin. My 4 House site Development, must now remain as a potential, with no unfair, or unreasonable obstructions blocking a future applications. On this I must have your assurance. There is a Highland Council proposal to build 4 low cost accommodations at Torview, Contin. When was this project proposed? Please send location and site plans. I would be obliged if this letter is copied to MSP and Highland Councillors whose decisions decided the context of future Local Plan. My Planning Applications 01/00800/FULRC and 03/00383/FULRC stated these applications were premature in respect of Local Plan Reviews. It would be expected the then current Local Plan would have acted as directive. The new Local Plan replacement was in 2007, some years after my application with the boundaries of mine and neighbours unchanged. Why then the reference to "premature" as it did not affect my Planning Application? Letter JMF/MIR of 27th September 2012. T Stott Item 5. states my whole ground and that of my neighbours was retained within the 2007 Local Plan to preserve it as an amenity. Shortly after failure of Planning Application an attempt was made to produce a plan with boundaries along line of the present attempt. When two ground owners noted this, myself included, the attempt was dropped. There is now in process another attempt to have this section of our ground outside the village, despite the claim that to safeguard the woodland it must remain within the village local Plan, and as I must remind you again, destroying the potential of an asset.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Expansion of Settlement Development Area to include land at Torridon, Old Rogie Farm Road.

Representation

[redacted] I have your Department letter of 6th July 2012, with enclosures. Please answer the questions as below, new and those still unanswered to date. Maximum period Highland Council are committed to reply to correspondence from date of receipt, answer please. 1. Names of H.S.P's to whom matters relating to the future Local Plan will be sent in 2013 – answer please. 2. The relining of the Local Plan boundary through my two neighbours ground. Have you contacted them, and if so copies of correspondence please or confirmation of verbal contacts:- Please answer. 3. The Highland Council (H.C.) Planning Environment and Development Committee – are they to receive the existing Local Plan or one of your rerouting through my and neighbours property? – yes or no. If your modifications will the Committee be informed that the rerouting is at least without my permission or approval and why? – answer please. 4. The 2002 Planning Application (copy enclosed from you) has photographs included, What is purpose of these photographs. Please enquire and answer. 5. Both my applications have in their recommendations “XXXX allocations XXXX to Local Plan Review”. Please enquire as to outcome of this Review and notify me – answer please. 6. Your letter IMFLDP MIR of 17th May 2012. States a deadline for “call to sites” was extended from April 2011 to late summer 2011. Exact date of late summer 2011 deadline please. Was our Contin Committee Council Chairman Rev J Gunner informed? Copy of correspondence to him or verbal contact confirming new deadline to him please – answer please. 7. Have you given notice in any form to other Contin residents? If so names please. 8. My letter to you of 20th June 2012 – In that HC forest officer gave clearance to remove trees. I expected a cancellation of Tree Preservation Order. When will it be sent to me? Answer please. 9. Highland Council has or had a motto. What is it or what was it. answer please 10. Unless Highland Council has a remit to damage or destroy a home owners property, you cannot produce a document with a rerouted Local Plan boundary which reduces or destroys the potential of my 4 house site development. Unless you have this remit you will now re-produce a Local Plan with the boundary as exists – answer please. 11. My letter of 28th June 2012. I have I have given you detail to be included in the Main Issue Report as it effects my property. A copy of this Reports sent to me, please. You have had it delivered before your deadline date of 6th July 2012. You are now been given sufficient time to prepare the correct Local Plan with the existing boundary and the Main Issues Report with included the detail affecting my property before submission to Planning Environment and Development Committee. Will you be doing so? Answer please. A number of questions are now to be answered, made up of new and still to be responded to from previous correspondence. Please take note of the number of notices to your department to cancel your version of the new Local Plan boundary restoring to that as present, a route which is that as shown on Plan accompanying Tree Preservation Order document. There maybe yet still some additional questions unanswered which a search on my part may discover. I suggest you now to likewise if only to reduce ongoing correspondence. Yours truly S Fraser

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Expansion of Settlement Development Area to include land at Torridon, Old Rogie Farm Road.

Representation

[redacted] Dear Mr Stott INNER MORAY FIRTH PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT Thank you for your letter of the 23rd October 2013, with the enclosures. A correction please make to those who are relevant in designing the future Local Plan. My proposed four house site plan is within my garden, and not a piece of ground which is, or nearby my property. You request I make representations to the future Local Plan deciding body or persons. My correspondence to yourselves, over the past months has provided this, and can be presented to bodies relevant. I would wish the enclosed plan labelled 'A' and 'B' be added , while not forgetting a copy of my letter to your Mr J Stuart of 3rd June 2013. Yours truly S Fraser

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Expansion of Settlement Development Area to include land at Torridon, Old Rogie Farm Road.

Representation

[redacted] Dear Mr Stott As I understand a committee will, or has examined all information from the various parties who are directly interested in the future Local Plan. Could you please give me names and addresses with telephone numbers of this Planning Committee. The names of the members who voted to retain the existing Local Plan boundary, and those who accepted the change of boundary as it effected my property. After this Planning Committee meets what is the next stage, and if you , or some other public servant body hold further discussions, what notification will be made, and what system employed in advertising these meetings to the public in general. What information will you give or have been giving regarding my house site project and where in writing copies please. Please let me have name, address and telephone number of the proposed Reporter. An early reply would be appreciated. Thank you. S Fraser PS/ Copy of Local Plan issued to be issued to the Planning Committee.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Expansion of Settlement Development Area to include land at Torridon, Old Rogie Farm Road.

Representation

[redacted] INNER MORAY FIRTH DEVELOPMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVE SITES AND USES CONSULTATION Attached letter ref IMFLDP of 16th May 2013 from Scott Dalgarno, Development Plan Manager. I am surprised and alarmed to note that he will not accept Royal Mail correspondence from those like me who do not use computer facilities. Further his comment on time limited to between 16th May to 30th June 2013, has further been reduced , due to his letter being sent out on the 16th May, Notice could have been given weeks if not months in advance, your comment please. In the proposed Inner Moray Firth Plan the Department of Planning and Development, Mr T Stott Principal Planner has modified Local Plan Boundary for Contin to cut through my garden and that of two of my neighbours, without previous consultation. Apparently Highland Council has no obligation to do so. (See letter IMF/MIR of 27th September 2012. Mr T Stott). This alteration leaves my potential 4 House Site Development outside Contin and being in countryside, creating a major obstruction to any repeated Planning Application for this development . This rerouting , damages, if not destroys an asset. Not the function of the Highland Council (H.C.) There must remain a boundary which contains all of my property and that of my neighbours. I would expect your full support in ensuring this, of which proof would be the issuing to me, such a plan. Copies of this Local Plan should also go to individuals and bodies whose recommendations influence the final Local Plan. My second Application would have been successful but for a reluctant chairperson vote against. Both of the previous applications had at that times a Tree Preservation Order existing ignored by some of the planning councillors. Trees on proposed site had a maximum value of £50.00 felled. I invited the Forestry Officer to view these trees He approved felling confirmed by the then Director of Planning. I expect the order to be rescinded by yourself and not demand of myself, or any other member of the public for that matter, to go in effect cap in hand to any HC official requesting cancellation of the order as your Department directs that I do. I would ask you, indeed I think it imperative, you read through correspondence to and from Mr T Stott Development Planning Department. I find some lack of clarity over deadline date changes. I have been requested to read through an email chain to discover one deadline (See IMF/MIR of 27th September2012). Mr Stott's Department refuses still to cancel their boundary chance affecting my property and that of my neighbours despite its affect on asset potential. I repeat. This is not a right of Highland Council. Your comments please. The proposed site development which is within my garden, you will note has over 60 residents signed support, reduced by one following a death. There is a population of 600 in Contin. My 4 House site Development, must now remain as a potential, with no unfair, or unreasonable obstructions blocking a future applications. On this I must have your assurance. There is a Highland Council proposal to build 4 low cost accommodations at Torview, Contin. When was this project proposed? Please send location and site plans. I would be obliged if this letter is copied to MSP and Highland Councillors whose decisions decided the context of future Local Plan. My Planning Applications 01/00800/FULRC and 03/00383/FULRC stated these applications were premature in respect of Local Plan Reviews. It would be expected the then current Local Plan would have acted as directive. The new Local Plan replacement was in 2007, some years after my application with the boundaries of mine and my neighbours unchanged. Why then the reference to "premature" as it did not affect my Planning Application? Letter IMF/MIR of 27th September 2012. T Stott Item 5. States my whole ground and that of my neighbours was retained within the 2007 Local Plan to preserve it as an amenity. Shortly after failure of Planning Application an attempt was made to produce a plan with boundaries along line of the present attempt. When two ground owners noticed this, myself included, the attempt was dropped. There is now in process another attempt to have this section of our ground outside the village, despite the claim that to safeguard the woodland it must remain within the village Local Plan, and as I remind you again, destroying the potential of an asset. Yours Sincerely S Fraser

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I am concerned that there is not enough detail regarding the proposed business' that may be sited at this location. I would be opposed if they are more than tourist business' that would compliment the area and the golf course.

Representation

The Black Isle, North Kessock is an area of natural beauty therefore it should not be spoilt with industrial units. There are more than enough of these industrial areas in Inverness and areas around these that should surely be reclaimed as Brown belt land. I would also be concerned about the safety of children within this area if there was a disproportionate and insensitive consideration of the type of business' allowed driving through the residential housing. the business' would potentially increase traffic which would put children at higher risk. At present this area is only used by residents and therefore with closed roads children and public in general enjoy the freedom to use the residential area and entrance to farmland and woods. this creates peace of mind for parents and public alike as the traffic is minimal and considerably slow appreciating the demographic. I chose to move to this area with the latter point as a priority, the proposal retrospectively takes that informed choice away.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I can not find a detailed plan on the development plan, however I feel that a petrol station, as proposed within North Kessock is not be required and I would like to see it removed from the paln.

Representation

I believe there are plenty of accessible and potentially cheaper alternatives at supermarkets within inverness. I believe these convenient petrol stations are more appropriately situated away from residential housing and places of environmental interest and beauty. You have cited the need for surveys of local potential disruption to wildlife and therefore the likelihood that this would .happen I would also be concerned about the safety of a petrol station in close proximity to residential housing due to potential increased traffic which would put children at higher risk. At present this area is only used by residents and therefore with closed roads children and public in general enjoy the freedom to use the residential area and entrance to farmland and woods. this creates peace of mind for parents and public alike as the traffic is minimal and considerably slow appreciating the demographic. I chose to move to this area with the latter point as a priority, the proposal retrospectively takes that informed choice away.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04383 Name S Tongue Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph IN54 drummond Hill

Reference IN54

Type Change

Comment Changes

The number of homes proposed is too high; would like to see a reduction

Representation

The number of homes proposed is 26. No supporting evidence for this number is provided. From the plan provided,, the apparent density of surrounding developments is much lower: 26 homes appears to be a substantially higher density development. It is hard to envisage how such a high density can be accommodated in such a small space, while addressing the very necessary stated requirements of access, setting, woodland, impact etc. The space currently provides a green space and a wildlife pathway between other green spaces (see aerial view). A much lower density development could mitigate adverse effects on these. The additional traffic and noise issues from such a high density development could also be considerable.

Allocated to South Inverness IN54 Drummond Hill

Customer Number 01003 Name Sainsbury's Supermarkets Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Katherine Pollock Turley Associates

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference NA13 - South of Balmakeith

Type Change

Comment Changes

The description of acceptable uses for this site should be amended to 'Retail'.

Representation

The description of acceptable uses for this site should be amended to 'Retail'. The 'Non-food retail' description provided in the Proposed Local Development Plan does not accurately reflect the existing use on the site (a Sainsbury's supermarket) or the uses permitted under planning permission 07/00099/NA.

Allocated to Nairn NA13 South of Balmakeith

Customer Number 04010 Name Sandra Day Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Strathdearn Type Change

Comment Changes

Less dense development of housing More amenity and infrastructure

Representation

The suggested density of housing without more amenities and infrastructure will be highly detrimental to the quality of life in this small village. The present proposed shop and public house development is too small in scale even for the present population. There is a great need for recreational areas to be preserved and also improved (pathways, amenity planting to ameliorate the woodland clearance for housing) The increase in traffic into the village along , the extra commuting to Inverness by car would be highly detrimental and there would need to be better facilities for public transport, as by bus or by opening the railway station to passengers.

Allocated to Tomatin General General

Customer Number 04010 Name Sandra Day Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Strathdearn

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

As a general comment this present proposed plan will take away the character of the quiet highland villages in this area, which have their own character and value. This plan will lead to the complete urbanisation of this part of the Highlands with its attendant problems.

Representation

As per comment changes representation.

Allocated to Tomatin General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Housing capacity should be reduced from 16 to 8 Requirements should include a clear indication of the expected design in terms of height and style of building e.g. Terraced one and a half or two story properties in keeping with the village. As well as footpath improvements, requirements should include improvements to village and public transport infrastructure, cycleways, and parking provision for residents of the development and neighbouring properties impacted by it.

Representation

Housing capacity should be reduced from 16 to ensure development that is appropriate to the site and adjacent Conservation Village and to ensure that impact on the infrastructure of the village in terms of roads, pavements, parking, public transport infrastructure etc. is minimised and enhanced. The level of provision proposed indicates an expectation that this site would be intensely developed, possibly in the style of flats. This site is highly visible at the entrance of the historic Clachnaharry village both from the road and from the canal. Improvements to the site are welcome but only where they are in keeping with and enhance the area, terraced one and a half or two story properties would be in keeping. Paragraph 4.1 notes the need to maximise the economic potential of the canal and 4.3 notes the historic nature of the Clachnaharry Conservation Village. This site is not within the Conservation Area but does impact on the setting of the conservation area and will be highly visible. This has been demonstrated by the recent flat development opposite the Inn which due to its height and style is highly visible from the canal, conservation village, and from across the water in North Kessock. Any development must be in keeping with the character of the village with a maximum height of two stories and of a design in keeping with the area e.g. terraced. This will enhance both the character of the village and setting of the canal for the benefit of residents and visitors alike. The current proposed capacity of the site indicates that this may not be the case. The capacity of this site will also increase pressure on the already strained infrastructure in the village. No further development should be considered in the village without improvements being made to the infrastructure, particularly on the High Street which is a main road where the volume and speed of traffic is very high. Entrance and exit to the proposed site will be dangerous as it is on a blind bend. The proposal notes the requirement for adequate visibility for access which will be vital. It is hard to see, however, how this might be achieved as already resident and visitor walkers, cyclists, and drivers struggle to safely enter, exit, and cross the road due to the volume and speed of traffic on the main road. Access visibility will have to be coupled with creative and appropriate traffic calming measures and parking provision. Pavements in the village are very narrow and in some places missing completely. There are no cycle lanes within the village. The Council has a requirement to provide 'safe routes to school' for residents and the infrastructure in the village is by no means safe at present - with increased residents this is likely to be made worse. The number of children in the village has increased with the new development of flats opposite the Inn, at least one of these children has already been injured by a passing car. The current poor infrastructure also discourages 'active travel' due to the lack of pavements, cycle ways, safe crossing points and safe bus stops. The current bus stop for going into the city centre requires travellers to stand on the edge of the road - there is no pavement and no bus shelter. In addition, the bus service is intermittent and unreliable and also on occasion fails to stop as those waiting for the bus are often difficult for the driver to see due to lack of a proper bus stop, parked cars etc. A small number of properties on the High Street have no vehicular access to the rear of their properties and have no parking provision. This requires any loading/unloading of vehicles to be done at the front from the busy road and for residents to park on the road or on property belonging to other parties by agreement. This is not sustainable and both of these options are at risk from this proposed development. Any new development must ensure that adequate parking provision is made both for residents of the development but also for the few properties that are impacted by it in terms of the entrance/exit to the site. If further development in the village is to take place then these issues must be addressed both by the Council, through their partners, the developers, and through planning gain. If these issues are not addressed it is likely that there would be strong local objection to any development on this site and the safety and amenity of existing residents greatly reduced.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I object to the proposed plan to build on the playing field (which does not belong to the Council) and car park (CB3 on your plan) in Conon Bridge.

Representation

My objections to building housing on the playing field and car park are as follows. These areas are important resources for the local community and are well used - the playing field is used every day during the summer by local children and is also used for community events. The car park is also a vital resource for the village, and especially for those using the Church, not just on a Sunday, but also for funerals and weddings. If people were forced to park on the surrounding streets, there would be significant congestion. Furthermore, this area, as I understand it, forms part of the flood plain for the River Conon. Highland Council has rejected development plans by others to build on an area just across the road from the CB3 site, citing the reason that it is on the flood plain even though it is in fact higher than the CB3 site. Thirdly, building houses on this CB3 site would significantly alter the character of the village. Finally, Highland Council does not own the playing field forming part of the CB3 site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Objection to promotion of site IN75 in IMFLDP 1. Lead in Groundwater A letter from the Principal Contaminated Land Officer dated 20 February 2012 refers to the British Geological Survey which explains that groundwater in the area east of Inverness exhibits relatively high lead levels derived from granite and metasediments, and the elevated lead measured in the groundwater at the site by Barratt agrees with that survey. Indeed, the tests conducted by Barratt in 2007 revealed that lead was present in the groundwater on average four times higher than the WHO permissible limit for human ingestion. In some bore holes the level was ten times above the permissible limit. In their geo environmental interpretative report, Barratt state no humans can come into contact with this groundwater, therefore there is no need to conduct a risk assessment. However, the approved site layout 70329/040 identifies a pond and other surface areas for the storage of groundwater. Therefore, if the groundwater is already known to be contaminated with lead (irrespective of the housing scheme being hooked up to the mains water supply or not) the storage pond and other areas on site nominated will no doubt contain that water with elevated levels of lead, and if consumed by children or pets will certainly represent a clear specific and present risk. It has not been demonstrated, either by the consent or the SEA, whether the land can support the development so proposed and the site should not have been included in the IMFLDP by Highland Council using that consent as justification as suitable for housing. Indeed, the SEA conducted in respect of site IN75 positively excludes provision for any assessment of groundwater. 2. Pond Management Barratt, the developer, noted there were two ponds on site, one permanent and one temporary and these represented a flood risk that could be managed subject to condition. The ponds would be retained, re-engineered as on site flood management measures. However, by email 19 June 2012 M Macleod to S Black, it is revealed that Barratt filled in that permanent pond as it represented a health and safety concern. Highland Council subsequently served a breach of planning control notice on Barratt dated 22 June 2012, providing Barratt with the option of (i) immediately completing the works they had proposed where these ponds would be re-engineered; (ii) reinstate the pond or (iii) submit an application to regularise the breach. None of these was done. It was 16 months later that the storage pond was worked on. However, any re-engineered pond as a flood management measure will similarly represent a similar health and safety issue as was present for Barratt's workers as for the public once said pond is completed. The principle of development in 1994 is relied upon consistently by the planners. However that did not factor in such matters required to deliver the development. Therefore this represents a significant matter arising, where the continued inclusion of the site in the local plan as a contribution to the supply of housing is in question. 3. Land Contamination The minute of the PED Meeting 23 September 2009 records concerns about land contamination and a lack of testing of the site. In response the Principal contaminated land officer explained "...the developer would not be able to proceed with the development until the site had been fully investigated, remedial work undertaken, and this work validated to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority...Assurances having been given that Local Members would be kept informed of progress, and that the site would be free from contamination before construction commenced, Mr D Henderson, seconded by Mr G Farlow, MOVED that the application be approved as set out in the report" On the 14 October 2011, the site was deemed to have been properly assessed, tested and decontaminated as per the requirements of the planning condition. However, neighbours remained concerned that significant quantities of waste could still be witnessed partly submerged on site. Accordingly they submitted complaints to the Highland Council for example in a letter dated 29 January 2012 they state "Since the second week of November 2011 residents have witnessed significant quantities of waste continuously being recovered from the soil and indeed the workers on the site have expressed concern at the extent of the waste. Given the above and that you appear to consider the works pertaining to the Remediation Strategy completed is the site still contaminated or not"? In response the Highland Council officials adopted a robust position, claiming the site had been tested and remediated properly. However, documents obtained under freedom of information reveal the position stated by Highland Council in response to concerns and complaints was deeply misleading, that the site had not been assessed and decontaminated as claimed:- In an email exchange dated 2 February 2012 involving Barratt's site agent Jeff Calder, contaminated land and Mr Gibson the contaminated land department state; "From visiting the site there is a bit (area 4m x 4m) that was missed in the investigation and should have been removed as part of the remediation. So I have asked for validation of the soils under this area" (Emphasis) An amendment to the site validation certificate took place as a result of this. Then on the 14 March 2012 Barratt's agents reveal there were actually further requirements to deal with contamination. They state:- "There have been three areas where suspected contamination has been discovered previous investigation targeted this location and trace levels of soluble PAH were detected in soils, but appear to have 'missed' the main source...as you can see, we had a tight

offset herringbone grid, but these seem to have 'slipped through' the net" This is of some concern firstly because the assurances provided to the planning committee were not upheld. Rather than the site being free of contamination prior to work starting, the opposite had been the case and unfortunately by this time in 2012 numerous foundations, roads and infrastructure had been laid. Yet another addition to the site validation certificate took place on the 14 June 2012. Therefore there was considerable uncertainty surrounding the status of the site having been properly assessed and remediated. Further gross contamination is evident every time further earthworks are conducted on the various bunds, including further car waste metals and demolition debris. In conclusion of Land Contamination In such circumstances, the allocation of the site in the IMFLDP based on the status of that consent is not realistic because that consent, with buildings and infrastructure covering the land, is a significant obstacle in demonstrating the site is properly as assessed suitable for housing as suggested and not a risk to the public. 4. Footpath The Local plan in 1994 notes the intention of Highland Council to upgrade Resaurie Road in 1998 and also to provide a footpath. That is broadly reflected in a memo dated 1 April 2008 where Mike Stephens Roads department provides advice to the planning officer that the fence line of the site must be moved away from the Resaurie road by a further 2.5m to allow for future road improvements, including the provision of a cyclepath to national cycle path standards. It was explained in the planning report to committee in 2009 that this had been agreed with the developer. The planning consent contained the requirement that prior to the start of work on site a revised site layout should be submitted showing the 2.5m set back to allow for the footpath. However that did not happen, Colin Ross of Roads department explained in a letter dated 17 July 2013 "...While this secured the delivery of the footway/cycleway by the developer it did not require any change to the site layout to allow for the 2.5m width to be routed behind the passing places at the locations initially requested. A change to the site layout would have been required to achieve this and that option was simply not available." This was because the planners did not enforce the condition about the drawing. While the footpath (not a cyclepath to national standard) has been built in 2013 to the benefit of pedestrians, it was not possible to set the fence line back the required 2.5m and still fit all the houses on the site (as explained above). Thereby, the available space for vehicles has actually been reduced under the Barratt regime. Indeed, it is particularly noteworthy that the Council has not responded to the concerns submitted about vehicles having to stop and reverse against the flow of traffic. There is therefore a detriment to the area due to this reduction in available road space, when vehicles meet now they very often have to stop and reverse against the flow of traffic and therefore the inclusion of the site in the IMFLDP as suitable for 64 houses is highly questionable because it appears the Council is placing a priority on the provision of cramming 64 houses on the site, whereas there is no explanation why that is preferred to the issue of a reduction in road safety. For all the above reasons, we object to the promotion of site IN75 in the IMFLDP For Resaurie Residents Association, Sandy Robertson.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Uses: Community Use only as opposed to 'sports pitch' Remove the wording 'non-permanent changing facilities' replace with 'Any built development limited for community use'.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04358 Name Sarah Hartley Organisation Dores & Essich Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DO1 Type Change

Comment Changes

The area marked on the plan is not congruent to the boundaries with adjoining ownership.

Representation

The area is significantly different to that discussed by the Community Council and HSCHT for development of housing. In addition this land is for mixed development of affordable housing with plots for self-build.

Allocated to Dores DO1 Land South of Dores Hall

Customer Number 01310 Name Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robe Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Emelda Maclean Emac Planning LLP

Section 1.Introduction Paragraph Paragraph 1.5: Vision & Spatial Strategy

Reference Site NA8 & NA9 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

The Spatial Strategy shown on Map 1 is supported, which illustrates that Nairn is a key town where the IMF Proposed LDP identifies significant housing within the Local Development Plan (LDP) growth period. The IMF Proposed LDP identifies that it aims to concentrate development on existing settlements, create sustainable new communities, provide the infrastructure and transport network required to support these communities whilst ensuring the area's most valuable built and natural assets are protected. It is considered that the land identified in Appendix 1, which is in the control of the consortium, can fulfill both the spatial strategy and its stated objectives.

Allocated to Nairn General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Development of the locations and uses specified in Section 4, that is sites NA8 and NA9, of the IMF Proposed LDP are supported in accordance with the requirements of Policy 2. It is noted that the requirements relate to provision of the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities required to support new development proposed as indicated in this Plan. Larger sites must be appropriately masterplanned. Each phase of development will require to show its relationship to this overall masterplan and demonstrate how the required infrastructure will be delivered. This Policy is supported, subject to comments on Site NA9. The consortium are concerned over the requirement in the IMF Proposed LDP for the restriction of the commencement of NA9 prior to the completion of NA8.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The consortium supports the Council's identification of Sites NA8 Nairn South and NA9 Nairn South (long term) in the IMF Proposed LDP and the associated requirements for new development at Site NA8. The IMF Proposed LDP identifies Site NA8 Nairn South for 520 homes, business and community use. The requirements for the site are that development is to be in accordance with the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan including phasing; transport assessment; identification of green network and appropriate footpath/cycleway connections; open space provision; education developer contributions; landscaping; consideration of potential heritage impacts; provision of a recreational access management plan; avoidance of any adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar. The commitment by the consortium to delivering the housing land and other land use requirements has been demonstrated by the planning application submitted to The Highland Council (THC) under Ref: 11/04355/FUL. The boundary of the application site is attached in Appendix 2 and relates to residential development of 319 units and associated infrastructure and public open space at land at Cawdor Road, Nairn. The southern boundary of the application site is contiguous with the southern boundary of allocation NA8 Nairn South and the proposed 319 houses and other community uses and open space seek to achieve delivery of Site NA8 Nairn South in accordance with the Nairn South Strategic Masterplan referred to. It is relevant that Application Ref: 11/04355/FUL was recommended for approval by officers of THC, having regard to the development plan and other material considerations, including the requirements referred to above. The application was refused by Members on the grounds of highway capacity. The refusal is currently subject to a planning appeal (DPEA Ref: PPA-270-2097) and is considered to be unjustified and unreasonable. The reason for refusal did not relate to the principle of the proposal as the site is already allocated in the adopted HwLDP. The consortium would wish to make further representations on the Proposed LDP in the event that the decision is of relevance to this Plan. The continued commitment to site NA8 in the IMF Proposed LDP is supported given the above and the requirements of the HwLDP.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01310 Name Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robe Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Emelda Maclean Emac Planning LLP

Section 1.Introduction Paragraph Policy 1 Promoting and Protecting City and Town Ce

Reference NA8 and NA9 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Nairn is identified as a Tier 2 settlement and its stated role under Policy 1 is supported. The allocations at NA8 and NA9 identified in the IMF Proposed LDP will positively support “the vitality and viability of any of the centres” including Nairn, by delivering planned residential and mixed use development, which will in turn support the objectives of Policy 1.

Allocated to Nairn NA8 Nairn South

Customer Number 01310 Name Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robe Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Emelda Maclean Emac Planning LLP

Section 2.Guiding and Delivering Development Paragraph Paragraph 2.10: Housing

Reference NA8 & NA9 Type Change

Comment Changes

Whilst there is general support for the Housing Land Requirement as identified, the consortium note from the HLR Background Paper that the 2010 Housing Land Audit appears to be in the process of being updated and the consortium would support an updated position on the Audit at the earliest opportunity. The consortium would wish to reserve the ability to comment further on this issue in the event that further clarification is provided on these figures during examination of the IMF Proposed LDP.

Representation

Table 1: Housing Land Requirement (HLR) identifies the requirement for the six housing market areas (HMAs) in the Inner Moray Firth Plan area, based on the Council’s 2010 Housing Need and Demand Assessment. The HLR is reflected in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) which underpins the strategic requirements for the IMF Proposed LDP and which already designates sites NA8 & 9 for housing/mixed use development. The Council’s existing commitment to this site clearly requires to be reflected in the IMF Proposed LDP to be in conformity with the HwLDP. In addition, land at Nairn South already contributes to the effective housing land supply as identified in the latest Housing Land Audit and this also justifies the requirement for sites NA8 and NA9 to be identified as an allocation in the IMF Proposed LDP. The figures Identified in Table 1: Housing Land Requirement and Map 4 of the IMF Proposed LDP identify a requirement for housing in Nairn as follows: 2011-2021: 1,562 housing units 2021-2031: 938 housing units Total: 2,500 Table 3 of the HWLDP identifies the following Housing Land Requirement (HLR) for the Housing Market Area (HMA): 2011-2021: 1,593 housing units 2021-2031: 972 housing units Total: 2,565 Within this HMA the HLR appears to have decreased marginally since the adoption of the HwLDP in April 2012. It is also noted from the HLR Background Paper that the 2010 Housing Land Audit appears to be in the process of being updated and the consortium would support an updated position on the Audit at the earliest opportunity. Paragraph 42 of PAN 2/2010 identifies that “Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) requires that a five-year ongoing effective land supply is available to meet the identified housing land requirements. Planning authorities should therefore carry out regular monitoring of housing completions and the progress of sites through the planning process. This can be achieved through the preparation of a housing land audit, carried out annually by the planning authority in conjunction with housing and infrastructure providers.” The consortium would wish to reserve the ability to comment further on this issue in the event that further clarification is provided on these figures during examination of the IMF Proposed LDP The newly stated HLR does not detract from the principle need to continue to allocate the sites at Nairn South to fulfill existing and committed site-specific allocations identified in the HwLDP and as required to deliver the stated Housing Land Supply (HLS). The land within the consortium’s interest can achieve the effective delivery of the HLR for the area.

Allocated to Guiding and Delivering Development

Customer Number 01310 Name Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robe Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Emelda Maclean Emac Planning LLP

Section Appendices Paragraph Proposed Action Programme

Reference Proposed Action Programme NA8 Type Change

Comment Changes

The consortium objects to the 'action' suggested in the Proposed Action Programme in relation to NA8: Nairn South. This states that "The Highland Council will participate in the Pause and Review of development in an early phase of development...". The consortium respectfully requests that the requirement for a pause and review is removed from the LDP.

Representation

The consortium objects to the 'action' suggested in the Proposed Action Programme in relation to NA8: Nairn South. This states that "The Highland Council will participate in the Pause and Review of development in an early phase of development...". The consortium respectfully requests that the requirement for a pause and review is removed from the LDP. It is considered that the requirement for a pause-and review fails to meet the policy tests and requirements for a S75 Obligations and as a result should not be included in the Action Programme. Paragraph 14 of Scottish Government Circular 3/2012 on Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements identifies that Planning obligations made under section 75 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests: o Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; o Serve a planning purpose and, where it is possible to identify infrastructure provision requirements in advance, should relate to development plans; o Relate to the proposed development either as a direct consequence of the development or arising from the cumulative impact of development in the area; o Fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development; o Be reasonable in all other respects. Planning application (Ref: 11/04355/FUL) submitted by the consortium for 319 houses was, as stated earlier in the consortium's submissions, recommended for approval by Officers of THC. The recommendation suggested a S75 Obligation securing a pause and review after the 100th house. The recent appeal lodged by the consortium (DPEA Ref: PPA-270-2097) submitted that the requirement for pause and review was unreasonable on planning grounds. The application site is located within Site NA8 and it is considered that the submissions made on this appeal, on the pause and review issue, also relate to principle of applying this stipulation within the Action Programme. It is considered that it is more appropriate to assess any future applications forthcoming on Site NA8 on their own merits, and that the stipulation in the Action Programme unduly restricts development without planning justification. The consortium would be grateful if the issues raised by the stipulation on the planning application are taken into consideration and that the requirement for a pause and review is removed from the LDP Action Programme: The following reasons were provided on the unreasonable nature of this restriction in the appeal submission, having regard to Scottish Government advice contained in Circular 3/2012: "Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms The requirement is not necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms. The TA confirms that there the proposed development, for 319 houses, is capable of being delivered in its entirety subject to specified road improvements, which are capable of being delivered. The TA does not identify the need for a pause and review after 100 units and the contents of the TA have been accepted by THC's Officer's having regard to professional advice from both Transport Scotland and THC's Access Officer. Paragraph 8.86 of the Report to the SPAC confirms that this requirement is not capable of being secured by a planning condition, and equally this requirement is considered to fail the test for imposition through planning agreement. Serve a planning purpose and, where it is possible to identify infrastructure provision requirements in advance, should relate to development plans The requirement does not serve a planning purpose as there is adequate infrastructure provision to accommodate the proposed 319 houses, having regard to the need to consider the application on its own merits. The requirement for a pause-and-review after 100 houses is not contained in the Development Plan or within Policy 18 of the HwLDP, which is site specific to Nairn South. The pause-and-review requirement is not supported or promoted by the Development Plan. In addition, to the above, the pause-and-review requirement is not supported by the submitted TA. The requirement could result in a review eventually taking place several years down the line and potentially re-open further financial implications for infrastructure provision. In entering in to an obligation that has financial implications, it is considered reasonable that developers can establish the likely costs of the Obligation and be aware of likely requirements through Development Plan policy. This approach is supported by Scottish Government advice contained in paragraph 16 of Circular 3/2012 which states " Planning authorities should satisfy themselves that an obligation is related to the use and development of land. This judgement should be rooted primarily in the development plan. This should enable potential developers to be aware when undertaking development appraisals and in designing their proposals of the: o likelihood of a planning obligation being sought, and, o likely financial requirements of that planning obligation." The Strategic Masterplan – Phases 1 & 2, Nairn South (Document 11) is a material consideration and does identify a requirement for a pause-and-review. As Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) this document does not have the planning weight afforded to a

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

Development Plan as it was not adopted with the HwLDP and has not been issued to the Scottish Government for consideration. The SPG does not form part of the Development Plan. Whilst the SPG is a material consideration, it is considered that little weight should be applied to the requirement for a pause-and-review after 100 houses contained within the SPG. This clause was not included in the Draft Masterplan, subject to public consultation, but was inserted by Members of the Planning, Environment and Development Committee when they resolved to adopt the Masterplan at their meeting on 15th May 2013. As a result, the appellants have not been afforded the opportunity to provide a consultation response on this clause and would have objected to its inclusion had the opportunity for a further consultation been provided on the final version of the Masterplan. Relate to the proposed development either as a direct consequence of the development or arising from the cumulative impact of development in the area/Fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development For the reasons referred to in paragraph 7.4 above, the requirement does not relate to the proposed development either as a direct consequence of the development or arising from the cumulative impact of development in the area or fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development. The TA submitted with the application identifies that the proposal is acceptable on its own merits and can deliver the required local improvements referred to. Paragraph 22 of Circular 3/2012 advises that "Entering into an obligation can have financial consequences for developers and may make proposals uneconomic. Cash flow will also be affected where substantial sums of money have to be paid either before the development gets under way or at an early stage in construction." As stated in paragraph 7.6 above, the requirement could result in a review eventually taking place several years down the line and potentially re-open further financial implications for infrastructure provision. The unknown outcome of the pause-and-review could have significant and unplanned for financial consequences for the appellants. Be reasonable in all other respects The requirement is not reasonable in all other respects. In the event that consent is be granted for 319 houses, the clause would have the potential effect of nullifying a substantial part of the permission, that is 219 houses. The clause is totally unreasonable in practice, effectively requiring work on the ground to stop after 100 houses, which is not a viable proposition, and providing no indication through its terms of when work could resume. Not least the Report to the SPA Committee acknowledges that if any changes were required as a result of the pause and review this may necessitate a further application to the Planning Authority. This would result in further delays, which are not in the control of the appellant. The clause is not practical from a construction viewpoint and would result in an impact on amenity for existing residents whilst work temporarily stopped, and impact on jobs and development viability. The clause is unduly restrictive, unreasonable and serves no planning purpose, on the contrary it will hinder THC's obligation to deliver effective housing land in accordance with the HWLDP at Nairn South on a site that is allocated in the Plan and which has been proven through the application to be acceptable having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations. Purchasers of the first 100 properties could be left living in the middle of a partially completed development, together with a building compound, with other masterplan objectives for the site, including open space and landscaping not being delivered. This could result significant practical and potentially legal difficulties for the developers of the site, associated with the reduced amenity for these properties, causing a loss of value and re-sale value. The situation would be exacerbated by any protraction in the planning process over which the appellants have no control over. Not least, as stated above, the prospect of submitting yet a further application to the Council for further amendments will add to further delays and uncertainty, to the detriment of the amenity of the area and to the delivery of the required housing supply for the area. Whilst the above comments do not detract from the principle planning considerations supporting this appeal, it is respectfully requested that the above comments on clause (i) of the S75 is taken into consideration."

Allocated to				Appendices
--------------	--	--	--	------------

Customer Number 01310 Name Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robe Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Emelda Maclean Emac Planning LLP

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Site NA9 Nairn South (long term)

Reference Site NA9 Nairn South (long term) Type Change

Comment Changes

The consortium supports the allocation and requirements of the allocation, with the exception of the requirement that “no development prior to completion of NA8” should proceed at NA9. Representations below are relevant.

Representation

The consortium supports the allocation of site NA9 Nairn South (long term) in the IMF Proposed LDP, including the requirements of the allocation, with the exception of the requirement that “no development prior to completion of NA8” should proceed at NA9. The consortium supports the identification of Site NA9 Nairn South (long term) for retail, 410 homes, business and community. The additional following requirements are also supported, including that the developer is to prepare a masterplan / development brief which should address phasing; transport assessment identifying requirement for linkages to the proposed A96 (T) bypass; open space provision; education developer contributions; footpath/cycleway connections and linkages to wider area; landscaping; consideration of potential heritage impacts; provision of a recreational access management plan; Flood Risk Assessment; avoidance of any adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar. The consortium objects to the stated requirement that no development should proceed on Site NA9 prior to completion of Site NA8. Whilst the Council has an aspiration that Site NA8 should be completed in its entirety the Planning Authority cannot control the completion date. The Local Authority also has a requirement to ensure the delivery of effective housing land, both within the period of the LDP and in the longer term. In the absence of any control over the completion of the entire allocation of NA8: Nairn South within the period of the LDP (2011-2021), further housing or other mixed use development at NA9 (2021-2031) should not be constrained in the long term, as housing will also be required in this period. The above restriction could prevent a further 410 houses coming forward in the long term in the event that NA8 is not completed within the period anticipated, that is 2011-2021 or shortly thereafter. The consortium requests that the above stated restriction is removed from the IMF Proposed LDP. The suggested and preferred alternative approach would be for the LDP to clarify instead that the delivery of site NA9: Nairn South (long term) is programmed for the period 2021-2031. It is considered that this approach would be consistent with Table 1 of the IMF Proposed LDP and also avoid the delivery of site NA9 being constrained by completion of site NA8 in its entirety. The completion of Site NA8 is not in the control of the Council or the consortium. Site NA9 is within the control of the consortium who intends to deliver development on site NA9 within the period 2021-2031. This restriction has the ability to impede the effective delivery of site NA9 in the period when this development is required. In summary, the consortium supports the objectives and vision for the IMF Proposed LDP, together with the proposed targets for growth, balanced against environmental considerations. The consortium supports the allocations at Nairn South including NA8 and NA9, but considers that the delivery of NA9 should not be constrained by the requirement for NA8 to be completed first, in its entirety. The submitted planning application (THC Ref: 11/04355/FUL) and current planning appeal (DPEA Ref: PPA-270-2097), illustrate the commitment of the consortium to delivering the housing land requirement and other identified land uses at Site NA8. The site already form part of the Council’s effective supply of housing land and therefore requires to be included in the IMF proposed LDP. The consortium remains committed to delivering the objectives for the long term site NA9 through the masterplanning process. The results of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) identify that both these sites are well located to accommodate the development proposed in the IMF Proposed LDP and should be supported. It is respectfully requested that the above representations are taken into consideration in support of the allocation of sites NA8 and NA9 in the LDP.

Allocated to Nairn NA9 Nairn South (long term)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The consortium supports the Council's identification of sites NA8 and NA9 in the IMF Proposed LDP. Pages 802 to 806 of Appendix 4a of the SEA support the allocations of these sites in the IMF Proposed LDP. Having regard to the nature of this assessment, with only 3 negative ratings out of the 36 criteria specified have been attributed to these allocations. The potential negatives, identified by the Council, relate to the fact that the sites are currently Greenfield in status, there will be a material change in their landscape character and a development of the scale proposed would need to include some lighting in the interests of safety however this would be limited to distributor roads. The additional 33 criteria assessed identify that the environmental impacts of the development of these sites would be either neutral or positive. It is considered that, in planning terms, the results of the SEA identify that these sites are well located to accommodate the development proposed in the IMF Proposed LDP and should be supported.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Whilst it is not possible to request a change to this Background Paper, the consortium would be grateful if the following comments are taken into consideration in support of previous submissions on the Proposed Action Programme.

Representation

The Council's summary of responses (MIR Ref: MIR 7.1) on comments on Nairn sites MU4 and MU5 (now referenced in the Proposed IMF LDP as NA8 and NA9) raise concerns for the reasons stated in submissions on the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan: Proposed Action Programme. The Council's response to consultations received states: "An existing Transport Assessment, supports the development of 319 dh at Nairn South on land between Cawdor and Balblair Road, this has been considered by the Council's roads engineers and has been found to be generally acceptable subject to some amendment and with the requirement for a pause and review to assess the impact of traffic as the development progresses. Any further development will need to demonstrate that existing or improved road capacity can accommodate further development prior to the construction of the A96 (T) bypass." The requirement for a pause and review was introduced by Members of The Highland Council when agreeing to the Strategic Masterplan, Phases 1 & 2, Nairn South. This requirement was not subject to consultation and is not supported by the Transport Assessment submitted with the referred to planning application for 319 houses with Site NA8. For the reasons provided in the submissions on the Proposed Action Programme, it is considered that the requirement for a pause and review is inappropriate and not justified on planning grounds.

Allocated to

Customer Number 01310 Name Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robe Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Emelda Maclean Emac Planning LLP

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Paragraphs 3.1, 3.2, 3.5 and 3.6

Reference NA8 & NA9 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

The consortium’s land is located in this growth area and the objectives under section 3.1 are supported, together with the vision identified in section 3.2. In particular, bullet 2 of paragraph 3.5 is supported which confirms that in allocating land for new development in the right places and for the right uses, land for new houses should be in an attractive environment and close to where facilities already exist. Nairn is referred to as such a location. Paragraph 3.6 seeks to also safeguard a network of green spaces, corridors and path networks to protect habitats and species whilst also allowing people and wildlife to travel through these spaces and to co-exist. The consortium supports the objectives of this stated strategy.

Allocated to Strategy for Growth Areas

Customer Number 04271 Name Scott Johnstone Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA1 Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

I feel that the 30 house zoning of Nairnshow Field will mean the loss of a treasured greenfield site at the heart of Nairn. There is also a historical covenant that the land should not be built upon and I think zoning would causing legal action for future development. Finally, there is no shortage of land around Nairn that is already being developed or included in the IMFLDP that could be used for the thirty houses proposed here.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 00662 Name Scottish Prison Service Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable) Mr Neil Gray Colliers International

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 8 Type Change

Comment Changes

In the "Requirements" section of Proposal IN 8, it is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a "Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement "suitable for Class 4,5 6 and 10 uses only" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions.

Representation

Colliers International is retained by Scottish Prison Service as property and planning advisor in relation to its future estate redevelopment project concerning the provision of a new HMP Highland prison facility and any future subsequent re-use of the existing HMP Inverness facility at Porterfield, Inverness. Earlier representations were made to Highland Council's consultation into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) at the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report stages. The most recent being to the Main Issues Report dated May 2012 where SPS made no specific reference to any development site for a future HMP Highland but did indicate that in the event of any future re-location of the existing prison facility away from Porterfield, then the existing property would become surplus to requirements and available for re-development. A further representation dated 7th August 2013 advised Council officers that progress had been made with early feasibility studies on potential development sites that may be suitable to accommodate a future HMP Highland. These feasibility studies are ongoing. Some of the early results, coupled with the site proposals identified in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan, have provided SPS with a degree of comfort to proceed with further investigations concerning a range of land use matters relevant to development in future, such as: accessibility, ground conditions and geotechnical, drainage and flood risk. This remains work in progress and is still subject to the resolution of technical and financial issues. SPS welcomes the Council's support for accommodating a new prison within the City. Accordingly, SPS is pleased to note the Council's broad direction of the IMF LDP Proposed Plan to accommodate the use on larger mixed use allocations where a degree of site layout masterplanning and set-back can be achieved, along with good public transport and other connections where they exist or can be created. SPS notes the Council has recognised "non-residential institutional" use possibilities for sites such as Proposal IN8 and IN82 in this regard. SPS would however wish modification to the Proposed Plan where the specific Use Class 8A "Secure residential institutions" as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Scotland Order 2006, which directs modification to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes (Scotland) Order 1997 at Class 8 (residential institutions) should be inserted. For uses which apply to the Crown, it states at paragraph 16: "Use for the provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks". Proposed modifications to the Proposed Plan are discussed further below in this context. SPS appreciates and supports the Council's development strategy for Central Inverness as explained in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan Paragraph 4.5. SPS particularly welcomes the statement: "Central Inverness' development options are focused on the re-use of previously developed land or reclamation. This Plan will be flexible and encouraging in terms of development proposals on vacant, underutilised, contaminated and potentially surplus sites to aid regeneration. For example, a flexible approach is offered in respect of Longman College, Cameron Barracks and Porterfield Prison to encourage efficient relocation of existing uses and quicker re-use of land and buildings which are vacated. This turnover is healthy and will allow the City to diversify its role and adapt to changing market trends and opportunities." SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 "Former Longman Landfill" for uses described as "Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers". It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include "Class 8A Secure residential institutions". It is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a "Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement "suitable for Class 4,5 6 and 10 uses only" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. It is noted how the Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for the Proposal IN8 site and wider former Longman Landfill. The developer requirement statement reads "...demonstration of no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar as a result of disturbance to or pollution of the SPA or adjacent bird feeding and roosting areas linked to the SPA. The Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for this site and the wider, former Longman Landfill area which would be based on the same guiding principles as listed above. Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application, this may affect the developable area". This is considered by SPS to be a sensible approach to enable site constraints

and limitations to be identified at an early stage in site layout planning. This would also assist the various indicated land uses, including for use Class 8A, to be accommodated in positions that take account of these limitations. By taking a flexible approach to the masterplanning process this can realise a series of positive outcomes – including regeneration of vacant or derelict land; remediation of land previously used as a landfill; creation of new business and community uses that bring people and new investment into the area; place making features can be planned into the site from an early stage which will enhance the setting of this visible location and allow the co-existence of compatible uses within the site. SPS would wish to work with Highland Council in the preparation of the guidance at the appropriate time. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 “Ashton Farm and adjoining land” for uses described as “1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution”. SPS notes the Council’s recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement “1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution” to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 “Porterfield Prison” for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as “Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly” it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed. SPS would be willing to work with Highland Council in the preparation and agreement of a developer masterplan as is indicated as a requirement for this Proposal. SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for ‘suitable for the elderly’. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. Again the specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process. SPS notes the developer requirement to include ‘built heritage value of existing buildings’. The prison buildings are not statutorily listed, however there is a recognition of their historic value as RCAHMS (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland) has recorded the buildings as having historical interest cited for being ‘Victorian prison buildings’. SPS does not consider it appropriate at this time to progress any historical listing exercise in light of the process of estate redevelopment described earlier, as this may prejudice the full potential of the redevelopment project. SPS may consider appropriate property disposal mechanisms available to it. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the ongoing feasibility works in progress at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation

Allocated to	Central Inverness	IN8	Former Longman Landfill	
--------------	-------------------	-----	-------------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for 'suitable for the elderly'. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. The specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process.

Representation

PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCES: IN8 (FORMER LONGMAN LANDFILL), IN82 (ASHTON FARM AND ADJOINING LAND) AND IN2 (PORTERFIELD PRISON). Colliers International is retained by Scottish Prison Service as property and planning advisor in relation to its future estate redevelopment project concerning the provision of a new HMP Highland prison facility and any future subsequent re-use of the existing HMP Inverness facility at Porterfield, Inverness. Earlier representations were made to Highland Council's consultation into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) at the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report stages. The most recent being to the Main Issues Report dated May 2012 where SPS made no specific reference to any development site for a future HMP Highland but did indicate that in the event of any future re-location of the existing prison facility away from Porterfield, then the existing property would become surplus to requirements and available for re-development. A further representation dated 7th August 2013 advised Council officers that progress had been made with early feasibility studies on potential development sites that may be suitable to accommodate a future HMP Highland. These feasibility studies are ongoing. Some of the early results, coupled with the site proposals identified in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan, have provided SPS with a degree of comfort to proceed with further investigations concerning a range of land use matters relevant to development in future, such as: accessibility, ground conditions and geotechnical, drainage and flood risk. This remains work in progress and is still subject to the resolution of technical and financial issues. SPS welcomes the Council's support for accommodating a new prison within the City. Accordingly, SPS is pleased to note the Council's broad direction of the IMF LDP Proposed Plan to accommodate the use on larger mixed use allocations where a degree of site layout masterplanning and set-back can be achieved, along with good public transport and other connections where they exist or can be created. SPS notes the Council has recognised "non-residential institutional" use possibilities for sites such as Proposal IN8 and IN82 in this regard. SPS would however wish modification to the Proposed Plan where the specific Use Class 8A "Secure residential institutions" as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Scotland Order 2006, which directs modification to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes (Scotland) Order 1997 at Class 8 (residential institutions) should be inserted. For uses which apply to the Crown, it states at paragraph 16: "Use for the provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks". Proposed modifications to the Proposed Plan are discussed further below in this context. SPS appreciates and supports the Council's development strategy for Central Inverness as explained in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan Paragraph 4.5. SPS particularly welcomes the statement: "Central Inverness' development options are focused on the re-use of previously developed land or reclamation. This Plan will be flexible and encouraging in terms of development proposals on vacant, underutilised, contaminated and potentially surplus sites to aid regeneration. For example, a flexible approach is offered in respect of Longman College, Cameron Barracks and Porterfield Prison to encourage efficient relocation of existing uses and quicker re-use of land and buildings which are vacated. This turnover is healthy and will allow the City to diversify its role and adapt to changing market trends and opportunities." SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 "Former Longman Landfill" for uses described as "Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers". It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include "Class 8A Secure residential institutions". It is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a "Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement "suitable for Class 4,5 6 and 10 uses only" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. It is noted how the Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for the Proposal IN8 site and wider former Longman Landfill. The developer requirement statement reads "...demonstration of no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar as a result of disturbance to or pollution of the SPA or adjacent bird feeding and roosting areas linked to the SPA. The Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for this site and the wider, former Longman Landfill area which would be based on the same guiding principles as listed above. Flood Risk

Assessment to support any planning application, this may affect the developable area". This is considered by SPS to be a sensible approach to enable site constraints and limitations to be identified at an early stage in site layout planning. This would also assist the various indicated land uses, including for use Class 8A, to be accommodated in positions that take account of these limitations. By taking a flexible approach to the masterplanning process this can realise a series of positive outcomes – including regeneration of vacant or derelict land; remediation of land previously used as a landfill; creation of new business and community uses that bring people and new investment into the area; place making features can be planned into the site from an early stage which will enhance the setting of this visible location and allow the co-existence of compatible uses within the site. SPS would wish to work with Highland Council in the preparation of the guidance at the appropriate time. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 "Ashton Farm and adjoining land" for uses described as "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution". SPS notes the Council's recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 "Porterfield Prison" for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as "Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly" it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed. SPS would be willing to work with Highland Council in the preparation and agreement of a developer masterplan as is indicated as a requirement for this Proposal. SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for 'suitable for the elderly'. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. Again the specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process. SPS notes the developer requirement to include 'built heritage value of existing buildings'. The prison buildings are not statutorily listed, however there is a recognition of their historic value as RCAHMS (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland) has recorded the buildings as having historical interest cited for being 'Victorian prison buildings'. SPS does not consider it appropriate at this time to progress any historical listing exercise in light of the process of estate redevelopment described earlier, as this may prejudice the full potential of the redevelopment project. SPS may consider appropriate property disposal mechanisms available to it. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the ongoing feasibility works in progress at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to	Central Inverness	IN2	Porterfield Prison	
--------------	-------------------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 "Ashton Farm and adjoining land" for uses described as "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution". SPS notes the Council's recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions.

Representation

PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCES: IN8 (FORMER LONGMAN LANDFILL), IN82 (ASHTON FARM AND ADJOINING LAND) AND IN2 (PORTERFIELD PRISON). Colliers International is retained by Scottish Prison Service as property and planning advisor in relation to its future estate redevelopment project concerning the provision of a new HMP Highland prison facility and any future subsequent re-use of the existing HMP Inverness facility at Porterfield, Inverness. Earlier representations were made to Highland Council's consultation into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) at the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report stages. The most recent being to the Main Issues Report dated May 2012 where SPS made no specific reference to any development site for a future HMP Highland but did indicate that in the event of any future re-location of the existing prison facility away from Porterfield, then the existing property would become surplus to requirements and available for re-development. A further representation dated 7th August 2013 advised Council officers that progress had been made with early feasibility studies on potential development sites that may be suitable to accommodate a future HMP Highland. These feasibility studies are ongoing. Some of the early results, coupled with the site proposals identified in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan, have provided SPS with a degree of comfort to proceed with further investigations concerning a range of land use matters relevant to development in future, such as: accessibility, ground conditions and geotechnical, drainage and flood risk. This remains work in progress and is still subject to the resolution of technical and financial issues. SPS welcomes the Council's support for accommodating a new prison within the City. Accordingly, SPS is pleased to note the Council's broad direction of the IMF LDP Proposed Plan to accommodate the use on larger mixed use allocations where a degree of site layout masterplanning and set-back can be achieved, along with good public transport and other connections where they exist or can be created. SPS notes the Council has recognised "non-residential institutional" use possibilities for sites such as Proposal IN8 and IN82 in this regard. SPS would however wish modification to the Proposed Plan where the specific Use Class 8A "Secure residential institutions" as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Scotland Order 2006, which directs modification to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes (Scotland) Order 1997 at Class 8 (residential institutions) should be inserted. For uses which apply to the Crown, it states at paragraph 16: "Use for the provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks". Proposed modifications to the Proposed Plan are discussed further below in this context. SPS appreciates and supports the Council's development strategy for Central Inverness as explained in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan Paragraph 4.5. SPS particularly welcomes the statement: "Central Inverness' development options are focused on the re-use of previously developed land or reclamation. This Plan will be flexible and encouraging in terms of development proposals on vacant, underutilised, contaminated and potentially surplus sites to aid regeneration. For example, a flexible approach is offered in respect of Longman College, Cameron Barracks and Porterfield Prison to encourage efficient relocation of existing uses and quicker re-use of land and buildings which are vacated. This turnover is healthy and will allow the City to diversify its role and adapt to changing market trends and opportunities." SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 "Former Longman Landfill" for uses described as "Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers". It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include "Class 8A Secure residential institutions". It is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a "Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement "suitable for Class 4,5 6 and 10 uses only" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. It is noted how the Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for the Proposal IN8 site and wider former Longman Landfill. The developer requirement statement reads "...demonstration of no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar as a result of disturbance to or pollution of the SPA or adjacent bird feeding and roosting areas linked to the SPA.

The Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for this site and the wider, former Longman Landfill area which would be based on the same guiding principles as listed above. Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application, this may affect the developable area". This is considered by SPS to be a sensible approach to enable site constraints and limitations to be identified at an early stage in site layout planning. This would also assist the various indicated land uses, including for use Class 8A, to be accommodated in positions that take account of these limitations. By taking a flexible approach to the masterplanning process this can realise a series of positive outcomes – including regeneration of vacant or derelict land; remediation of land previously used as a landfill; creation of new business and community uses that bring people and new investment into the area; place making features can be planned into the site from an early stage which will enhance the setting of this visible location and allow the co-existence of compatible uses within the site. SPS would wish to work with Highland Council in the preparation of the guidance at the appropriate time. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 "Ashton Farm and adjoining land" for uses described as "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution". SPS notes the Council's recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 "Porterfield Prison" for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as "Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly" it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed. SPS would be willing to work with Highland Council in the preparation and agreement of a developer masterplan as is indicated as a requirement for this Proposal. SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for 'suitable for the elderly'. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. Again the specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process. SPS notes the developer requirement to include 'built heritage value of existing buildings'. The prison buildings are not statutorily listed, however there is a recognition of their historic value as RCAHMS (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland) has recorded the buildings as having historical interest cited for being 'Victorian prison buildings'. SPS does not consider it appropriate at this time to progress any historical listing exercise in light of the process of estate redevelopment described earlier, as this may prejudice the full potential of the redevelopment project. SPS may consider appropriate property disposal mechanisms available to it. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the ongoing feasibility works in progress at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Colliers International is retained by Scottish Prison Service as property and planning advisor in relation to its future estate redevelopment project concerning the provision of a new HMP Highland prison facility and any future subsequent re-use of the existing HMP Inverness facility at Porterfield, Inverness. Earlier representations were made to Highland Council's consultation into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) at the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report stages. The most recent being to the Main Issues Report dated May 2012 where SPS made no specific reference to any development site for a future HMP Highland but did indicate that in the event of any future re-location of the existing prison facility away from Porterfield, then the existing property would become surplus to requirements and available for re-development. A further representation dated 7th August 2013 advised Council officers that progress had been made with early feasibility studies on potential development sites that may be suitable to accommodate a future HMP Highland. These feasibility studies are ongoing. Some of the early results, coupled with the site proposals identified in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan, have provided SPS with a degree of comfort to proceed with further investigations concerning a range of land use matters relevant to development in future, such as: accessibility, ground conditions and geotechnical, drainage and flood risk. This remains work in progress and is still subject to the resolution of technical and financial issues. SPS welcomes the Council's support for accommodating a new prison within the City. Accordingly, SPS is pleased to note the Council's broad direction of the IMF LDP Proposed Plan to accommodate the use on larger mixed use allocations where a degree of site layout masterplanning and set-back can be achieved, along with good public transport and other connections where they exist or can be created. SPS notes the Council has recognised "non-residential institutional" use possibilities for sites such as Proposal IN8 and IN82 in this regard. SPS would however wish modification to the Proposed Plan where the specific Use Class 8A "Secure residential institutions" as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Scotland Order 2006, which directs modification to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes (Scotland) Order 1997 at Class 8 (residential institutions) should be inserted. For uses which apply to the Crown, it states at paragraph 16: "Use for the provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks". Proposed modifications to the Proposed Plan are discussed further below in this context. SPS appreciates and supports the Council's development strategy for Central Inverness as explained in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan Paragraph 4.5. SPS particularly welcomes the statement: "Central Inverness' development options are focused on the re-use of previously developed land or reclamation. This Plan will be flexible and encouraging in terms of development proposals on vacant, underutilised, contaminated and potentially surplus sites to aid regeneration. For example, a flexible approach is offered in respect of Longman College, Cameron Barracks and Porterfield Prison to encourage efficient relocation of existing uses and quicker re-use of land and buildings which are vacated. This turnover is healthy and will allow the City to diversify its role and adapt to changing market trends and opportunities." SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 "Former Longman Landfill" for uses described as "Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers". It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include "Class 8A Secure residential institutions". It is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a "Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement "suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. It is noted how the Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for the Proposal IN8 site and wider former Longman Landfill. The developer requirement statement reads "...demonstration of no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar as a result of disturbance to or pollution of the SPA or adjacent bird feeding and roosting areas linked to the SPA. The Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for this site and the wider, former Longman Landfill area which would be based on the same guiding principles as listed above. Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application, this may affect the developable area". This is considered by SPS to be a sensible approach to enable site constraints and limitations to be identified at an early stage in site layout planning. This would also assist the various indicated land uses, including for use Class 8A, to be accommodated in positions that take account of these limitations. By taking a flexible approach to the masterplanning process this can realise a series of positive outcomes – including regeneration of vacant or derelict land; remediation of land previously used as a landfill; creation of new business and community uses that bring people and new investment into the area; place making features can be planned into

the site from an early stage which will enhance the setting of this visible location and allow the co-existence of compatible uses within the site. SPS would wish to work with Highland Council in the preparation of the guidance at the appropriate time. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 "Ashton Farm and adjoining land" for uses described as "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution". SPS notes the Council's recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 "Porterfield Prison" for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as "Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly" it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed. SPS would be willing to work with Highland Council in the preparation and agreement of a developer masterplan as is indicated as a requirement for this Proposal. SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for 'suitable for the elderly'. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. Again the specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process. SPS notes the developer requirement to include 'built heritage value of existing buildings'. The prison buildings are not statutorily listed, however there is a recognition of their historic value as RCAHMS (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland) has recorded the buildings as having historical interest cited for being 'Victorian prison buildings'. SPS does not consider it appropriate at this time to progress any historical listing exercise in light of the process of estate redevelopment described earlier, as this may prejudice the full potential of the redevelopment project. SPS may consider appropriate property disposal mechanisms available to it. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the ongoing feasibility works in progress at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to	Central Inverness	IN8	Former Longman Landfill	
--------------	-------------------	-----	-------------------------	--

Customer Number 00662 Name Scottish Prison Service Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable) Mr Neil Gray Colliers International

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN 2 Type Change

Comment Changes

SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 "Porterfield Prison" for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as "Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly" it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed.

Representation

PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCES: IN8 (FORMER LONGMAN LANDFILL), IN82 (ASHTON FARM AND ADJOINING LAND) AND IN2 (PORTERFIELD PRISON). Colliers International is retained by Scottish Prison Service as property and planning advisor in relation to its future estate redevelopment project concerning the provision of a new HMP Highland prison facility and any future subsequent re-use of the existing HMP Inverness facility at Porterfield, Inverness. Earlier representations were made to Highland Council's consultation into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) at the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report stages. The most recent being to the Main Issues Report dated May 2012 where SPS made no specific reference to any development site for a future HMP Highland but did indicate that in the event of any future re-location of the existing prison facility away from Porterfield, then the existing property would become surplus to requirements and available for re-development. A further representation dated 7th August 2013 advised Council officers that progress had been made with early feasibility studies on potential development sites that may be suitable to accommodate a future HMP Highland. These feasibility studies are ongoing. Some of the early results, coupled with the site proposals identified in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan, have provided SPS with a degree of comfort to proceed with further investigations concerning a range of land use matters relevant to development in future, such as: accessibility, ground conditions and geotechnical, drainage and flood risk. This remains work in progress and is still subject to the resolution of technical and financial issues. SPS welcomes the Council's support for accommodating a new prison within the City. Accordingly, SPS is pleased to note the Council's broad direction of the IMF LDP Proposed Plan to accommodate the use on larger mixed use allocations where a degree of site layout masterplanning and set-back can be achieved, along with good public transport and other connections where they exist or can be created. SPS notes the Council has recognised "non-residential institutional" use possibilities for sites such as Proposal IN8 and IN82 in this regard. SPS would however wish modification to the Proposed Plan where the specific Use Class 8A "Secure residential institutions" as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Scotland Order 2006, which directs modification to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes (Scotland) Order 1997 at Class 8 (residential institutions) should be inserted. For uses which apply to the Crown, it states at paragraph 16: "Use for the provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks". Proposed modifications to the Proposed Plan are discussed further below in this context. SPS appreciates and supports the Council's development strategy for Central Inverness as explained in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan Paragraph 4.5. SPS particularly welcomes the statement: "Central Inverness' development options are focused on the re-use of previously developed land or reclamation. This Plan will be flexible and encouraging in terms of development proposals on vacant, underutilised, contaminated and potentially surplus sites to aid regeneration. For example, a flexible approach is offered in respect of Longman College, Cameron Barracks and Porterfield Prison to encourage efficient relocation of existing uses and quicker re-use of land and buildings which are vacated. This turnover is healthy and will allow the City to diversify its role and adapt to changing market trends and opportunities." SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 "Former Longman Landfill" for uses described as "Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers". It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include "Class 8A Secure residential institutions". It is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a "Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement "suitable for Class 4,5 6 and 10 uses only" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. It is noted how the Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for the Proposal IN8 site and wider former Longman Landfill. The developer requirement statement reads "...demonstration of

no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar as a result of disturbance to or pollution of the SPA or adjacent bird feeding and roosting areas linked to the SPA. The Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for this site and the wider, former Longman Landfill area which would be based on the same guiding principles as listed above. Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application, this may affect the developable area". This is considered by SPS to be a sensible approach to enable site constraints and limitations to be identified at an early stage in site layout planning. This would also assist the various indicated land uses, including for use Class 8A, to be accommodated in positions that take account of these limitations. By taking a flexible approach to the masterplanning process this can realise a series of positive outcomes – including regeneration of vacant or derelict land; remediation of land previously used as a landfill; creation of new business and community uses that bring people and new investment into the area; place making features can be planned into the site from an early stage which will enhance the setting of this visible location and allow the co-existence of compatible uses within the site. SPS would wish to work with Highland Council in the preparation of the guidance at the appropriate time. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 "Ashton Farm and adjoining land" for uses described as "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution". SPS notes the Council's recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 "Porterfield Prison" for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as "Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly" it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed. SPS would be willing to work with Highland Council in the preparation and agreement of a developer masterplan as is indicated as a requirement for this Proposal. SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for 'suitable for the elderly'. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. Again the specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process. SPS notes the developer requirement to include 'built heritage value of existing buildings'. The prison buildings are not statutorily listed, however there is a recognition of their historic value as RCAHMS (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland) has recorded the buildings as having historical interest cited for being 'Victorian prison buildings'. SPS does not consider it appropriate at this time to progress any historical listing exercise in light of the process of estate redevelopment described earlier, as this may prejudice the full potential of the redevelopment project. SPS may consider appropriate property disposal mechanisms available to it. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the ongoing feasibility works in progress at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to	Central Inverness	IN2	Porterfield Prison	
--------------	-------------------	-----	--------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 "Former Longman Landfill" for uses described as "Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers". It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include "Class 8A Secure residential institutions".

Representation

Colliers International is retained by Scottish Prison Service as property and planning advisor in relation to its future estate redevelopment project concerning the provision of a new HMP Highland prison facility and any future subsequent re-use of the existing HMP Inverness facility at Porterfield, Inverness. Earlier representations were made to Highland Council's consultation into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) at the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report stages. The most recent being to the Main Issues Report dated May 2012 where SPS made no specific reference to any development site for a future HMP Highland but did indicate that in the event of any future re-location of the existing prison facility away from Porterfield, then the existing property would become surplus to requirements and available for re-development. A further representation dated 7th August 2013 advised Council officers that progress had been made with early feasibility studies on potential development sites that may be suitable to accommodate a future HMP Highland. These feasibility studies are ongoing. Some of the early results, coupled with the site proposals identified in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan, have provided SPS with a degree of comfort to proceed with further investigations concerning a range of land use matters relevant to development in future, such as: accessibility, ground conditions and geotechnical, drainage and flood risk. This remains work in progress and is still subject to the resolution of technical and financial issues. SPS welcomes the Council's support for accommodating a new prison within the City. Accordingly, SPS is pleased to note the Council's broad direction of the IMF LDP Proposed Plan to accommodate the use on larger mixed use allocations where a degree of site layout masterplanning and set-back can be achieved, along with good public transport and other connections where they exist or can be created. SPS notes the Council has recognised "non-residential institutional" use possibilities for sites such as Proposal IN8 and IN82 in this regard. SPS would however wish modification to the Proposed Plan where the specific Use Class 8A "Secure residential institutions" as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Scotland Order 2006, which directs modification to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes (Scotland) Order 1997 at Class 8 (residential institutions) should be inserted. For uses which apply to the Crown, it states at paragraph 16: "Use for the provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks". Proposed modifications to the Proposed Plan are discussed further below in this context. SPS appreciates and supports the Council's development strategy for Central Inverness as explained in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan Paragraph 4.5. SPS particularly welcomes the statement: "Central Inverness' development options are focused on the re-use of previously developed land or reclamation. This Plan will be flexible and encouraging in terms of development proposals on vacant, underutilised, contaminated and potentially surplus sites to aid regeneration. For example, a flexible approach is offered in respect of Longman College, Cameron Barracks and Porterfield Prison to encourage efficient relocation of existing uses and quicker re-use of land and buildings which are vacated. This turnover is healthy and will allow the City to diversify its role and adapt to changing market trends and opportunities." SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 "Former Longman Landfill" for uses described as "Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers". It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include "Class 8A Secure residential institutions". It is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a "Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement "suitable for Class 4,5 6 and 10 uses only" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. It is noted how the Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for the Proposal IN8 site and wider former Longman Landfill. The developer requirement statement reads "...demonstration of no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar as a result of disturbance to or pollution of the SPA or adjacent bird feeding and roosting areas linked to the SPA. The Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for this site and the wider, former Longman Landfill area which would be based on the same guiding principles as

listed above. Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application, this may affect the developable area". This is considered by SPS to be a sensible approach to enable site constraints and limitations to be identified at an early stage in site layout planning. This would also assist the various indicated land uses, including for use Class 8A, to be accommodated in positions that take account of these limitations. By taking a flexible approach to the masterplanning process this can realise a series of positive outcomes – including regeneration of vacant or derelict land; remediation of land previously used as a landfill; creation of new business and community uses that bring people and new investment into the area; place making features can be planned into the site from an early stage which will enhance the setting of this visible location and allow the co-existence of compatible uses within the site. SPS would wish to work with Highland Council in the preparation of the guidance at the appropriate time. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 "Ashton Farm and adjoining land" for uses described as "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution". SPS notes the Council's recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement "1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution" to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 "Porterfield Prison" for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as "Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly" it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed. SPS would be willing to work with Highland Council in the preparation and agreement of a developer masterplan as is indicated as a requirement for this Proposal. SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for 'suitable for the elderly'. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. Again the specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process. SPS notes the developer requirement to include 'built heritage value of existing buildings'. The prison buildings are not statutorily listed, however there is a recognition of their historic value as RCAHMS (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland) has recorded the buildings as having historical interest cited for being 'Victorian prison buildings'. SPS does not consider it appropriate at this time to progress any historical listing exercise in light of the process of estate redevelopment described earlier, as this may prejudice the full potential of the redevelopment project. SPS may consider appropriate property disposal mechanisms available to it. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the ongoing feasibility works in progress at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to	Central Inverness	IN8	Former Longman Landfill	
--------------	-------------------	-----	-------------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We request that that the Council does not allocate the land at Inverness Harbour Marina (IN9) as a development allocation.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client Scottish Provincial Press Ltd. Our client owns a property at Stadium Road, Inverness and wishes to object to the proposals for the land at Inverness Harbour Marina (Allocation IN9). Scottish Provincial Press Ltd is a privately owned company producing fifteen weekly newspapers covering Caithness, Sutherland, Ross-shire, Inverness-shire, Strathspey, Moray and Banffshire. The newspapers are produced from 11 offices, one of which is based at Stadium Road, Inverness. Scottish Provincial Press Ltd fully supports the enhancement of this waterfront area. However, it is considered that the extent of the proposed development and the uses proposed will impact on the existing businesses at this location. Development Allocations Site IN9: Land to South and East of Inverness Harbour Marina The proposed allocation at Inverness Harbour Marina allows for a variety of uses including business, industrial, tourism, retail and leisure. This designation allows for a wide range of uses and does not provide any guidance on how these uses will be integrated with the surrounding land uses. The proposed designation provides no indication of floorspaces that would be allowed at this site. The allocation of this site and the requirements also do not identify any phasing for the development of the site. In particular, our client is concerned about the potential for industrial use at this location. In proposing industrial use at this location the Council has not taken into consideration noise impact on the existing businesses in this location. Noise associated with the proposed industrial use at this location has the potential to have significant impacts on existing businesses. The allocation of this site has also not taken into account transport implications associated with the increase in traffic in this area, particularly the scale of vehicles associated with industrial development. An industrial development at this location also has the potential to raise air quality issues and visual impacts at this important waterfront location. The Proposals Map suggests that a significant area of land reclamation will be undertaken. It is unclear from the proposed requirements what this reclaimed area will be used for and how far it will extend. We consider that given the constraints associated with the site and the impact on the existing land uses, this site should not be identified as a development allocation in the emerging Local Development Plan. Main Issues Report This site was not identified as a preferred development site at the Main Issues Report consultation stage. At the Main Issues Report consultation stage the Council had identified a number of constraints associated with the site including the following: •Flood Risk •Impact on Natural Heritage •Visual Prominence We fully agree with the Council's assessment of the site at the Main Issues Report stage. We consider that this site should not be identified as a development site in the Local Development Plan. We also fully agree that this is a visually prominent and important waterfront location and the development of this area would have significant visual impacts, particularly associated with the proposed industrial use. The development of this site also has the potential to impact on the existing land uses in terms of traffic and noise. It is unclear why The Highland Council is now supporting the allocation of this site at the Proposed Plan stage. The importance of this waterfront location and the visual prominence any development would have should be fully recognised in the preparation of the Local Development Plan. We request that the Council takes into account the impact on the existing land uses and the important local and regional economic resource that these existing businesses provide. We request that the Council does not allocate the land at Inverness Harbour Marina as a development allocation. We trust that the above comments will be taken into consideration in the preparation of the Local Development Plan. As a neighbouring property, our client requests that they are fully consulted on any development brief or masterplan that is prepared for this site.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04403 Name Scottish Widows Investment Organisation Scottish Widows Investment Partnership Property Trust

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Phil Pritchett Pritchett Planning Consultancy

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Site INF55, page 45 Type Change

Comment Changes

The site allocation is for mixed use and there is no justification or reasoning for specifying exact uses at this stage. The site is already identified in the HWLDP as mixed use and that plan states that a development framework will be produced for a wider area than the site now identified in the IMFLDP. The two plans are contradictory in wording and in site allocations. The IMFLDP should be consistent with the HWLDP and it is not. The site INF55 should be simply identified for mixed use as lying adjacent to the identified Inshes District Centre.

Representation

The IMFLDP should be consistent with the HWLDP. The site allocation at INF55 is not consistent with the HWLDP in that it specifies a restricted range of uses with no reasoned justification whereas the HWLDP coupled together with the saved policies of the Inverness Local Plan allow for a range of mixed uses and assessment of such uses against a broad range of policy criteria. There is no reasoned justification for identifying a restricted range of uses on this site. It is sufficient to identify the site for mixed use which would be compatible with the HWLDP. The reference to the development framework should be the same as that contained in the HWLDP as otherwise there is inconsistency in approach. The allocation is also inconsistent with the HWLDP as there is different wording relating to road improvements/drainage improvements contained in the HWLDP. None of the LDP documents indicate any specific proposals for trunk road improvements or drainage improvements in the Inshes area and as such it is not appropriate for a site specific land allocation in INF55 to specifically refer to such detailed issues in respect of one particular site where there is no indication on the proposals map or elsewhere in the plan which proposals are being referred to. The references to infrastructure works should be adjusted so as to be consistent with the HWLDP.

Allocated to South Inverness IN55 Land at Dell of Inshes

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The development of the land proposed under Sites AV3, AV4 and AV5 would represent a substantial loss of good agricultural land. The land is currently worked by a family partnership who are long term tenants of the land owners. To date no formal approach has been made to the tenants to discuss the removal of this land from their lease. It should be noted that Site AV5 comprises the farm steadings at Muiralehouse Farm which is the principal centre for the tenant farmers' operations on this and two other neighbouring farms. Concern is also expressed as to the impact which development of such significant areas would have on the infrastructure of the surrounding area particularly as regards roads and schools.. The proposal to allocate Site AV5 for business use must also be questioned in that there is no identifiable need for additional land to be provided for these uses in Avoch and even if there were, the location of the proposed site for business purposes adjacent to the entrance to the village is not thought to be appropriate.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

look at the indicative housing densities in relation to the potential for mitigating the road junction at Rosskeen

Representation

We refer to the notification of the publication of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan sent to us with reference to site AL4. Having read the document together with other documents and maps referred to we are struck by the enormity of the task attempted and are generally supportive of the policies and vision set out. The realization of those policies and vision over the next 20 years is the real challenge. We have particular concerns relating to the impact of introducing the indicative housing capacities of 693 houses for AL2,AL3,AL4,AL6, and AL7. Our concerns relate specifically to two aspects. Namely the implied traffic generated and the apparent dangers of piecemeal development. It is noted that for AL3 and AL4 a transport assessment in particular to determine appropriate mitigation measures on the road between Mossfield and the A9 trunk road will be required.. Whereas for AL2 and AL6 there is only mention of the Old Milnafua Road upgrade. The proposal for near continuous housing between Obsdale School and Mossfield will hugely increase traffic attempting to join the A9 at the Rosskeen Church junction. There is no reason to think that pressure will not include a significant proportion of traffic from AL2 and AL6. In any event there is no indication of what such mitigation measures may be, though para 3.19 mentions improvements to important A9 junctions including Rosskeen. As residents we have been using this junction on a daily basis for over 30 years. The time taken to safely join the 60 mph traffic stream has noticeably increased particularly at peak times. That the authorities have erected an electronic sign warning A9 users of traffic turning ahead is an indication of the concern at the traffic accident record of this junction. Our point is that the A9 is already struggling to cope with demand. The designation of indicative housing capacities appears not to acknowledge the real difficulty of finding a safe solution to the junction. Neither does it acknowledge the steep left hand bend of the Old Milnafua Road as it enters Mossfield nor the 10-15 meters sight lines at the junction with the Mossfield Rosskeen church road. Mitigation measures would appear to be limited by garden boundaries along this road. A safe resolution of these traffic pressures is likely to be very difficult to achieve and may even require a separate road from AL3. We fear that even were a feasible solution found, the relatively quiet rural character of Mossfield will be changed for the worse. We turn to our second main area of concern and refer to the brief entries for AL2, AL3, AL4, AL6 and AL7 and the general dangers from piecemeal and un-coordinated development.. It is noted that for AL2 (248 houses) and AL6 (206 houses) the developer is required to prepare a masterplan/brief to be agreed with the council. This is not stated for AL3 (111 houses), AL4 (48 houses), nor AL7 (77 houses). This approach appears piecemeal. Given that the expansion of housing in Alness is likely to be a gradual one over the next 20 years it is hard to see how the various parcels of land will deliver the ideals set out in particular in Policy 29 (Design Quality and Place making) and Policy 74 (Green Networks). The holistic delivery of these and other policies through the commitment of commercial developers does not seem very likely. We would suggest that the expansion of Alness warrants a charrette process involving the entire community. This approach has been encouraged elsewhere in the Highlands such as Wick and Thurso. The process might also include staff and students from academic planning courses and the local schools. The process could examine the issues in far more detail than is currently presented and at least explore some realistic scenarios. We have some comments relating to site AL4 nearest to our property. It is noticed that for AL3 issues to be addressed include “ set back from pylons and associated power lines....”. If this is relevant for AL3 then it is critical for AL4 where there is no such comment. We suspect this may be an error but if not it is an oversight. The main grid marches to the edge of this site where the ground falls steeply making development unlikely. Nonetheless the site is designated as suitable for 48 houses some 3 times the density of existing housing at Mossfield. Again the process for calculating indicative housing capacity seems to be driven by the need to match numbers required than by any relationship to the existing housing density and character. We suggest that such density as indicated is inappropriate, and detrimental to the existing community and does not reflect the aspirations expressed elsewhere in the planning guidance. Finally we would make the following suggestions. There is mention in para 2.17 that work is progressing on the Rossshire Green Network. This is encouraging and awaited with interest. We wonder if the potential of the nearly worked out Caplich Quarry is being considered. With a little ingenuity and cooperation this large space could be made safe for access as a hugely beneficial recreational and wildlife resource in close proximity to the expanding Alness. We see no specific mention of the importance of minimizing light pollution. One of the enduring pleasures of living in Rossshire is the relatively dark sky at night with the marvelous star scape and occasional display of the Northern Lights. This is something frequently noticed with delight by visitors to the north. This may be mentioned but not found. At least it needs to be flagged up with emphasis on the need to use the least light polluting systems available. This should also tie in with the Carbon Clever agenda. There have been numerous examples over the past 30 years of thoughtless costly over provision of street lighting

spreading the orange glow. More recently the spread of ill directed domestic and commercial security lighting has started to impact on the beauty of the night sky. THC policy could more clearly address this issue.

Allocated to Alness General General

Customer Number 04128 Name Sebastian Woodward Organisation Springfield Properties Plc.

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA5 - Lochloy Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Springfield Properties support this site allocation and look forward to seeing it pushed through the examination process and included in the final adopted version of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.

Allocated to Nairn NA5 Lochloy

Customer Number 04268 Name Seonaid Duncan Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN45 Type Change

Comment Changes

No housing on IN45

Representation

We live at, and own Inshes Farm. My husbands uncle currently farms the land and it has been a source of economic support and income generation in the locality for over 40 years. The farm will then be passed on to my husband Neil and his brother Alan. Neil and I also have two sons, one of which is only 11 and can already plough, sew, harvest etc, anything that is required for farming, both our sons intend to farm Inshes when they become of age. We also have a number of important wildlife species as per LBAP and I don't believe the council would be taking full recognition of their national and international responsibilities if they proceeded with the intended house building. I understand that the Crofters commission is keen for small crofts to be maintained which adds weight to our argument. Also, there have been a lot of houses built down the hill from where we stay and I am aware of at least 3 houses that have been flooded, one of which cannot get house insurance as they have been flooded 3 times. Obviously the current drainage system is not adequate. Our children both attend Inshes Primary school and I am aware that it is almost at capacity, There is no parking outside the school so therefore causes congestion at various times throughout the day so adding to this would be total madness not to mention increased air pollution. Im extremely worried for the safety of my children accessing the school because of the traffic problem and the current infrastructure simply does not support the intended increase in population.

Allocated to South Inverness IN45 Inshes Small Holdings (south)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

We wish to strongly object to the allocation of land at Bogbain Wood (Reference IN 49) for the development of 75 Homes, Business and Tourism. The existing Inverness Local Plan, Adopted 2006 may have allocated this land for development and there may have been permissions granted on this site, but this Replacement LDP allows the Council an opportunity to re-assess the site characteristics and existing uses and re-examine the issues and opinions of local people as they are now. As a result, we believe the land should now be safeguarded from development and thus object to the proposed allocation to build 75 houses on Bogbain Wood.

Representation

As an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living and the quality of life of the immediate and wider community. Furthermore, we feel that there has been a lack of opportunity for public participation in the preparation of these plans as this notification letter was the first we heard about it. Our initial objections are as follows: 1. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities We believe that the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of our area and the amenities enjoyed by local residents. It does not respect local context and would be entirely out of character for the area, to the detriment of the local environment. This proposal would harm the amenities enjoyed by local residents, in particular the loss of valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. In addition, the proposed development is on land which not only the local, but also the wider community enjoy and use regularly for a range of outdoor activities. This land has long been established for recreational use, not just for Milton of Leys residents, but for many people in Inverness and outlying areas. There are a network of paths and rights of way, some constructed, but many made by the frequent passage of people and animals. All year round the area is enjoyed by many walkers, joggers, cyclists, cross country skiers and bird & wildlife enthusiasts. To develop this area would result in the detrimental loss of a natural recreational area and pedestrian 'rights of way' network, which currently benefits the Highland people. This area benefits the health, wellbeing and education of the people of the Highlands and should therefore be safeguarded from development. The land is naturally diverse, encompassing open grasslands and moorlands, heather, watercourses, ponds, historic landmarks and a mixed variety of trees. As a result, primary and secondary school children frequently visit the area to carry out project work where they learn about the natural environment and wildlife at first hand. We do not find this natural diversity in forestry plantations, manicured parks, play areas or agricultural land and the fact this area is easily accessible to the public makes it a unique natural resource on our doorstep which should be protected. 2. The loss of valuable open space One of the council's broad aims is to protect or enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area concerned is a wildlife haven for many birds and animals and adds significantly to the area. The proposed allocation for development would contravene the Policies, Aims and Vision for the Highlands as set out in the Council's 'Highland Wide Local Development Plan' (HWLDP), recently adopted in April 2012. It sets out the overarching spatial planning policy for the Highland Council area and represents their up to date Policies and Statements. Within this Document they refer to the "need to safeguard special places, to create and maintain green networks and corridors, to preserve open space that improves the quality of life for visitors and residents and to ensure people of the Highlands have access to the outdoors". We believe Policies 60, 74 and 75 in particular are not being adhered to with regard to the allocation of this land. Furthermore, the Government Planning Policy Statement PPS1, Paragraphs 17 – 19 states that: The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. We believe the proposal contravenes this guidance as it is to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area.

It is important that the Council protects and enhances the local environment, including wildlife habitats, trees and woodland parks and gardens, urban open space, water resources and the greenbelt. It should also be protected for current and future generations to use and enjoy. 3. Loss of privacy for the occupants of adjacent residential properties. In line with our right to quiet enjoyment of garden amenities we would urge you to consider the responsibilities under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes home and other land. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. The protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. We believe that the proposed development would not result in a benefit to our area. To the contrary it would lead to the loss of valuable green space and the enjoyment of that land by the public. 4. This area forms the gateway into an important green space on the edge of existing development where wildlife live and people enjoy recreational use without detriment to each other. This area is indeed a 'green corridor,' which leads to Daviot Woods, General Wade's Road and the wider network of open space. This land provides the natural 'buffer zone' between the built and natural environment. To encroach into this land and extend the current boundary line of development would adversely impact on wildlife, the environment and local people. We object to the proposed loss of this 'green corridor' and to the proposed inappropriate extension of the settlement boundary. 5. We object because alternative and more appropriate sites for housing and business development are available. Furthermore, in the 'Main Issues Report', the document which preceded this Proposed LDP, in paragraph 7.12 it states:- "Inverness has significant physical constraints that guide the optimum location for further development. Higher land and steep slopes to the west and south, plus firths to the north explain why Inverness is committed to eastward expansion. Higher and sloping land is on average more expensive to develop and service and offers a poorer living environment." It therefore seems incredulous that this land, identified "as south inverness" in the 'Development Allocations' of the HWLDP, is therefore once again allocated for housing and business development despite the Council's New Strategy for growth of the city as outlined above. This land is certainly a valuable resource, not for future developers, but for local people and wildlife and thus it should be safeguarded from development in accordance with the Council's own planning policies. We would be grateful if the Council would take our objections into consideration when deciding on this proposal for a developer to build 75 homes on Bogbain Wood; an area that we feel should be left as it is for everyone, as well as future generations, to continue to enjoy and appreciate.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number 03934 Name Shirley Frasert Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CU7 Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove the proposal to have this land allocated for housing if no business, retail of office use is found.

Representation

This is a small parcel of land that Cairn Housing own and they have already applied for and had refused an application to have 8, then 6 flats situated upon it. Their plans were considered unsympathetic for the site. An appeal to the Scottish Government also failed. I have no doubt they will pursue a planning change to allow them to develop this plot at any cost. I find it strange that the Highland Council is now attempting to ratify this in their new plan, one could almost suggest they are working hand in glove with them. There is a lot of local opposition to Cairns plans. Affordable housing is not only not wanted within Culbokie, but there is an over provision of it. I can not see how this change would be justified and even an argument could be made, then there is plenty of other land in the area that could be used, rather than have all the affordable housing at one end of the village.

Allocated to Culbokie CU7 East of Old Primary School

Customer Number 03934 Name Shirley Frasert Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference CU6 Type Change

Comment Changes

Remove CU6 from future developments in respect to housing etc.

Representation

I note that CU6 includes an area that is already divided into serviced plots and has planning permission. I would consider in the circumstances this is inappropriate to be included in your future development plan. I am also alarmed that the other part of this area, to the south of the above, presently agricultural land, is allocated for housing. I consider this to be an over provision in an area already densely populated and over developed.

Allocated to Culbokie CU6 North of Schoolcroft

Customer Number 04392 Name Shona Wescott Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.41

Reference NA1 Former Showfield East Type Change

Comment Changes

No houses to be built on this site

Representation

This area should be kept as a green space, and continue to be used solely for the purpose of leisure as it is now, any development should be for a better play park. Lodeghill Road is a busy thoroughfare for cars and school pupils, ending in a very dangerous junction onto Waverley Road which certainly does not need any more traffic. I would like a better explanation of what is described as Improvement of footpaths too, this is not at all clear from description or maps? I say again there is little enough green space in the centre of Nairn as it is, this area should not be used for housing.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Delete the provision that would allow this land to be reassigned to housing.

Representation

I refer to the above. Please pass on my comments to the appropriate person or inform me who that is and I will do it. It is not clear on your site how one should address any observations. In relation to the recent draft Development Plan, specifically at CU7. Land east of the Old Primary School, Culbokie. I note the your comments and those made by the Culbokie Development Group and the Fenintosh Community Council. The former who have stated it is their opinion that the land is unsuitable for housing. I wholeheartedly agree. Put basically, your proposals in this plan are fatally flawed. Cairn Housing own this land and have a pending change of use application to permit them to use this land to their own advantage in the provision of social housing. It has not been progressed, so I presume they have anticipated your opinion as to the possible future use of the land in this report. Your comments do appear to be a fait accompli in that it gives Cairn latitude to potentially restrictively market the land for a token 6 months, unrealistic in the present economic climate, and in all probably at inflated price, which would not attract any interest, merely to satisfy the conditions that would then allow them to justifiably apply to a change of use for the land. You then state that potentially 6 units would be put onto this small piece of land. It is totally unsuitable and unneeded and contrary what a lot of residents would prefer to happen to this land. I therefore object to you proposals. Historically, Cairn Housing purchased this plot several years ago, arrogantly assuming they would be allowed to develop it for affordable housing, departing from the then local plan which allocated it for business use. To potentially build high density accommodation blocks, is totally incompatible with the designation of this land under the last Structure Policy Plan G2 and as stated, against the majority wishes of the local community. Unfortunately, this misconception was endorsed by the misguided Councils Estate Department on disposal of the land and by the local Planning Office. Thankfully, it was rejected by the Planning Committee. Cairn then went to appeal and lost. Reference should be made to the Reporters Appeal Decision, which state the reasons why. Encapsulated, this report states that the site hasn't been marketed for any form of business, so it cant be established that there is no demand for that use. How could it, for all intents and purposes, it seems that a behind closed doors deal was done prior to it becoming surplus. That itself requires investigation and the results made public. Cairn then utilised the land as a Builders Site for a substantial period of time, whilst constructing affordable housing at another site a short distance away at Raven Croft. Now that development is completed, they now seek to change the usage of this plot as a precursor to development. Culbokie has reached a saturation point with affordable housing with its present infrastructure. The Raven Croft development still has vacant property if we are to believe the For Sale/Reserved sign in the windows there. We do not need more, nor do we need it in the concentration that is proposed. By placing any development so close to an existing one, there is a real danger that the east end of Culbokie will become known as the poorer part. There is a high possibility that potential residents will not be integrated, but ghettoised with all the potential problems that will entail. A social error in the making that accentuates Cairns lack of vision beyond the build and one that could be endorsed by you plan. The site is physically very small in any case. 0.29 acre, yet under former proposals, Cairn was willing to squeeze 8 flats in, all being 3 person properties. In a desperate attempt to have plans passed, they reduced this to 6 flats. I would maintain the site is unsuitable per se. Properties would have to be built right on the boundaries with the pavement. There are also physical limitations and concerns with regards to drainage, the site slopes away to the north by a meter overall, increased traffic, congestion, parking and the existing residents privacy would not only be compromised, but severely encroached upon. This would transpose to a diminution of private property values locally. Cairn earlier this year engaged in a meeting with near neighbours. They stated they did not intend to develop this land for at least 2 years and were open to the site being used for a community asset in the meantime. There was a hint that they would consider a community buy out. I view this meeting as being an appeasement to satisfy their ultimate motive to build on this land. It is my impression they are less than genuine in engaging with the local community unless they think it will help their cause. Put simply, they are not to be trusted. What I can say with conviction is as a local resident for the last 20 years, I am getting weary with all the development there has been recently in this part of the village, be it the conversion of the local Church, the upgrade of the access road, the provision of private housing plots to the north or indeed Cairns previous planning attempt and their builders site. Time should be called on them now and prevent further speculation on the future of this site and your plan should be the starting point not the green light. [redacted]

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Simpson Highview along with Mr and Mrs Grant have prepared a joint submission regarding how the Inshes District Park can be safeguarded. The landowners' support the need for safeguarding the park and wish to invest in its future. Please refer to the attached representation proposing a finish of the Park at Site Proposal IN61.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

For site reference IN 61 add "community/commercial" use allocation to land as indicated, lying to the north edge of Inshes Park.

Representation

With regard to 'South Inverness' Para 4.12-4.14 of the Proposed Plan. The south side of Inverness has seen considerable expansion. These new neighbourhoods place demands on the access to and use of open space, such as Inshes District Park. The landowner proposals for IN61 will assist Highland Council in completion of the north edge of Inshes District Park and help safeguard its long term existence. This meets the strategy set out for the South Inverness area. This is an approach by both landowners to demonstrate that the site (as per indicative masterplan) is a deliverable and viable commercial opportunity. The subject site lies vacant, positioned on the northern edge of Inshes District Park adjacent to Inshes Primary School. It presently offers no amenity value or economic benefit to the local area. It is not in the ownership of Highland Council who are leading the completion of Inshes District Park. We fully support the Council's proposals for Inshes District Park. However, this land has been allocated for community use/park use for a number of years without being delivered. We have undertaken a review of the Council's Proposed Layout for Inshes District Park. The proposals include the creation of access to the adjacent consented 5 a-side sports complex and boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. The remainder of the site has no specific requirement indicated in the Council's Proposed Layout, suggesting this will be utilised as open space. There is an opportunity to support the proposals for Inshes District Park by combining delivery of the Council's requirements for this site alongside delivery of the proposed commercial use in a complimentary fashion which does not impact on local residential amenity or detract from the parkland setting of this part of the District Park. It would offer a solution to Highland Council in enabling a formal entrance to the Park from the north edge, along with car parking for shared-needs and parkland boundary edge planting to 'finish off' the Park setting itself. Main Issues Report and Previous Consultation Comments Both landowners previously promoted this site for commercial use at the Call for Sites and Main Issues Report (MIR) stage. The site was not identified at the MIR as a preferred site for commercial use. In the assessment of the site at the MIR stage, the Council identified the commercial visibility of the site due to the nearby compatible uses. It was also identified that the site was flat and developable. The Council's concerns in relation to this site are due to loss of greenspace and the requirement for the creation of an entrance to the Inshes District Park. The Council also considers that there is restricted capacity of local road network. In terms of loss of greenspace, this site currently offers no amenity value and is not utilised by local residents. There have also been episodes of unlawful occupation of the site by travelling people. This representation puts forward a proposal that would allow the Council's aspirations for Inshes District Park to be delivered along with a commercial use at the site which is demonstrated in this submission to be compatible with the park land setting and benefit to the local and wider community. In terms of the restricted capacity of local road network, this site is in an easily accessible location that can be accessed by foot, cycle and public transport as well as private car. Given the small scale of the proposal and the proposed retail and commercial development at Inshes Retail Park, it is unclear why the capacity of the local road network is a particular concern for this site. The comments made to the proposed Lidl store by the Council's Roads Department did not indicate any capacity issues that would impact on the development of this site. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to Main Issues Report Site R8 the Council states that: "The safeguarding and development of Inshes Park is a considerable achievement in working with the private developers and the community. However, the lack of suitable "gateway" entrance on its northern and most public frontage is a drawback which is why this land has been allocated as part of the Park for many years and successfully defended as such against alternative retail proposals at application/appeal. There has been no material change in circumstance since these decisions to justify a different approach. The respondent's claim of consolidating the City and allowing the expansion of the Inshes district centre are spurious given the availability of vacant land within the Inshes centre and in other commerce centres across the City. Matters of inadequate road capacity relate primarily to Inshes Roundabout and its associated junctions. It is accepted that the site access is adequate or can easily be made so. The site should be retained as allocated for community use – i.e. as an entrance to Inshes Park. Land to the north east comprising a wide road verge should be left as verge or be considered as part of wider proposals for improved parking, turning or drop off for the primary school." We have taken into considerations the comments the Council has raised in response to the representations submitted at the Main Issues Report stage. We fully recognise the importance of Inshes District Park and support the delivery of the park. We consider that there is an opportunity to ensure that this site can be developed to create an entrance to the park as well as providing commercial and community uses. The Proposed Plan zones the site as part of Inshes Park (Site IN61) for community use. The policy requirement details that the site should be developed in accordance with planning permission

07/00145/NIDIN. We request that this allocation is amended to allow for commercial and community use at this site. A Compatible Use at Inshes District Park The landowners recognise the key position the proposal site presents in relation to its location at the northern 'entrance' to the recently developed Inshes District Park. We are aware this has been a long-standing policy priority for Highland Council to provide the District Park, a key component of the Inshes and Milton of Leys community growth area plans for the south side of Inverness since the mid-1990's. We are also aware the District Park has been planned in a manner which seeks to offer visitors and residents a more rural 'country park' environment in the Milton of Leys area, utilizing its steeper topography and wooded landscape close to residents. Whereas in the Inshes area, particularly as one progresses north towards Sir Walter Scott Drive and transition into Inshes Retail Park, the Council's masterplan for the District Park aspires for a more formal parkland layout, including for "managed open space" and an element of "boundary screening" all of which are identified to be sited on the proposal land. In granting permission for the adjacent site for a five-a-side football facility, the officer report to Highland Council pointed to the compatibility of that proposed use compliant with the aims and objectives of creating the Inshes District Park. The landowners of this proposal site envisage the same compatibility and complementarity of development, in proposing a use or uses within Use Class 2,3,4, 10 or 11. Broadly the use would benefit the vision for "managed recreational open space" at this location of the Park; and may include activity such as organised physical activity offered to visiting members of the public. Proposals for the Subject Site The proposals submitted for the subject site seek to take all of the above matters relating to Inshes District Park into context. These include matters relating to: •compatibility of use with the District Park setting and proximity of the site to Inshes Primary School and the Southern Distributor Road; •Position of the proposed use relative to public access provision (on foot, cycle and by motor vehicle) into the northern entrance of Inshes District Park; •Types of use considered compatible with the site, its setting and potential function as a "managed recreational open space" for visiting members of the public. It is also relevant to comment that the proposals for the site must also be geared to bring commercial reality into the development proposals. The proposals will not be delivered in full by the landowners for the wider enjoyment of the community without an understanding that private investment may only be sustained by commercial value returned to the development. Therefore the proposals also bring an ancillary use with a higher commercial value into the site. The landowners of this site have taken into consideration the comments made by the Council at the previous consultation stages of the Local Development Plan and also the reasons for refusal of the Lidl proposal. We have also recognised the importance of Inshes District Park and that the delivery of this Park is a key priority for The Highland Council. We have prepared a proposal that we consider will assist the Council in delivering their aspirations for the park as well as providing commercial and community uses that will be of benefit to the local community. The site currently offers no amenity value or function and these proposals are an opportunity to bring the site into economic use, create employment opportunities and assist the Council in meeting their aspirations for the delivery of the District Park. Increasing sustainable economic growth is the stated overarching purpose of the Scottish Government. SPP advises at paragraph 45 that authorities should '... respond to the diverse needs and locational requirements of different sectors and sizes of businesses and take a flexible approach to ensure that the changing circumstances can be accommodated and new economic opportunities realised. Removing unnecessary planning barriers to business development and providing scope for expansion and growth is essential'. In particular it advises that the planning system should support economic development in all areas by, amongst other things: • 'Promoting development in sustainable locations, particularly in terms of accessibility supporting development which will provide new employment opportunities and enhance local competitiveness". Please find enclosed an indicative sketch layout showing details of the proposals for the site and how it can be delivered. The proposed development will incorporate a new access point to the site at the existing roundabout. This proposed access will be extended through the site to provide access to the consented 5 a-side sports complex and provide a formal entrance into the District Park. Parking provision will be provided at the site that will service the proposed community and commercial uses at the site. In addition this could also be utilised as over-spill parking for the sports complex and primary school. We believe this is of multiple-benefit to residents, visitors and to Highland Council in terms of delivering a solution to the matters outlined by the Council in the Main Issues Report response. In accordance with the Proposed Layout for the District Park we propose to provide boundary planting at Sir Walter Scott Drive. This will have the additional effect of 'rounding off' Inshes District Park and containing the parkland and its managed recreational open space within. An area for the provision for formal recreational activity will be provided, this may be classified within Class 10 or 11 of the Use Classes Order. This will enhance the amenity value of the site and comply with the Council's aspirations for the park. In order to enable these requirements to be achieved and assist the Council in delivering their proposals for Inshes District Park an element of commercial development will be required. We are proposing to include a 1,000 sq m commercial unit at the site. It is proposed that this unit can be used for Classes 2, 3, 4, 10 or 11 use. It could offer services relating to managed recreational open space such as indoor and outdoor sports (excluding motor sports and sports involving firearms) and be complemented by ancillary services to visiting members of the public.

Allocated to	South Inverness	IN61	Inshes Park	
--------------	-----------------	------	-------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would suggest that paragraph 4.157 (Maryburgh) and 4.133 (Conon Bridge) are modified slightly to the following: required to make a contribution to: (a) The provision of community facilities within Conon Bridge and Maryburgh (b) Future required expansion of Ben Wyvis Primary School.

Representation

The wording in the existing plan does not make it clear as to the location of the community facilities which will receive a contribution. There are currently existing facilities in both the Ben Wyvis Primary school and in Maryburgh. The plan correctly identifies in paragraph 4.155 that the Maryburgh Futures Group is looking at a range of development plans for the Maryburgh School site including community use. Which will further expand the Maryburgh community facilities. The above change to the wording will ensure that the contribution made within that catchment area will benefit the community facilities in both parts of the community ie Maryburgh as well as Conon Bridge.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The development of area CB3 should be removed from the plan.

Representation

I do not understand why this area has been included within this plan marked for mixed use – housing and community. Several times in the section relating to Conon Bridge there is mention of the flood defence system. This is absolutely correct as this area has encountered severe flooding within recent history. However, the area CB3 appears on the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) “Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map” and is marked as a “storage area”. This area has been set aside as a store for any potential flood waters. Also on the map there is an area quite clearly marked as an “Area benefiting from flood defence relative to the scheme's standard of protection”. The removal of this storage area (CB3) will remove this protection from these properties, and from the area CB4 which has also been ear marked for development. This is unacceptable. It is also unacceptable that there is a proposal to build housing on an area (CB3) which known to flood, and is a fundamental part of the Conon Bridge flood defences.

Allocated to

Customer Number 00202 Name Sir/Madam Organisation Highland Housing Alliance

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN20 Westercraigs, Inverness Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance supports the provision of housing at Westercraigs.

Allocated to South Inverness IN20 Westercraigs

Customer Number 00202 Name Sir/Madam Organisation Highland Housing Alliance

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference DW5 Dingwall North Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance supports the above site.

Allocated to Dingwall DW5 Dingwall North

Customer Number 00202 Name Sir/Madam Organisation Highland Housing Alliance

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference Mounthigh Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance owns a site at Mounthigh. It currently has planning for 16 houses. It is not mentioned in the plan but we would like our support noted for this site.

Allocated to Policy 3 Other Settlements

Customer Number 00202 Name Sir/Madam Organisation Highland Housing Alliance

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference TN4 Rowan Drive Tain Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance supports the above site.

Allocated to Tain TN4 Rowan Drive

Customer Number 00202 Name Sir/Madam Organisation Highland Housing Alliance

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN17 Carse Road Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance support the plan in relation to our site at Carse Rd, Inverness.

Allocated to West Inverness IN17 Carse Road

Customer Number 00202 Name Sir/Madam Organisation Highland Housing Alliance

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN18 Glendoe Terrace, Inverness Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance supports the plan in relation to our site at Glendoe Terrace, Inverness.

Allocated to West Inverness IN18 Glendoe Terrace

Customer Number 00202 Name Sir/Madam Organisation Highland Housing Alliance

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN63 East of Balvonie Braes Inverness Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Highland Housing Alliance supports the above site.

Allocated to South Inverness IN63 East of Balvonie Braes

Customer Number 04396 Name Sonia Wayman Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NK1 Type Change

Comment Changes

The landscape setting of North Kessock and the shore road is an important asset for the village that is valued by residents and tourists alike. The allocation of land should be sympathetic to this and consideration should be given to more sensitive positioning of the development site in a less obtrusive location. The development site should be set within the contours of the fields towards the A9 in order to reduce the visual impact and should not encroach onto the lower shore level as is shown on the proposal.

Representation

The proposed housing allocation in NK1 will have a significant negative visual impact on the western approach to the village. The character and setting of Charleston and that of the rural shore road landscape should be safeguarded and protected. Developing housing sites down to the shore road will erode the amenity of this highly valued local landscape and will set an unwelcome precedent for future expansion and encroachment into this area. Given the proximity of the adjoining rural landscape and the traditional character of Charleston, the development should be sympathetic to this context. Consideration should be given to a landscape buffer zone between the development and Charleston and along the shore road in order to mitigate the visual impact of the development.

Allocated to North Kessock NK1 Bellfield

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

it reads "By 2031, the number of jobs, people and facilities in Ross-shire will have significantly increased and the area will be increasingly self sufficient. Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables." SFG wish a modification of the second sentence to read "Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics] and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables." The proposed change would better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector.

Representation

PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCE: NG 1: NIGG YARD Colliers International is retained by St Francis Group (SFG) as property and planning advisor in relation to its land interest at Nigg. This comprises the proximal lands east of the Nigg Yard and referred in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP) adopted April 2012, as land comprising Policy 23 and also forming lands referred in the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Nigg Development Masterplan, adopted in 2009. SFG has made representations to all of the previous stages of the preparation of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP). In its last representation, dated June 2012, SFG expressed support for the identification of land in its control, comprising part of the HWLDP Policy 23 allocation including the identification of potential expansion land. This opportunity was further identified in the IMF LDP Main Issues Report as the Council's preferred option (site reference I1) for future business and industrial use associated with the Nigg Yard itself, linked with future economic growth anticipated within the onshore and offshore renewable energy sector. To support SFG's case for future industrial and business development in the areas identified in Policy 23, supporting studies were submitted with the Main Issues Report consultation. These demonstrated assessments to understand the topography of the land to accommodate development sites within the allocation; an assessment of landscape and visual character for the capacity of the site to accommodate the proposed development; and an assessment of the site's natural habitat to accommodate development. SFG's representation concluded that the site is effective in terms of accommodating future business and industrial development, stating "SFG is of the view that development platforms to accommodate the large scale developments [associated with the Nigg Development Masterplan uses] could best be fitted onto the lower slopes and mid-way up the site as capable of short to medium term development (within the LDP plan period of 5 years), followed on in future by development of further platform(s) in the northern parts of the site according to future demand and land supply." (Colliers International Main Issues Report representation, page 14). Overall, SFG expressed support for the Council's identification of the site to accommodate industry which has specialist large-scale space requirements, e.g. Renewable energy plant / components or mailers relating to decommissioning and subsea marine fabrication. Proposal NG1 In relation to the IMF LDP Proposed Plan the subject of this consultation, SFG wish to express support for the identification of land in its control, as part of the Proposal NG1. It is noted that the developer requirements set out in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Nigg Masterplan will be carried forward into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development. This requirement is not disputed by SFG as it also made supportive contributions to the consultations leading to the adoption of the Nigg Masterplan. It is noted that Highland Council will require SFG to undertake species surveys. This is in principle acceptable, however the information previously submitted in support of the proposals (June 2012) provided a Phase 1 Habitat Survey (undertaken by Environ). It demonstrates an "unremarkable" ecology for the site, and that the key designation within the site, the Rosemarkie to Shandwick Coast SSSI is designated because of its special woodland, birds and plant life. However the proposals are not likely to pose a risk to designated sites. Environ did conclude the development opportunities for the site offer ecological enhancement potential, thereby enabling improvement and with it ecological benefits to the area. Therefore SFG would be willing to focus on the most appropriate species surveys which can add value to any future development proposals. Turning to the proposed boundary of Proposal NG1 identified in the Proposed Plan. SFG notes how this boundary has been reduced from the Preferred Option Site I1 identified in the Main Issues Report of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. It is however acknowledged this change is designed to reflect the boundary as shown in the HWLDP including the areas shown as potential expansion in the HWLDP. In so reducing the site boundary as shown for Proposal NG1, it is understood the other areas at Pitcalzean Farm omitted from the new boundary are not to be allocated in order to safeguard the natural, built and cultural heritage interest of the site. This being the case, SFG's comments above in relation to the requirement for future species surveys support the request that only a focussed or appropriately scoped species survey need be undertaken in future in relation to the

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

Proposal NG1 boundary. For the avoidance of doubt, it is also confirmed that all of the land in control of SFG within the Proposal NG1 boundary remains effective, as demonstrated in the Main Issues Report submission showing the indicative development platforms for large-scale space required for the specialist operations. A copy of this indicative plan is attached to this representation to confirm this to be the case. Vision for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to the wording of the vision statement at Section 3.10 of the Plan. This should be modified to better reflect the range of specialist large-scale business and industrial operations that will make a new future at Nigg. These may be developments of an uncertain size and with locational characteristics, and which can only be accommodated on sites such as Proposal NG1. At Section 3.10 of the Proposed Plan, it reads “By 2031, the number of jobs, people and facilities in Ross-shire will have significantly increased and the area will be increasingly self sufficient. Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” SFG wish a modification of the second sentence to read “Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics] and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” The proposed change would better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. Strategy for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to Paragraph 3.11 with the wording of the first bullet describing the plan’s strategy. It is proposed this be modified, to better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector, as follows: The first bullet currently states: “3.11 Be the beating industrial heart of the Highland economy with: • Development of the fabrication industry at Nigg, Invergordon and Highland Deephaven as focal points for North Sea oil, subsea and renewables projects, rail and sea freight “ It is requested the following additional sentence is added “and [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics]”. Section 4: Strategic Employment Sites – Large Employment Allocations in Ross-shire SFG objects to Paragraph 4.24 of this part of the Plan and is seeking a change. Presently Paragraph 4.24 states: “Nigg was also chosen to be an Enterprise Area due to its potential to create new employment opportunities, stimulate private investment and boost economic growth. Capacity also exists at these locations for the manufacture of sub-sea renewables structures.....” SFG wish an additional phrase leading after the above sentence, as follows: “and the accommodation of specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics” It is considered this proposed change will better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss these proposed changes to the Proposed Plan. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission

Allocated to	Nigg	NG1	Nigg Yard	
--------------	------	-----	-----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Presently Paragraph 4.24 states: "Nigg was also chosen to be an Enterprise Area due to its potential to create new employment opportunities, stimulate private investment and boost economic growth. Capacity also exists at these locations for the manufacture of sub-sea renewables structures....." SFG wish an additional phrase leading after the above sentence, as follows: "and the accommodation of specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics" It is considered this proposed change will better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector.

Representation

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF ST FRANCIS GROUP PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCE: NG 1: NIGG YARD Colliers International is retained by St Francis Group (SFG) as property and planning advisor in relation to its land interest at Nigg. This comprises the proximal lands east of the Nigg Yard and referred in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP) adopted April 2012, as land comprising Policy 23 and also forming lands referred in the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Nigg Development Masterplan, adopted in 2009. SFG has made representations to all of the previous stages of the preparation of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP). In its last representation, dated June 2012, SFG expressed support for the identification of land in its control, comprising part of the HWLDP Policy 23 allocation including the identification of potential expansion land. This opportunity was further identified in the IMF LDP Main Issues Report as the Council's preferred option (site reference I1) for future business and industrial use associated with the Nigg Yard itself, linked with future economic growth anticipated within the onshore and offshore renewable energy sector. To support SFG's case for future industrial and business development in the areas identified in Policy 23, supporting studies were submitted with the Main Issues Report consultation. These demonstrated assessments to understand the topography of the land to accommodate development sites within the allocation; an assessment of landscape and visual character for the capacity of the site to accommodate the proposed development; and an assessment of the site's natural habitat to accommodate development. SFG's representation concluded that the site is effective in terms of accommodating future business and industrial development, stating "SFG is of the view that development platforms to accommodate the large scale developments [associated with the Nigg Development Masterplan uses] could best be fitted onto the lower slopes and mid-way up the site as capable of short to medium term development (within the LDP plan period of 5 years), followed on in future by development of further platform(s) in the northern parts of the site according to future demand and land supply." (Colliers International Main Issues Report representation, page 14). Overall, SFG expressed support for the Council's identification of the site to accommodate industry which has specialist large-scale space requirements, e.g. Renewable energy plant / components or mailers relating to decommissioning and subsea marine fabrication. Proposal NG1 In relation to the IMF LDP Proposed Plan the subject of this consultation, SFG wish to express support for the identification of land in its control, as part of the Proposal NG1. It is noted that the developer requirements set out in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Nigg Masterplan will be carried forward into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development. This requirement is not disputed by SFG as it also made supportive contributions to the consultations leading to the adoption of the Nigg Masterplan. It is noted that Highland Council will require SFG to undertake species surveys. This is in principle acceptable, however the information previously submitted in support of the proposals (June 2012) provided a Phase 1 Habitat Survey (undertaken by Environ). It demonstrates an "unremarkable" ecology for the site, and that the key designation within the site, the Rosemarkie to Shandwick Coast SSSI is designated because of its special woodland, birds and plant life. However the proposals are not likely to pose a risk to designated sites. Environ did conclude the development opportunities for the site offer ecological enhancement potential, thereby enabling improvement and with it ecological benefits to the area. Therefore SFG would be willing to focus on the most appropriate species surveys which can add value to any future development proposals. Turning to the proposed boundary of Proposal NG1 identified in the Proposed Plan. SFG notes how this boundary has been reduced from the Preferred Option Site I1 identified in the Main Issues Report of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. It is however acknowledged this change is designed to reflect the boundary as shown in the HWLDP including the areas shown as potential expansion in the HWLDP. In so reducing the site boundary as shown for Proposal NG1, it is understood the other areas at Pitcalzean Farm omitted from the new boundary are not to be allocated in order to safeguard the natural, built and cultural heritage interest of the site. This being the case, SFG's comments above in relation to the requirement for future species surveys support the request that only a focussed or appropriately scoped species survey need be undertaken in future in relation to the Proposal NG1 boundary. For the avoidance of doubt, it is also confirmed that all of the land in control of SFG within the Proposal NG1 boundary remains effective, as demonstrated in the Main Issues Report submission showing the indicative development platforms for large-scale space required for the specialist operations. A copy of

this indicative plan is attached to this representation to confirm this to be the case. Vision for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to the wording of the vision statement at Section 3.10 of the Plan. This should be modified to better reflect the range of specialist large-scale business and industrial operations that will make a new future at Nigg. These may be developments of an uncertain size and with locational characteristics, and which can only be accommodated on sites such as Proposal NG1. At Section 3.10 of the Proposed Plan, it reads “By 2031, the number of jobs, people and facilities in Ross-shire will have significantly increased and the area will be increasingly self sufficient. Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” SFG wish a modification of the second sentence to read “Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics] and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” The proposed change would better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. Strategy for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to Paragraph 3.11 with the wording of the first bullet describing the plan’s strategy. It is proposed this be modified, to better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector, as follows: The first bullet currently states: “3.11 Be the beating industrial heart of the Highland economy with: • Development of the fabrication industry at Nigg, Invergordon and Highland Deephaven as focal points for North Sea oil, subsea and renewables projects, rail and sea freight “ It is requested the following additional sentence is added “and [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics]”. Section 4: Strategic Employment Sites – Large Employment Allocations in Ross-shire SFG objects to Paragraph 4.24 of this part of the Plan and is seeking a change. Presently Paragraph 4.24 states: “Nigg was also chosen to be an Enterprise Area due to its potential to create new employment opportunities, stimulate private investment and boost economic growth. Capacity also exists at these locations for the manufacture of sub-sea renewables structures.....” SFG wish an additional phrase leading after the above sentence, as follows: “and the accommodation of specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics” It is considered this proposed change will better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss these proposed changes to the Proposed Plan. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to	Nigg	NG1	Nigg Yard	
--------------	------	-----	-----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF ST FRANCIS GROUP PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCE: NG 1: NIGG YARD Colliers International is retained by St Francis Group (SFG) as property and planning advisor in relation to its land interest at Nigg. This comprises the proximal lands east of the Nigg Yard and referred in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP) adopted April 2012, as land comprising Policy 23 and also forming lands referred in the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Nigg Development Masterplan, adopted in 2009. SFG has made representations to all of the previous stages of the preparation of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP). In its last representation, dated June 2012, SFG expressed support for the identification of land in its control, comprising part of the HWLDP Policy 23 allocation including the identification of potential expansion land. This opportunity was further identified in the IMF LDP Main Issues Report as the Council's preferred option (site reference I1) for future business and industrial use associated with the Nigg Yard itself, linked with future economic growth anticipated within the onshore and offshore renewable energy sector. To support SFG's case for future industrial and business development in the areas identified in Policy 23, supporting studies were submitted with the Main Issues Report consultation. These demonstrated assessments to understand the topography of the land to accommodate development sites within the allocation; an assessment of landscape and visual character for the capacity of the site to accommodate the proposed development; and an assessment of the site's natural habitat to accommodate development. SFG's representation concluded that the site is effective in terms of accommodating future business and industrial development, stating "SFG is of the view that development platforms to accommodate the large scale developments [associated with the Nigg Development Masterplan uses] could best be fitted onto the lower slopes and mid-way up the site as capable of short to medium term development (within the LDP plan period of 5 years), followed on in future by development of further platform(s) in the northern parts of the site according to future demand and land supply." (Colliers International Main Issues Report representation, page 14). Overall, SFG expressed support for the Council's identification of the site to accommodate industry which has specialist large-scale space requirements, e.g. Renewable energy plant / components or mailers relating to decommissioning and subsea marine fabrication. Proposal NG1 In relation to the IMF LDP Proposed Plan the subject of this consultation, SFG wish to express support for the identification of land in its control, as part of the Proposal NG1. It is noted that the developer requirements set out in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Nigg Masterplan will be carried forward into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development. This requirement is not disputed by SFG as it also made supportive contributions to the consultations leading to the adoption of the Nigg Masterplan. It is noted that Highland Council will require SFG to undertake species surveys. This is in principle acceptable, however the information previously submitted in support of the proposals (June 2012) provided a Phase 1 Habitat Survey (undertaken by Environ). It demonstrates an "unremarkable" ecology for the site, and that the key designation within the site, the Rosemarkie to Shandwick Coast SSSI is designated because of its special woodland, birds and plant life. However the proposals are not likely to pose a risk to designated sites. Environ did conclude the development opportunities for the site offer ecological enhancement potential, thereby enabling improvement and with it ecological benefits to the area. Therefore SFG would be willing to focus on the most appropriate species surveys which can add value to any future development proposals. Turning to the proposed boundary of Proposal NG1 identified in the Proposed Plan. SFG notes how this boundary has been reduced from the Preferred Option Site I1 identified in the Main Issues Report of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. It is however acknowledged this change is designed to reflect the boundary as shown in the HWLDP including the areas shown as potential expansion in the HWLDP. In so reducing the site boundary as shown for Proposal NG1, it is understood the other areas at Pitcalzean Farm omitted from the new boundary are not to be allocated in order to safeguard the natural, built and cultural heritage interest of the site. This being the case, SFG's comments above in relation to the requirement for future species surveys support the request that only a focussed or appropriately scoped species survey need be undertaken in future in relation to the Proposal NG1 boundary. For the avoidance of doubt, it is also confirmed that all of the land in control of SFG within the Proposal NG1 boundary remains effective, as demonstrated in the Main Issues Report submission showing the indicative development platforms for large-scale space required for the specialist operations. A copy of this indicative plan is attached to this representation to confirm this to be the case. Vision for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to the wording of the vision statement at Section 3.10 of the Plan. This should be modified to better reflect the range of specialist large-scale business and industrial operations that will make a new future at Nigg. These may be developments of an uncertain size and with locational characteristics, and which can only be accommodated on sites such as Proposal NG1. At Section 3.10 of the Proposed Plan, it reads "By 2031, the number of jobs, people and facilities in Ross-shire will have significantly increased and the area will be increasingly self sufficient. Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have

enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” SFG wish a modification of the second sentence to read “Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics] and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” The proposed change would better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. Strategy for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to Paragraph 3.11 with the wording of the first bullet describing the plan’s strategy. It is proposed this be modified, to better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector, as follows: The first bullet currently states: “3.11 Be the beating industrial heart of the Highland economy with: • Development of the fabrication industry at Nigg, Invergordon and Highland Deephaven as focal points for North Sea oil, subsea and renewables projects, rail and sea freight “ It is requested the following additional sentence is added “and [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics]”. Section 4: Strategic Employment Sites – Large Employment Allocations in Ross-shire SFG objects to Paragraph 4.24 of this part of the Plan and is seeking a change. Presently Paragraph 4.24 states: “Nigg was also chosen to be an Enterprise Area due to its potential to create new employment opportunities, stimulate private investment and boost economic growth. Capacity also exists at these locations for the manufacture of sub-sea renewables structures.....” SFG wish an additional phrase leading after the above sentence, as follows: “and the accommodation of specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics” It is considered this proposed change will better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss these proposed changes to the Proposed Plan. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to	Nigg	NG1	Nigg Yard	
--------------	------	-----	-----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Change the wording of the first bullet describing the plan's strategy. It is proposed this be modified, to better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector, as follows: The first bullet currently states: "3.11 Be the beating industrial heart of the Highland economy with: • Development of the fabrication industry at Nigg, Invergordon and Highland Deephaven as focal points for North Sea oil, subsea and renewables projects, rail and sea freight " It is requested the following additional sentence is added "and [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics]"

Representation

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF ST FRANCIS GROUP PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCE: NG 1: NIGG YARD Colliers International is retained by St Francis Group (SFG) as property and planning advisor in relation to its land interest at Nigg. This comprises the proximal lands east of the Nigg Yard and referred in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan (HWLDP) adopted April 2012, as land comprising Policy 23 and also forming lands referred in the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Nigg Development Masterplan, adopted in 2009. SFG has made representations to all of the previous stages of the preparation of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP). In its last representation, dated June 2012, SFG expressed support for the identification of land in its control, comprising part of the HWLDP Policy 23 allocation including the identification of potential expansion land. This opportunity was further identified in the IMF LDP Main Issues Report as the Council's preferred option (site reference I1) for future business and industrial use associated with the Nigg Yard itself, linked with future economic growth anticipated within the onshore and offshore renewable energy sector. To support SFG's case for future industrial and business development in the areas identified in Policy 23, supporting studies were submitted with the Main Issues Report consultation. These demonstrated assessments to understand the topography of the land to accommodate development sites within the allocation; an assessment of landscape and visual character for the capacity of the site to accommodate the proposed development; and an assessment of the site's natural habitat to accommodate development. SFG's representation concluded that the site is effective in terms of accommodating future business and industrial development, stating "SFG is of the view that development platforms to accommodate the large scale developments [associated with the Nigg Development Masterplan uses] could best be fitted onto the lower slopes and mid-way up the site as capable of short to medium term development (within the LDP plan period of 5 years), followed on in future by development of further platform(s) in the northern parts of the site according to future demand and land supply." (Colliers International Main Issues Report representation, page 14). Overall, SFG expressed support for the Council's identification of the site to accommodate industry which has specialist large-scale space requirements, e.g. Renewable energy plant / components or mailers relating to decommissioning and subsea marine fabrication. Proposal NG1 In relation to the IMF LDP Proposed Plan the subject of this consultation, SFG wish to express support for the identification of land in its control, as part of the Proposal NG1. It is noted that the developer requirements set out in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Nigg Masterplan will be carried forward into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development. This requirement is not disputed by SFG as it also made supportive contributions to the consultations leading to the adoption of the Nigg Masterplan. It is noted that Highland Council will require SFG to undertake species surveys. This is in principle acceptable, however the information previously submitted in support of the proposals (June 2012) provided a Phase 1 Habitat Survey (undertaken by Environ). It demonstrates an "unremarkable" ecology for the site, and that the key designation within the site, the Rosemarkie to Shandwick Coast SSSI is designated because of its special woodland, birds and plant life. However the proposals are not likely to pose a risk to designated sites. Environ did conclude the development opportunities for the site offer ecological enhancement potential, thereby enabling improvement and with it ecological benefits to the area. Therefore SFG would be willing to focus on the most appropriate species surveys which can add value to any future development proposals. Turning to the proposed boundary of Proposal NG1 identified in the Proposed Plan. SFG notes how this boundary has been reduced from the Preferred Option Site I1 identified in the Main Issues Report of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. It is however acknowledged this change is designed to reflect the boundary as shown in the HWLDP including the areas shown as potential expansion in the HWLDP. In so reducing the site boundary as shown for Proposal NG1, it is understood the other areas at Pitcalzean Farm omitted from the new boundary are not to be allocated in order to safeguard the natural, built and cultural heritage interest of the site. This being the case, SFG's comments above in relation to the requirement for future species surveys support the request that only a focussed or appropriately scoped species survey need be undertaken in future in relation to the Proposal NG1 boundary. For the avoidance of doubt, it is also confirmed that all of the land in control of SFG within the Proposal NG1 boundary remains effective, as demonstrated in the Main Issues Report submission showing the indicative development platforms for large-scale space required for the specialist operations. A copy of

this indicative plan is attached to this representation to confirm this to be the case. Vision for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to the wording of the vision statement at Section 3.10 of the Plan. This should be modified to better reflect the range of specialist large-scale business and industrial operations that will make a new future at Nigg. These may be developments of an uncertain size and with locational characteristics, and which can only be accommodated on sites such as Proposal NG1. At Section 3.10 of the Proposed Plan, it reads “By 2031, the number of jobs, people and facilities in Ross-shire will have significantly increased and the area will be increasingly self sufficient. Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” SFG wish a modification of the second sentence to read “Nigg, Invergordon, Highland Deephaven will have enhanced their reputation as a focal point for North Sea Oil, cruise ship berthing, rail and sea freight, [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics] and fabrication of both on-shore and off-shore renewables.” The proposed change would better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. Strategy for Ross-shire (including Nigg) SFG wish to object to Paragraph 3.11 with the wording of the first bullet describing the plan’s strategy. It is proposed this be modified, to better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector, as follows: The first bullet currently states: “3.11 Be the beating industrial heart of the Highland economy with: • Development of the fabrication industry at Nigg, Invergordon and Highland Deephaven as focal points for North Sea oil, subsea and renewables projects, rail and sea freight “ It is requested the following additional sentence is added “and [specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics]”. Section 4: Strategic Employment Sites – Large Employment Allocations in Ross-shire SFG objects to Paragraph 4.24 of this part of the Plan and is seeking a change. Presently Paragraph 4.24 states: “Nigg was also chosen to be an Enterprise Area due to its potential to create new employment opportunities, stimulate private investment and boost economic growth. Capacity also exists at these locations for the manufacture of sub-sea renewables structures.....” SFG wish an additional phrase leading after the above sentence, as follows: “and the accommodation of specialist large scale marine related land uses with specific locational characteristics” It is considered this proposed change will better reflect a wider scope of opportunities of the site at Nigg suitable for inward investors in the specialist large scale marine related sector. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss these proposed changes to the Proposed Plan. Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Comments and objectives previously made to you remain. I seriously wonder whether our objections have been taken on board by elected members and /or officials. We still consider the rezoning of this agricultural land for housing & business use to be unnecessary. there is already and has been for many years, land ALREADY zoned for housing at Western Teandallon and it has NOT been used. There appear to be no signs of it being used for housing in the immediate or medium term, so we don't see it being fully utilised in the time scale of your proposed plan. We are also concerned to see changes to the number of proposed houses in the field have been moved upwards. Originally it was to be 195, which was then reduced to 85 and now you are proposing 160 houses. It looks as though the Council are just sticking to their own agenda: just going through the motions of the Consulation process. We remain totally opposed to the proposed development and yet again confirm our written objections to the entire development, as proposed for the Culcairn site EV2. Will you take note of our objections and views this time and respond to them?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Constaints of: Woodland (including tree protection areas), a single point of access at a hazardous junction, exposed plateau microclimate, and protected features in terms of TPO and listed buildings: should all limit the development capacity.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

I wish to strongly oject to the proposed plan for the following reasons: Proposed Access: From Lochloy Road access is unsuitable for proposed development. This is a route already at capacity & incapable of safely accommodating additional vehicular traffic. Insufficient regard has been taken of current private, commercial & farm vehicle use & amenity pedestrian, cycle & equestrian use. A popular access to beach, culbin sands, culbin forest & beyond, single track sections, blind corners & high banked verges present a significant safety risk even with current volume of traffic. Current A96 junction to Lochloy Road currently incapable of safely accomodating increased volume of traffic without major investment & reconfiguring. A96 conjestion through Nairn would be increased dramatically as a result of additional flow to & from Lochloy Road. Notwithstanding my objection to the proposed plan, I consider a thorough transport assessment is essential to determine risks presented by current usage and subsequently through additional volume demands.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04276 Name Steven Jack Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA2 Type Change

Comment Changes

My Representation is an objection & I would like site NA2 removed from proposed plan. I would further like the proposed development of site NA2 to not be approved in current form.

Representation

Over-development: Kingsteps is a semi-rural area with very low housing density totalling 18 houses. Proposed 90 new homes represents a 5x higher density and is totally incompatible as a result. Any housing north of the Kingsteps burn would compromise the integrity of Kingsteps and disregard green space undertakings and objectives of the plan

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 04313 Name Stewart Morrison Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA2 - South Kingsteps Type Change

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan Site: NA2 – South Kingsteps I write with reference to the above site proposed for inclusion in the IMFLDP. Whilst not completely opposed to some degree of housing development, I would like the following points to be considered and implemented if the site is to be adopted in the IMFLDP. Kingsteps is a historic rural settlement in it’s own rights and any development adjacent to this area needs to be sympathetic to ensure Kingsteps retains it’s individual identity. Accordingly; a. In it’s current format Lochloy Road is incapable of serving a development of an additional 90 houses and any attempt to improve/widen to achieve an access at the Eastern end of Kingsteps would completely disrupt the harmony of the historic Kingsteps hamlet. Lochloy Road is already running at capacity (or above it) and an additional 90 houses each with a minimum of 2 cars per household would render it unsafe. If any development whatsoever is granted for site NA2 then access should be taken via the current Springfield development and not from Lochloy Road. b. The implied housing density of 6+ houses per acre is not appropriate for site NA2’s semi-rural location. Housing densities should be consistent with the rural Kingsteps area where all properties are built on 0.5+ acre plots. Therefore housing density on the proposed site NA2 should be restricted to 2 houses per acre. c. No house building whatsoever should be permitted north of the Kingsteps burn which dissects the site. I would insist this is a condition of any future Planning consent to create a divide between any new housing and Kingsteps and to ensure Kingsteps retains it’s identity as a settlement in it’s own right. A landscaping proposal should also be agreed and implemented prior to any house construction commencing. It should incorporate a 20 – 25 metre wide dense planted zone along the northern boundary of site NA2 bordering Kingsteps to ensure Kingsteps retains it’s own separate identity.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I am seeking clarity on the housing development planned at the rear of Millerton Avenue, Inverness IV3 8RY. I am aware that housing is a priority for this site and accept this but I would like to know how near the current housing in Millerton Avenue these houses will be. The plan I saw during the public consultation looked like there would be housing right outside our back door which would affect 55/57 but not other properties but the distance could not be clarified to me at that time. We also experienced severe flooding of our garden and communal path at the rear of the houses when the latest Robertson houses were under construction so this gives us cause for concern in the future. Cllr Graham, TECS and Ward Manager were aware of this at the time. I would appreciate some specific information regarding the development in order to comment in more detail on how this will affect our home and privacy.

Representation

See comment changes representation.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04351 Name Stuart Rennie Organisation Rennie Design Golf & Landscape Architects

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph Muir of Ord 4.70

Reference MO3 Ardnagrask, Corrie Road Type Change

Comment Changes

1. Health & Safety Risk will be created if building too close to the existing adjacent golf course. 2. Who will hold liability for a person/property being hit by a stray golf ball. Muir-of-Ord golf Club and the golfers who play there should not have this risk of liability forced upon them. 3. Density of housing in a country side location seems over ambitious. 4. This development will create a precedent for future development in the countryside around Muir-of Ord. 5. Significant visual impact. 6. Golf Course will have no opportunity to expand with proposed housing in such close proximity. 7. Drainage issues associated to this part of the golf course could become more of an issue. 8. Corrie Road is currently single track, transport issues. 9. Noise Pollution. 10. Unwanted footfall on the golf course. 11.If a significant buffer is created which takes professional golf course design health and safety parameters into consideration some housing may be achievable. High fencing will be required to be erected if health and safety parameters are not taken into consideration.

Representation

Initially I would oppose the proposed development of housing in this area but in the worst case scenario my below comments should be taken onto consideration. 1. Health and Safety; Industry standard Golf Design Health and Safety parameters should be adopted and taken into consideration. The boundary of any proposed development should be at least 60m from the centreline of play from the 11th hole on the Muir-of-Ord golf course as indicated in the attached professionally drawn plan by me a qualified golf course architect. 2. Liability; Law cases are becoming more common in golf, I would have concerns about liability's created for the golf club and the players. 3. The density of housing seems over ambitious when taking the local build fabric into consideration. If you look at an aerial image (gmaps), the existing 12-15 private houses adjacent to the site would potentially fill the whole site if superimposed onto the proposed area. Is this the correct location to adopt another high density Cairns style development in Muir-of-Ord? 4. Is this site classified as countryside location? This would surely act as a precedent for future development, with the potential for the golf club to become completely land locked by housing. 5. Visual impact from local house owner receptors and from the golf course. 6. If the golf club were ever to consider to expand this would be an ideal location for golf. 7. Historically there has been drainage issue on the adjacent 11th hole and associated with the ditches running across the 12th hole to behind the clubhouse. Any hydrological water run off would naturally fall towards these drainage channels on the golf course. This could be an issue. Also the woodland above the site has always been prone flooding where peat bogs are present. This is currently overflowing into the site due to recent tree removal which would have helped keep water in situ. 8. The Corrie Road can be dangerous at the best of times, further traffic will only make this worse. 9. Noise pollution would be significant from any new housing and from traffic. 10. There is a possibility of people traversing the golf course or gaining unpaid access in this location some distance from the golf clubhouse. 11. It would be recommended that the Highland Council liaise with a professional golf course architect to understand the health and safety parameters used in modern day golf course design. My professionally drawn attached image identifies this. Please do not hesitate to contact me for further consultation of required. High fencing would be visually intrusive and an unnecessary solution.

Allocated to Muir of Ord MO3 Ardnagrask, Corrie Road

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Consideration of issues as developer requirements for Site MO3.

Representation

I am writing to object to the proposed development for 51 houses in the field below Ardnagrask, off Corrie Road, Muir of Ord. Although not resident of Corrie Road, I have strong links to this area and, for the following reasons, am very concerned as to the impact this proposed development would have on the residents of Corrie Road. 1) Corrie Road currently has a semi rural aspect which would be completely lost. 2) Additional traffic along this road leading to increased noise, pollution, and as this road is barely two way, reduction in safety for users. 3) As yet there has been no improvement to the infrastructure and facilities available to current residents of Muir of Ord, despite other housing development already in process in Muir of Ord. 4) The development will visually impact on this area. 5) Further loss of precious green space. 6) Loss of privacy for existing residents on the south side of Corrie road. 7) Potential drainage/flooding problems, already an issue caused by previous building along this stretch of road.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

1. Reduction in density of the number of homes allocated for the FR1 Greenside Farm site. 2. No allocation for a particular number of houses (however "purely indicative" the plan may state the number to be) before the Authority is satisfied that this number can be accommodated without compromising road safety along Courthill Road. 3. No allocation for a particular number of houses (however "purely indicative" the plan may state the number to be) before the Authority is certain that there is/are feasible solutions(s) to the water pressure issues.

Representation

Subject to our concerns relating to road safety and water pressure being adequately addressed, we do not object to the principle of housing development on the FR1 Greenside Farm, Rosemarkie site. We do, however, object to the density of the housing development proposed on the FR1 site. In the adopted RACE LP, the final boundary of the area allocated for building houses at Greenside Farm was more or less the same as is now proposed in the FR1 allocation. We assume that the increase from the RACE LP designation of 1.7 hectares to the proposed FR1 designation of 1.9 hectares, has arisen because of greater accuracy of measurement (plus the inclusion of Greenside House itself and the originally-proposed access area within the proposed FR1 boundary). In relation to density, the indicative capacity in the RACE LP was "30 houses" on the then allocated 1.7 hectare area. The current proposal in FR1 is for "50 homes" on the now proposed 1.9 hectare area. Even allowing for the fact that some of the proposed "50 homes" are likely to be flatted properties, this is an exceptionally high density of houses and flats for this particular site. We consider that in terms of any reasonable planning assessment, the FR1 site should be regarded as an edge-of-village/semi-rural site. The proposed density of 50 homes is, however, akin to the density one might expect on an edge-of-city or indeed an inner-city site. This is not an appropriate density in this location, particularly since the site is a gateway to the village. Further, the proposed density would not be in keeping with the pattern of existing housing along the rest of Courthill Road. In addition, from the house known as "The Old School" north-eastwards, the properties on Courthill Road form part of the Rosemarkie Outstanding Conservation Area. As well as being a gateway site to the village, the FR1 site therefore forms part of the setting of the Outstanding Conservation Area and is accordingly an area where such high density of housing is inappropriate. Finally, the FR1 site also borders part of the Fairy Glen Designed Landscape and the high density of housing proposed is also inappropriate on what is part of the setting of a Designed Landscape. Secondly, we further object on the basis that there appears to have been no proper assessment of the feasibility of accommodating the proposed high density of housing development without compromising road safety along Courthill Road. An allocation for this density of housing is accordingly premature. We appreciate that detailed transport assessment and mitigation proposals would be required as part of any masterplan/development brief to be agreed for the site following adoption of the IMFLDP. However, the known deficiencies and constraints affecting Courthill Road, and the feasibility of overcoming these satisfactorily, ought surely to be properly assessed before allocating the FR1 site for such a high number of new homes. If the Authority allocates the site for 50 new homes without first being satisfied that the deficiencies of Courthill Road can be overcome, and if it then turns out that these deficiencies cannot be satisfactorily overcome, there is a genuine risk that sub-standard road solutions will be accepted, and that road safety will be compromised, under pressure to permit the development of 50 new homes to proceed. We consider it imprudent, therefore, that detailed assessment of road arrangements to accommodate 50 new homes should be required only after the site has been allocated for this number of homes. Of particular concern is the junction of Courthill Road with Bridge Street. While there will be land available to improve the junction at the Manse Brae end, there is no scope to improve the dangerously inadequate visibility splay at the junction with Bridge Street. Consequently, arrangements in respect of the proposed 50 new homes would have to be such as to ensure no increase in vehicular use of that junction. We fail to see how this could be achieved. While there is mention in the FR1 "Requirements" section of "road closure for Courthill Road", the junction at Bridge Street cannot be stopped up unless two-way traffic can safely be accommodated along the length of Courthill Road, from the Gordon Memorial Hall to the junction with Manse Brae/Rosemarkie Road. However, such a two-way system cannot be achieved because of existing pinch points, particularly where the road starts to descend steeply at the house known as "Courthill". There is no way of widening the road at that point to accommodate two-way traffic as on the one side there is a steep descent into the rear gardens of the houses on the High Street and on the other side sits the high retaining wall forming the boundary of the garden pertaining to "Courthill". Once a 50 home allocation is adopted in the IMFLDP, the principle that 50 additional homes can be accommodated on the FR1 site will be established, leaving the Authority little room then to resist an application for 50 homes on the site on road safety grounds. We fear there is a genuine risk that inadequate solutions to the road constraints may then be accepted on the basis that the principle of a 50 home development has already

been established and agreed in the IMFLDP. We feel that the Courthill Road constraints, and the feasibility of any solutions to them, should therefore be fully assessed before any allocation of the FR1 site for 50 homes. We note that a solution requires to be found to water pressure issues and, while the installation of a new link water main to service the development is mentioned, there is no mention of whether the feasibility of any such solution has been checked. For reasons similar to those expressed at point 2. above, we feel that the Planning Authority should ensure that feasible solutions to the water pressure issues exist before an allocation of the site for 50 homes is adopted and the principle of a 50 home development on the site thereby established.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR1	Greenside Farm	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------------	--

Customer Number 00607 Name The Castle Leod Maintenance Fund Trustees Organisation Bowlts Chartered Surveyors

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable) Mr Ken Bowlts Bowlts Chartered Surveyors

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference H1 Type Change

Comment Changes

THIS REPRESENTATION SUPERCEDES OUR EARLIER REPRESENTATION This objection seeks the re-inclusion of The Nutwood field, Strathpeffer for housing, as per the site's current allocated status for residential development in the adopted Ross and Cromarty Local Plan 2007 and the H1 allocation shown as a preferred site in the IMFLDP Main Issues Report (spring 2012). The site extends to approximately 3 hectares and has an indicative housing capacity of 15 units in the current Local Plan.

Representation

THIS REPRESENTATION SUPERCEDES OUR EARLIER REPRESENTATION This representation to maintain the current housing allocation in the adopted Ross and Cromarty Local Plan 2007 for the Nutwood is presented on the basis that nothing has changed in the intervening period and that issues such as impact on trees and achieving satisfactory access, can be addressed, in detail, as part of a future planning application. With reference to the Committee Report to the PED dated 18th September 2013, we address the specific points raised for The Nutwood site (H1 – preferred in MIR) as follows:- SNH raised concerns regarding part of the access being formed through stands of ancient woodland. • A detailed survey of the woodland and a Tree Impact Assessment would be carried out as part of the design work to ensure that the impact of the access would be minimised as much as possible; • Based on the indicative route of the access through the woodland, it is estimated that less than 10 mature trees would be removed. Given the scale of the proposed development and the scope for compensatory planting, this was not considered to be a significant detrimental factor. It is also to be noted that the site owner is willing to explore an alternative access via the existing Nutwood drive, in order to avoid the ancient woodland. Furthermore, it is proposed that in consultation with the Tree Officers, an appropriate junction onto the public road can be identified at either the existing Nutwood junction or at any other suitable point along the public road that sufficiently minimises the impact to the broadleaf avenue. “Given the scale of the development now proposed, the Forestry Officer considered that it is unlikely that the Council could support a road in the location proposed”. • It is noted that at no point has there been a request by the Forestry Officers to prepare a Tree Impact Assessment for further comment. It is reiterated that the indicative route through the woodland would result in less than 10 mature trees being removed, which may not have been appreciated at the outset; • The scale of development does not in itself create a reason for the site not to be supported. The indicative layout of the 3 hectare site had been presented in such a way as to promote effective use of land and green space; • For the avoidance of doubt, the indicative capacity was not specifically based on concerns raised by the Strathpeffer Community Council, but by informed site design work prior to these views being put forward; • Any visual impact will be mitigated against by compensatory planting and sensitive positioning of the access. • The scale and massing at Nutwood would be informed by the Conservation Area Management Plan to be prepared by the Council. “The Forestry Officer also had significant concerns over the impact that this scale of development will have on the mature trees surrounding the site”. • The significance of this specific concern is queried, given that the proposed housing layout does not directly impact on the mature trees surrounding the site. The indicative housing layout did provide a green buffer zone between the building footprint locations and the surrounding mature trees. As part of the ongoing house layout designing process of the site, it is proposed that the principle is established for a significant green buffer zone to safeguard surrounding mature trees. The Forestry Officer also had significant concerns over “the lack of open space within the site” • The significance of this specific concern is queried, given the points made above. It is also noted that the indicative housing layout included a central green space for amenity and recreational purposes, together with indicative compensatory planting throughout and around the perimeter of the site; • The Main Issues Report identifies the fact that the site is enclosed by mature woodland, which limits landscape impact, as a significant pro; • It is noted that the indicative housing layout suggested a housing density of approximately 0.061 hectares (0.15 acres) per unit, which is comparable to the SP1 Kinellan site within the Proposed Plan, which has an indicative housing density of 0.066 hectares (0.16 acres) per unit. For the avoidance of doubt, the final housing density for The Nutwood would be determined by the principles of sustainable use of land and necessary flexibility to provide appropriate affordable or smaller housing to meet local needs, whilst providing ample green space. It is proposed that as part of the site designing process, the principle is set for a significant green buffer to be established between the edge of the development and the Outstanding Conservation Area to the south. This will address concerns raised by the Strathpeffer Community Council and the comments made by the Forestry Officer of perceived lack of open space. The Committee Report suggests an “absence of any evidence explaining public benefits of the scheme”. • The development would create an opportunity to prepare a Tree Management Plan for the area that would safeguard and enhance the amenity value of the vicinity. • By applying modern designing principles, any increase in the unit number (above the current allocation of 15) will allow for a greater contribution to be made for much needed affordable homes in the area. • The development would create an opportunity to enhance linkage and public access to the Eaglestone

Schedule Monument; • The development would create opportunities for improved public access to, and within, the ancient woodland and to the golf course amenity land to the north; • As a viable development site, The Nutwood will improve the ability of Strathpeffer to deliver its housing requirements and help reduce the dependency on a single housing site (SP1), which is subject to its own constraints. Concerns were raised about the “accessibility of the site by a choice of transport options”. • It is noted that the development would benefit from an active travel connection via the path to the Eaglestone Schedule Monument and that opportunities will be created to enhance this further for pedestrian and cycling use; • It is noted that the existing link between The Nutwood and the village centre is less than a five minute walk. It is noted in the Committee Report that the site is “not required to meet the housing land requirements in the part of the Wester Ross housing market area that lies within the Plan area”. • As a viable development site, The Nutwood would offer variety and would help mitigate against the risks and dependency on a single housing site (SP1), as currently presented in the Proposed Plan, in delivering the housing requirements for the village of Strathpeffer and the wider area.

Allocated to	Strathpeffer	General	General	
--------------	--------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

This objection seeks the re-inclusion of The Nutwood field, Strathpeffer for housing, as per the site's current allocated status for residential development in the Ross and Cromarty Local Plan 2007 and the H1 allocation shown as a preferred site in the IMFLDP Main Issues Report (spring 2012). The site extends to approximately 3 hectares and has an indicative housing capacity of 15 units in the current Local Plan.

Representation

This representation to maintain the current housing allocation in the Ross and Cromarty Local Plan 2007 for the Nutwood is presented on the basis that nothing has changed in the intervening period and that issues such as impact on trees and achieving satisfactory access, can be addressed, in detail, as part of a future planning application. With reference to the Committee Report to the PED dated 18th September 2013, we address the specific points raised for The Nutwood site (H1 – preferred in MIR) as follows:- SNH raised concerns regarding part of the access being formed through stands of ancient woodland. • A detailed survey of the woodland and a Tree Impact Assessment would be carried out as part of the design work to ensure that the impact of the access would be minimised as much as possible; • Based on the indicative route of the access through the woodland, it is estimated that less than 10 mature trees would be removed. Given the scale of the proposed development and the scope for compensatory planting, this was not considered to be a significant detrimental factor. It is also to be noted that the site owner is willing to explore an alternative access via the existing Nutwood drive, in order to avoid the ancient woodland. Furthermore, it is proposed that in consultation with the Tree Officers, an appropriate junction onto the public road can be identified at either the existing Nutwood junction or at any other suitable point along the public road that sufficiently minimises the impact to the broadleaf avenue. “Given the scale of the development now proposed, the Forestry Officer considered that it is unlikely that the Council could support a road in the location proposed”. • It is noted that at no point has there been a request by the Forestry Officers to prepare a Tree Impact Assessment for further comment. It is reiterated that the indicative route through the woodland would result in less than 10 mature trees being removed, which may not have been appreciated at the outset; • The scale of development does not in itself create a reason for the site not to be supported. The indicative layout of the 3 hectare site had been presented in such a way as to promote effective use of land and green space; • For the avoidance of doubt, the indicative capacity was not specifically based on concerns raised by the Strathpeffer Community Council, but by informed site design work prior to these views being put forward; • Any visual impact will be mitigated against by compensatory planting and sensitive positioning of the access. • The scale and massing at Nutwood would be informed by the Conservation Area Management Plan to be prepared by the Council. “The Forestry Officer also had significant concerns over the impact that this scale of development will have on the mature trees surrounding the site”. • The significance of this specific concern is queried, given that the proposed housing layout does not directly impact on the mature trees surrounding the site. The indicative housing layout did provide a green buffer zone between the building footprint locations and the surrounding mature trees. As part of the ongoing house layout designing process of the site, it is proposed that the principle is established for a significant green buffer zone to safeguard surrounding mature trees. The Forestry Officer also had significant concerns over “the lack of open space within the site” • The significance of this specific concern is queried, given the points made above. It is also noted that the indicative housing layout included a central green space for amenity and recreational purposes, together with indicative compensatory planting throughout and around the perimeter of the site; • The Main Issues Report identifies the fact that the site is enclosed by mature woodland, which limits landscape impact, as a significant pro; • It is noted that the indicative housing layout suggested a housing density of approximately 0.061 hectares (0.15 acres) per unit, which is comparable to the SP1 Kinellan site within the Proposed Plan, which has an indicative housing density of 0.066 hectares (0.16 acres) per unit. For the avoidance of doubt, the final housing density for The Nutwood would be determined by the principles of sustainable use of land and necessary flexibility to provide appropriate affordable or smaller housing to meet local needs, whilst providing ample green space. It is proposed that as part of the site designing process, the principle is set for a significant green buffer to be established between the edge of the development and the Outstanding Conservation Area to the south. This will address concerns raised by the Strathpeffer Community Council and the comments made by the Forestry Officer of perceived lack of open space. The Committee Report suggests an “absence of any evidence explaining public benefits of the scheme”. • The development would create an opportunity to prepare a Tree Management Plan for the area that would safeguard and enhance the amenity value of the vicinity. • By applying modern designing principles, any increase in the unit number (above the current allocation of 15) will allow for a greater contribution to be made for much needed affordable homes in the area. • The development would create an opportunity to enhance linkage and public access to the Eaglestone Schedule Monument; • The development would create opportunities for

improved public access to, and within, the ancient woodland and to the golf course amenity land to the north; • As a viable development site, The Nutwood will improve the ability of Strathpeffer to deliver its housing requirements and help reduce the dependency on a single housing site (SP1), which is subject to its own constraints. Concerns were raised about the “accessibility of the site by a choice of transport options”. • It is noted that the development would benefit from an active travel connection via the path to the Eaglestone Schedule Monument and that opportunities will be created to enhance this further for pedestrian and cycling use; • It is noted that the existing link between The Nutwood and the village centre is less than a five minute walk. It is noted in the Committee Report that the site is “not required to meet the housing land requirements in the part of the Wester Ross housing market area that lies within the Plan area”. • As a viable development site, The Nutwood would help mitigate against the risks and dependency on a single housing site (SP1), as currently presented in the Proposed Plan, in delivering the housing requirements for the village of Strathpeffer and the wider area.

Allocated to	Strathpeffer	General	General	
--------------	--------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses.

Representation

REPRESENTATION IN SUPPORT OF THE ALLOCATION OF LAND SOUTH AND EAST OF A862/NESS ROAD, FORTROSE FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING RETAIL, BUSINESS/COMMUNITY AND TOURIST USES. 2.1.As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses. 2.2The Council has acknowledged that there is an opportunity for relocated expanded food store in Fortrose, that being a relocation of the existing Co-op store at High Street. At this point it is worth giving some coverage to the rationale for the proposed Co-op relocation. 2.3The existing Co-op store at High Street extends to 219 sqm (gross) and has been trading for over 12 years. While the High Street store has served our client well, its scale, nature and characteristics no longer best serve the customers who shop at the store. The existing store suffers from a variety of problems which compromise the satisfaction of the customers and the efficient operation of the store, including the following: •Aisles are too narrow resulting in congestion within the store; •General congestion around the checkouts and aisles results in conflict between customers waiting to be served and those manoeuvring through these areas; •The entrance foyer to the store is constricted and does not allow for the full range of customer services to be provided. Congestion also arises in this area; •Checkout provision is insufficient, resulting in frequent and persistent queues; •Congestion within the store makes it difficult to manoeuvre stock trolleys and cages through aisles and shelves to replenish stock. As a result shelves are stacked at higher levels than normally found in foodstores. •The need for stock replenishment during busy times is, in itself, inconvenient for customers as cages take up valuable circulation space; •There is insufficient floorspace to display a sufficient quantity of some goods and insufficient floorspace to offer customers the desired range of goods; •The size and configuration of the storage area is currently inadequate, creating a compromised working environment for warehouse staff; and •Lack of storage space results in increased need for more frequent deliveries which is both environmentally damaging and inefficient from an operational perspective. 2.4The existing Co-op store is exhibiting the above characteristics and these deficiencies cannot be resolved through the reorganisation of the store's internal layout. It should be noted that the deficiencies of the existing store have given rise to a series of operational difficulties, resulting in the Council having to pursue enforcement proceedings due to the storage of materials outwith the Co-op store. 2.5Today, customers expect convenience stores to provide an attractive and spacious shopping environment allowing them to undertake their shopping trip efficiently and in relative comfort. The existing Co-op store does not allow for this and consequently the Co-operative Group is keen to meet customer expectations and demands in Fortrose. 2.6The Co-op enjoy a reputation for a high level of quality and customer service within their stores but facilities in the existing Fortrose store no longer meet the company's standards. The Co-operative Group are therefore committed to making a significant investment to provide a new larger foodstore in Fortrose, improving upon the quality of the existing store and improving the overall retail offer in the town. 2.7It is therefore necessary to provide a new Co-op store in Fortrose in the right location in order to provide a shopping facility that provides a more comprehensive range of goods and services, more closely aimed at meeting shopper's needs and on a site that is highly accessible to the catchment population and well connected to Fortrose town centre. Sequential Approach 2.8Scottish Planning Policy is clear that in allocating land for retail development, the local planning authority must have regard to the sequential approach and allocations must be suitable, viable and take commercial realities into account. 2.9The Co-operative Group consider that the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most suitable location for a relocated and expanded store in Fortrose, offering the opportunity to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned mixed use development, in close proximity to the existing town centre. 2.10The accompanying retail study demonstrates that there are no suitable or available sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre and that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most suitable site for new retail development in Fortrose. The land at Rosemarkie Road lies only 190 metres from the defined town centre and offers the opportunity to create a development that will be well connected to the town centre. 2.11Secondly, the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most commercially suitable site for new retail development in Fortrose. The Co-op require to maintain a high profile trading position in the town and this is something which the land at Rosemarkie Road would provide, allowing the Co-op to develop a new store that would have strong linkages with

established commercial activities and local businesses. Retail Capacity 2.12Having established that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most favourable site sequentially and commercially, we have given consideration to whether new retail development can be accommodated at Rosemarkie Road without having any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.13Firstly, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the proposed convenience store is not a large supermarket and is of a scale that is designed to improve the existing retail offer of the town but is commensurate with the role and function of Fortrose. At 557 sqm the proposed retail store would fall well below the 2,500 sqm threshold which SPP requires a retail impact assessment to be undertaken. 2.14A retail study has been prepared in support of our clients proposals and this demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op store without there being any impacts on the vitality and viability of Fortrose town centre. 2.15In terms of key findings, the study demonstrates that the resident population within the Fortrose catchment area generate approximately £12.68m of convenience goods expenditure and only £5.30m of this expenditure is captured by existing stores within the Fortrose catchment. 2.16The study indicates that up to £7.38m of the convenience goods expenditure generated by the Fortrose catchment is currently leaking to more distant locations, most probably to Inverness. 2.17The store proposed at Rosemarkie Road would have a company average turnover of approximately £3.08m, with £2.8m drawn from the Fortrose catchment. Of this £2.8m, £1.73m would be diverted from the existing Co-op store in Fortrose and the remaining £1.1m would be drawn from the £7.33m of trade that is currently leaking from the Fortrose catchment. 2.18Given the scale of capacity within the Fortrose catchment area it is evident that there is sufficient expenditure within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support a new store at Rosemarkie Road without there being any negative impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.19The provision of a larger Co-op store in Fortrose will simply help to retain more shoppers within the town, thereby reducing the number of shoppers travelling a longer distance to the large foodstores located outwith the catchment area and clawing back expenditure to the town. 2.20The proposals would not have any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. The other convenience retailers in Fortrose town centre provide specialist bakery and butchery products and are well supported by the local community. A relocated Co-op store would not have an instore bakery or fresh butchery counter and therefore would not compete with these well established businesses that the Co-op already trade alongside. Moreover, with the proposed site being only 190 metres from the town centre, there are likely to be spin off benefits for the town centre by developing a new store in such close proximity to the High Street. Other Relevant Matters 2.21The land at Rosemarkie Road is the most sequentially preferable site in Fortrose for new retail development and a new store of the scale and nature proposed can be accommodated on the site without there being any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.22In terms of other relevant matters, a well-designed development on the site would not only deliver a new planned defensible boundary on the town's northern edge but would also achieve a more uniform boundary when considered in conjunction with adjacent land uses, thus improving the defensibility of the edge generally. 2.23The Rosemarkie Road site relates more in character to the existing settlement and should be considered more as a suitable site on the edge of the existing settlement than a meaningful component of the countryside. The proposed development would knit into the existing urban fabric and will also allow for the creation of a sensitive, clearly defined and well contained interface with the countryside to the north. Contained development at Rosemarkie would form an appropriate edge to the settlement and would not form urban sprawl or encourage coalescence in any way. 2.24The proposed development will have no significant adverse impacts upon the environment, landscape, heritage resources and nature conservation. Rather, it will have a beneficial impact upon the above through high quality proposals that respect local character, delivering an improved landscape setting. 2.25In overall terms, the proposal complies with national, strategic and local planning policies for retail development. Having regard to the proposal's ability to deliver additional choice to Fortrose, the absence of any sequentially preferable sites and its compliance with planning policy, it is evident that the proposed store represents a valuable opportunity to meet the needs of Fortrose and is therefore commended to The Highland Council for inclusion within the emerging local development plan.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. We wish to see the support for retail development at FR2 removed.

Representation

The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. 1.2 The prospect of the land at Ness Gap being allocated for retail use, first emerged in the Council's 'Alternative Sites and Uses' Consultation Paper (June 2013). Section 6.9 of this consultation paper put forward the allocation of the Ness Gap site for retail development, advising that the Ness Gap site offers the following benefits as a retail development location: • Opportunity for relocated expanded food store (subject to proving no detrimental impact on town centre) • edge of centre location • provides flexibility for future • could improve parking situation in town centre • within easy walking distance of much of Fortrose • close to public transport connections 1.3 The Council gave no demonstration at that time that it had considered or applied the sequential approach to site selection as prescribed in Scottish Planning Policy (SPP). 1.4 The proposed local development plan has taken matters forward and allocates land at Ness Gap (Ref FR2) for a mixed use development, with support for 80 homes and 1.6ha for community, business, office, tourism or retail use. 1.5 In the first instance, it should be noted that our client is supportive of the Council's acknowledgement, as expressed in the alternative sites consultation paper, that there would be benefit in providing for a relocated and expanded foodstore in Fortrose. This of course is the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op foodstore in Fortrose. 1.6 However, our client does not consider that the land at Ness Gap is the most appropriate location for a relocated Co-op foodstore and they wish to object to the proposed allocation for the reasons set out below. 1.7 The supporting text for draft allocation FR2 establishes that development of the Ness Gap site is to be in accordance with the 09/00471/OUTRC outline planning permission. This application was approved on 8th June 2010 and granted consent for "Masterplan for the erection of houses, formation of access and parking and provision of amenity/open space (Outline)" 1.8 We are not aware of this outline permission establishing any support for retail development on the Ness Gap site and there is a disconnect between the uses referred to in proposed allocation FR2 and the requirement for the site to be developed in accordance with the outline planning permission. 1.9 The FR2 requirements in the proposed plan also advise that retail development would be required to satisfy the sequential approach to site selection and be the subject of retail impact analysis. 1.10 Based on these requirements it appears that the Council have offered support for retail development on the Ness Gap site, without knowing if there are sequentially preferable sites available in Fortrose or if retail development can be accommodated on that site without there being unacceptable impacts on nearby town centres. 1.11 Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (paragraph 15) requires that development plans should be aspirational but also realistic and that local development plans should be clear about the scale of anticipated change, demonstrating the underlying reasons for the preferred locations for development. It is evident from the proposed development plan that this established approach to allocating land for development has not been followed by the Council in supporting retail development on site FR2. 1.12 In terms of retail development, SPP (paragraph 56) requires that the development plan should enable gaps and deficiencies in provision of shopping, leisure and other services to be remedied by identifying appropriate locations for new development and regeneration. SPP adds that commercial realities should be taken into account when development plans are prepared and that planning authorities should be responsive to the needs of town centre uses, identifying suitable and viable sites in terms of size, location and availability within a reasonable time period, indicating how and when constraints could be resolved. 1.13 In allocating the land at Ness Gap for retail development, the Council have had no regard to commercial realities and nor have they considered whether retail development at this location would be suitable or viable. This is particularly important when the rationale of the proposed allocation is to provide for a relocated and expanded Co-op store. 1.14 Having applied the sequential approach and considered the alternatives in Fortrose, The Co-operative Group does not consider the Ness Gap site to be suitable from a commercial perspective. Firstly, the site is poorly located as it is physically and functionally detached from Fortrose town centre. Secondly, the Ness Gap site has no visibility which is an absolute commercial requirement for any retail site. Thirdly, a new retail store at Ness Gap would have to be developed amongst an emerging residential development, creating conflict with existing residents and requiring a proposed store to have restricted opening hours and servicing arrangements. It is our client's experience that introducing a foodstore onto the Ness Gap site would compromise the ability of that site to deliver a high standard of residential amenity for the housing. 1.15 These are all important commercial and operating factors and the commercial deficiencies of the Ness Gap site are such that Co-operative Group would have no interest in it. Therefore, the proposed allocation fails to comply with SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither

suitable nor viable as a location for retail development. 1.16 Paragraph 62 of SPP also requires that the sequential approach should be used when selecting locations for all retail and commercial leisure uses unless the development plan identifies an exception. It is evident from the list of requirements associated with draft allocation FR2 that the Council have had no regard to the sequential approach as required by SPP. 1.17 SPP (paragraph 62) requires that locations for retail development are considered in the following order: • town centre, • edge of town centre, • other commercial centres identified in the development plan, • out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.18 We do not agree with the Council’s comments in the alternative sites consultation paper that the Ness Gap site is edge of centre. As the Council acknowledge, the Ness Gap site is at least 480 metres from the edge of the defined town centre, lying outwith the 400 metre walking distance benchmark for encouraging active travel. We therefore consider that the Ness Gap site is out of centre rather than edge of centre. Furthermore, The Ness Gap site is not accessible by a choice of transport modes and lies some 310 metres from the nearest bus stop. 1.19 In terms of there being sequentially preferable sites to the land at Ness Gap, this is given coverage in the retail study which has been prepared in support of our client’s proposals for Fortrose. This study demonstrates that there is a sequentially preferable alternative site at Rosemarkie Road which is much closer to the defined town centre and is highly accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.20 The Rosemarkie Road site is located approximately 190 metres from the defined town centre, significantly closer than the Ness Gap site. This site offers the opportunity to develop a new foodstore at the junction of Rosemarkie Road and Ness Road, the closest point to the town centre, ensuring that new retail development at this location would have strong linkages with established commercial activities and providing the profile and visibility required by the Co-op. 1.21 There are no sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre which are suitable and available for a relocated and expanded Co-op store and the land at Rosemarkie Road has the ability to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned expansion area which lies in close proximity to the town centre. The land at Rosemarkie Road also addresses commercial realities and is a suitable, available and viable site that is well positioned to maximise spin off benefits for Fortrose town centre. 1.22 Taking the above matters into account, it is evident that the proposed FR2 Ness Gap allocation runs contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy as there is a sequentially preferable development site available at Rosemarkie Road. Moreover, the draft FR2 allocation is also contrary to SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither suitable nor viable as a location for retail development and it is evident that the Council have had no regard to the commercial realities of developing this site for retail use. 1.23 In the course of the development plan process there have been two letters of representation lodged on behalf of the Co-op (and a third letter - Erratum) that set out the operational need for a new Co-op store in Fortrose; that this was a priority for the company moving forward; that the Ness Gap site was unsuitable for operational and policy reasons, and that a favoured site was located adjacent to Rosemarkie Road/Ness Road. 1.24 It is disappointing therefore that our client’s requirements have not been supported in the proposed local development plan and that the site discouraged is identified for retail use, even though by dint of the Council’s policy it is not available; and that the site our clients sought, which is proven by application of the sequential approach and the attached retail study to be the most favourable option, is not included, when there appears no reasonable justification not to have done so.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. We would like support for retail development at Site FR2 removed and land at Rosemarkie Road allocated as a mixed use development opportunity, with support for retail development.

Representation

1.OBJECTION TO ALLOCATION OF LAND AT NESS GAP (REF: FR2 NESS GAP – 80 HOMES WITH 1.6HA FOR COMMUNITY, BUSINESS, OFFICE, TOURISM OR RETAIL) 1.1The Co-operative Group object to draft allocation FR2 Ness Gap, specifically to the support which the proposed local development plan gives to retail development at this location. 1.2The prospect of the land at Ness Gap being allocated for retail use, first emerged in the Council’s ‘Alternative Sites and Uses’ Consultation Paper (June 2013). Section 6.9 of this consultation paper put forward the allocation of the Ness Gap site for retail development, advising that the Ness Gap site offers the following benefits as a retail development location: •Opportunity for relocated expanded food store (subject to proving no detrimental impact on town centre) •edge of centre location •provides flexibility for future •could improve parking situation in town centre •within easy walking distance of much of Fortrose •close to public transport connections 1.3The Council gave no demonstration at that time that it had considered or applied the sequential approach to site selection as prescribed in Scottish Planning Policy (SPP). 1.4The proposed local development plan has taken matters forward and allocates land at Ness Gap (Ref FR2) for a mixed use development, with support for 80 homes and 1.6ha for community, business, office, tourism or retail use. 1.5In the first instance, it should be noted that our client is supportive of the Council’s acknowledgement, as expressed in the alternative sites consultation paper, that there would be benefit in providing for a relocated and expanded foodstore in Fortrose. This of course is the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op foodstore in Fortrose. 1.6However, our client does not consider that the land at Ness Gap is the most appropriate location for a relocated Co-op foodstore and they wish to object to the proposed allocation for the reasons set out below. 1.7The supporting text for draft allocation FR2 establishes that development of the Ness Gap site is to be in accordance with the 09/00471/OUTRC outline planning permission. This application was approved on 8th June 2010 and granted consent for “Masterplan for the erection of houses, formation of access and parking and provision of amenity/open space (Outline)” 1.8We are not aware of this outline permission establishing any support for retail development on the Ness Gap site and there is a disconnect between the uses referred to in proposed allocation FR2 and the requirement for the site to be developed in accordance with the outline planning permission. 1.9The FR2 requirements in the proposed plan also advise that retail development would be required to satisfy the sequential approach to site selection and be the subject of retail impact analysis. 1.10Based on these requirements it appears that the Council have offered support for retail development on the Ness Gap site, without knowing if there are sequentially preferable sites available in Fortrose or if retail development can be accommodated on that site without there being unacceptable impacts on nearby town centres. 1.11Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (paragraph 15) requires that development plans should be aspirational but also realistic and that local development plans should be clear about the scale of anticipated change, demonstrating the underlying reasons for the preferred locations for development. It is evident from the proposed development plan that this established approach to allocating land for development has not been followed by the Council in supporting retail development on site FR2. 1.12In terms of retail development, SPP (paragraph 56) requires that the development plan should enable gaps and deficiencies in provision of shopping, leisure and other services to be remedied by identifying appropriate locations for new development and regeneration. SPP adds that commercial realities should be taken into account when development plans are prepared and that planning authorities should be responsive to the needs of town centre uses, identifying suitable and viable sites in terms of size, location and availability within a reasonable time period, indicating how and when constraints could be resolved. 1.13In allocating the land at Ness Gap for retail development, the Council have had no regard to commercial realities and nor have they considered whether retail development at this location would be suitable or viable. This is particularly important when the rationale of the proposed allocation is to provide for a relocated and expanded Co-op store. 1.14Having applied the sequential approach and considered the alternatives in Fortrose, The Co-operative Group does not consider the Ness Gap site to be suitable from a commercial perspective. Firstly, the site is poorly located as it is physically and functionally detached from Fortrose town centre. Secondly, the Ness Gap site has no visibility which is an absolute commercial requirement for any retail site. Thirdly, a new retail store at Ness Gap would have to be developed amongst an emerging residential development, creating conflict with existing residents and requiring a proposed store to have restricted opening hours and servicing arrangements. It is our client’s experience that introducing a foodstore onto the Ness Gap site would compromise the ability of that site to deliver

a high standard of residential amenity for the housing. 1.15 These are all important commercial and operating factors and the commercial deficiencies of the Ness Gap site are such that Co-operative Group would have no interest in it. Therefore, the proposed allocation fails to comply with SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither suitable nor viable as a location for retail development. 1.16 Paragraph 62 of SPP also requires that the sequential approach should be used when selecting locations for all retail and commercial leisure uses unless the development plan identifies an exception. It is evident from the list of requirements associated with draft allocation FR2 that the Council have had no regard to the sequential approach as required by SPP. 1.17 SPP (paragraph 62) requires that locations for retail development are considered in the following order: •town centre, •edge of town centre, •other commercial centres identified in the development plan, •out of centre locations that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.18 We do not agree with the Council's comments in the alternative sites consultation paper that the Ness Gap site is edge of centre. As the Council acknowledge, the Ness Gap site is at least 480 metres from the edge of the defined town centre, lying outwith the 400 metre walking distance benchmark for encouraging active travel. We therefore consider that the Ness Gap site is out of centre rather than edge of centre. Furthermore, The Ness Gap site is not accessible by a choice of transport modes and lies some 310 metres from the nearest bus stop. 1.19 In terms of there being sequentially preferable sites to the land at Ness Gap, this is given coverage in the retail study which has been prepared in support of our client's proposals for Fortrose. This study demonstrates that there is a sequentially preferable alternative site at Rosemarkie Road which is much closer to the defined town centre and is highly accessible by a choice of transport modes. 1.20 The Rosemarkie Road site is located approximately 190 metres from the defined town centre, significantly closer than the Ness Gap site. This site offers the opportunity to develop a new foodstore at the junction of Rosemarkie Road and Ness Road, the closest point to the town centre, ensuring that new retail development at this location would have strong linkages with established commercial activities and providing the profile and visibility required by the Co-op. 1.21 There are no sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre which are suitable and available for a relocated and expanded Co-op store and the land at Rosemarkie Road has the ability to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned expansion area which lies in close proximity to the town centre. The land at Rosemarkie Road also addresses commercial realities and is a suitable, available and viable site that is well positioned to maximise spin off benefits for Fortrose town centre. 1.22 Taking the above matters into account, it is evident that the proposed FR2 Ness Gap allocation runs contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy as there is a sequentially preferable development site available at Rosemarkie Road. Moreover, the draft FR2 allocation is also contrary to SPP as the Ness Gap site is neither suitable nor viable as a location for retail development and it is evident that the Council have had no regard to the commercial realities of developing this site for retail use. 1.23 In the course of the development plan process there have been two letters of representation lodged on behalf of the Co-op (and a third letter - Erratum) that set out the operational need for a new Co-op store in Fortrose; that this was a priority for the company moving forward; that the Ness Gap site was unsuitable for operational and policy reasons, and that a favoured site was located adjacent to Rosemarkie Road/Ness Road. 1.24 It is disappointing therefore that our client's requirements have not been supported in the proposed local development plan and that the site discouraged is identified for retail use, even though by dint of the Council's policy it is not available; and that the site our clients sought, which is proven by application of the sequential approach and the attached retail study to be the most favourable option, is not included, when there appears no reasonable justification not to have done so.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	FR2	Ness Gap	
--------------	-------------------------	-----	----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses.

Representation

2.1 As noted in our objections to proposed allocation FR2 Ness Gap, we consider that the emerging local development plan should offer support for retail development, as part of a mixed use proposal on land at Rosemarkie Road, Fortrose. Indeed, this representation seeks the allocation of the land at Rosemarkie Road for a mixed use development with support for retail, tourism, community and leisure uses. 2.2 The Council has acknowledged that there is an opportunity for relocated expanded food store in Fortrose, that being a relocation of the existing Co-op store at High Street. At this point it is worth giving some coverage to the rationale for the proposed Co-op relocation. 2.3 The existing Co-op store at High Street extends to 219 sqm (gross) and has been trading for over 12 years. While the High Street store has served our client well, its scale, nature and characteristics no longer best serve the customers who shop at the store. The existing store suffers from a variety of problems which compromise the satisfaction of the customers and the efficient operation of the store, including the following: • Aisles are too narrow resulting in congestion within the store; • General congestion around the checkouts and aisles results in conflict between customers waiting to be served and those manoeuvring through these areas; • The entrance foyer to the store is constricted and does not allow for the full range of customer services to be provided. Congestion also arises in this area; • Checkout provision is insufficient, resulting in frequent and persistent queues; • Congestion within the store makes it difficult to manoeuvre stock trolleys and cages through aisles and shelves to replenish stock. As a result shelves are stacked at higher levels than normally found in foodstores. • The need for stock replenishment during busy times is, in itself, inconvenient for customers as cages take up valuable circulation space; • There is insufficient floorspace to display a sufficient quantity of some goods and insufficient floorspace to offer customers the desired range of goods; • The size and configuration of the storage area is currently inadequate, creating a compromised working environment for warehouse staff; and • Lack of storage space results in increased need for more frequent deliveries which is both environmentally damaging and inefficient from an operational perspective. 2.4 The existing Co-op store is exhibiting the above characteristics and these deficiencies cannot be resolved through the reorganisation of the store's internal layout. It should be noted that the deficiencies of the existing store have given rise to a series of operational difficulties, resulting in the Council having to pursue enforcement proceedings due to the storage of materials outwith the Co-op store. 2.5 Today, customers expect convenience stores to provide an attractive and spacious shopping environment allowing them to undertake their shopping trip efficiently and in relative comfort. The existing Co-op store does not allow for this and consequently the Co-operative Group is keen to meet customer expectations and demands in Fortrose. 2.6 The Co-op enjoy a reputation for a high level of quality and customer service within their stores but facilities in the existing Fortrose store no longer meet the company's standards. The Co-operative Group are therefore committed to making a significant investment to provide a new larger foodstore in Fortrose, improving upon the quality of the existing store and improving the overall retail offer in the town. 2.7 It is therefore necessary to provide a new Co-op store in Fortrose in the right location in order to provide a shopping facility that provides a more comprehensive range of goods and services, more closely aimed at meeting shopper's needs and on a site that is highly accessible to the catchment population and well connected to Fortrose town centre. Sequential Approach 2.8 Scottish Planning Policy is clear that in allocating land for retail development, the local planning authority must have regard to the sequential approach and allocations must be suitable, viable and take commercial realities into account. 2.9 The Co-operative Group consider that the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most suitable location for a relocated and expanded store in Fortrose, offering the opportunity to deliver new retail floorspace as part of a planned mixed use development, in close proximity to the existing town centre. 2.10 The accompanying retail study demonstrates that there are no suitable or available sites within or on the edge of Fortrose town centre and that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most suitable site for new retail development in Fortrose. The land at Rosemarkie Road lies only 190 metres from the defined town centre and offers the opportunity to create a development that will be well connected to the town centre. 2.11 Secondly, the land at Rosemarkie Road is the most commercially suitable site for new retail development in Fortrose. The Co-op require to maintain a high profile trading position in the town and this is something which the land at Rosemarkie Road would provide, allowing the Co-op to develop a new store that would have strong linkages with established commercial activities and local businesses. Retail Capacity 2.12 Having established that the Rosemarkie Road site is the most favourable site sequentially and commercially, we have given consideration to whether

new retail development can be accommodated at Rosemarkie Road without having any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.13 Firstly, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the proposed convenience store is not a large supermarket and is of a scale that is designed to improve the existing retail offer of the town but is commensurate with the role and function of Fortrose. At 557 sqm the proposed retail store would fall well below the 2,500 sqm threshold which SPP requires a retail impact assessment to be undertaken. 2.14 A retail study has been prepared in support of our clients proposals and this demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support the relocation and expansion of the existing Co-op store without there being any impacts on the vitality and viability of Fortrose town centre. 2.15 In terms of key findings, the study demonstrates that the resident population within the Fortrose catchment area generate approximately £12.68m of convenience goods expenditure and only £5.30m of this expenditure is captured by existing stores within the Fortrose catchment. 2.16 The study indicates that up to £7.38m of the convenience goods expenditure generated by the Fortrose catchment is currently leaking to more distant locations, most probably to Inverness. 2.17 The store proposed at Rosemarkie Road would have a company average turnover of approximately £3.08m, with £2.8m drawn from the Fortrose catchment. Of this £2.8m, £1.73m would be diverted from the existing Co-op store in Fortrose and the remaining £1.1m would be drawn from the £7.33m of trade that is currently leaking from the Fortrose catchment. 2.18 Given the scale of capacity within the Fortrose catchment area it is evident that there is sufficient expenditure within the Fortrose catchment to comfortably support a new store at Rosemarkie Road without there being any negative impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.19 The provision of a larger Co-op store in Fortrose will simply help to retain more shoppers within the town, thereby reducing the number of shoppers travelling a longer distance to the large foodstores located outwith the catchment area and clawing back expenditure to the town. 2.20 The proposals would not have any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. The other convenience retailers in Fortrose town centre provide specialist bakery and butchery products and are well supported by the local community. A relocated Co-op store would not have an instore bakery or fresh butchery counter and therefore would not compete with these well established businesses that the Co-op already trade alongside. Moreover, with the proposed site being only 190 metres from the town centre, there are likely to be spin off benefits for the town centre by developing a new store in such close proximity to the High Street. Other Relevant Matters 2.21 The land at Rosemarkie Road is the most sequentially preferable site in Fortrose for new retail development and a new store of the scale and nature proposed can be accommodated on the site without there being any adverse impacts on Fortrose town centre. 2.22 In terms of other relevant matters, a well-designed development on the site would not only deliver a new planned defensible boundary on the town's northern edge but would also achieve a more uniform boundary when considered in conjunction with adjacent land uses, thus improving the defensibility of the edge generally. 2.23 The Rosemarkie Road site relates more in character to the existing settlement and should be considered more as a suitable site on the edge of the existing settlement than a meaningful component of the countryside. The proposed development would knit into the existing urban fabric and will also allow for the creation of a sensitive, clearly defined and well contained interface with the countryside to the north. Contained development at Rosemarkie would form an appropriate edge to the settlement and would not form urban sprawl or encourage coalescence in any way. 2.24 The proposed development will have no significant adverse impacts upon the environment, landscape, heritage resources and nature conservation. Rather, it will have a beneficial impact upon the above through high quality proposals that respect local character, delivering an improved landscape setting. 2.25 In overall terms, the proposal complies with national, strategic and local planning policies for retail development. Having regard to the proposal's ability to deliver additional choice to Fortrose, the absence of any sequentially preferable sites and its compliance with planning policy, it is evident that the proposed store represents a valuable opportunity to meet the needs of Fortrose and is therefore commended to The Highland Council for inclusion within the emerging local development plan.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number 01311 Name The Executory Of Hector Munro Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Alan R Farningham Farningham Planning Ltd

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Support Plan as written.

Allocated to East Inverness IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land

Customer Number 04217 Name The Seafield Farm Trust Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Mr Ken Bowlts Bowlts Chartered Surveyors

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.15

Reference IN82 Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

We write on behalf of our clients, The Seafield Farm Trust, the owners of part of site IN82, identified within the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan as "Ashton Farm and adjoining land". We attach a copy of the East Inverness Plan overlaid with our clients' ownership shown cross-hatched and outlined in red. We write to confirm our clients' continued support of the inclusion of their land within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan and their hope that the land can be brought forward for development in early course.

Allocated to East Inverness IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The Proposals Map (parcels CD3-10) should be adjusted to reflect precisely the “search area” identified in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan: this should be represented as a whole area CD3.

Representation

This objection concerns the Proposals Map and its representation of CD3-10. The Highland-wide Local Development Plan (adopted 2012) (policy 22) identifies a search area for Cawdor Expansion (masterplan). This was determined after Examination and endorsed by the Reporter. The search area is identified as a whole and composite area; it is the principle on which a masterplan is to be prepared. The representation of that development potential in the Inner Moray Firth Local Plan fragments that whole and composite area into the piecemeal land parcels CD3-10. In so doing, it distorts the principle of a whole and comprehensive masterplan; and it omits land identified as part of the search area in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. For example, the grey shaded area on the plan to the south east of CD7 should be included within the mixed use area as this area has the potential to play a key and pivotal role in the new village centre at this location. This representation seeks that the whole and composite masterplan search area as identified in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan is carried through in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan because: •the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (Proposals Map) omits land included in the search area which comprises land with development or redevelopment potential. That includes the farm buildings at Ballichnockan and land west of the Cawdor burn. No evidence has been lodged by Cawdor Estate - the owner of all of the land affected - as proponents of the Masterplan; or by the planning authority or in any representations made in respect of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan that inform or justify the omission of that land. If these omissions arise as a result of any concern for flood risk, then the Flood Risk Assessment lodged to support the outcome of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan indicates these areas not to be at risk. That information was presented to the Highland-wide Local Development Plan Examination and is available to the planning authority; •the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (Proposals Map) insofar as it fragments the search area with development potential has no relevance to corresponding policy. The Plan does not differentiate the parcels CD3-11 in policy or refer to them independently; but it does refer to the parcels CD3-11 collectively at para. 4.93. Thus, the Proposals Map and the policy do not coincide, and the parcels CD3-11 therefore appear to have no rationale and impose purely arbitrary restrictions that serve no purpose but could unnecessarily restrict the masterplan from achieving its full potential for a well-designed overall settlement; •the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (Proposals Map) does not convey the comprehensive masterplan approach promoted in the development plan. As indicated in representations to the Highland-wide Local Development Plan a comprehensive approach is essential to securing the development plan objectives through a masterplan and its related public process, and in particular, essential to respecting the character of the conservation village, design quality and coherent layout, a balanced land use mix, proper phasing of development, proper infrastructure planning, and a viable market proposition. The fragmented and piecemeal representation of that objective confuses the purpose and process of a masterplan, and runs counter to the development plan objectives and the landowner aspirations; and as also indicated to the planning authority, representations undertaken to date as part of the public masterplan process thus far. The representations lodged on behalf of The Trustees of Cawdor Discretionary Trust in respect of the Main Issues Report invited the planning authority to reflect the terms of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and avoid artificially fragmenting the search area. The Trustees are extremely disappointed at the planning authority’s response.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

reinstatement of boundaries to the north and west.Removal of proposal to include area KH5 within village boundary

Representation

Moving the northern boundary eastwards to Carse place removes approx ten established residencies and a brownfield development site[with detailed planning consent for 13 dwellings] from the village envelope.this would seem to contradict the local development plan aim to draw boundaries 'relatively widely round existing built-up areas'.The proposal states the' country lane nature of many internal roads limit the availability of development sites' and housing expansion is directed to the north and west.Why in this direction? The zone identified as KH5 [90 homes plus business and community] is currently agricultural land outwith the village boundary [although with rather nice views over the Firth].A loop road would be created to connect with the existing Newton Park road.The same 'country lane roads' the council would seek to avoid.The potential development site at Fingask Steading has,as part of its consent obligations,to improve the access road from the community hall north west to Mains of Fingask.The necessary wayleaves to facilitate this are in place. With regard to the field opposite Tealach House and the community centre,the Local Plan makes reference to Affordable Housing and an 'ageing population'.What better location, than this area,for infill development?Less than 100 metres to the community hall, little more to the school adjacent to the playpark and with very little work or upheaval to improve the junction of St Mary's Rd with the B9164 [the main through road]. In short I consider this to be a poorly thought out proposal and should be reconsidered.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Notified Proposed Development Site is redrawn to omit .23 acre next to Tigh An Dallon House which is registered to me.

Representation

As per purchase document.

Allocated to

Customer Number 03971 Name Thomas McIntyre Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph EV1

Reference Type Change

Comment Changes

Objection to building development close to Tigh An Dallon House.

Representation

Tigh An Dallon House is the only private residence located next to EV1 therefore: 1. Disruption to our daily lives. 2. Views blocked by building of prperty in front of house. 3. Access problems from Swordale Road. 4. Too many homes in location. I would like to know what steps are going to be taken to avoid these points.

Allocated to Evanton EV1 Teandallon East

Customer Number 04521 Name Thomas Stewart Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN49 Type Change

Comment Changes

Bogbain wood to allow public access and use as an openspace

Representation

I have been advised of your proposed development of the above and being computer illiterate, I have no other means or time other than to write of my objection. I have lived at the above address for about 14 years and have witnessed little but house-building, as was planned in a 1997 mixed development plan, along with the school, distributor road etc. most importantly the plan stated in 1 section 5 :- "bogbain wood was to allow public access and use as an open space (90 h.a.) I am a 68 year old pensioner who regularly walks a circuit via general wade track, daviot wood and bogbain wood, one of the few leisurable experiences still available in this area. As do many others, I encounter various forms of wild-life including deer, pine martins and badgers, most of which abide in the bogbain area. A heron flew over my head and landed in the swamped area of bogbain on Tuesday of this week. Do you really want to destroy this natural habitat? Your plan will also detract usage of the public footpath to daviot (via general wade track) and would entail walking adjacent to urban housing. The majority of residents of Milton of leys are unaware of the location of bogbain wood and thus the significance of your proposal. Please reconsider and revert to the 1997 development plans for the area which was a major reason for my relocation.

Allocated to South Inverness IN49 Bogbain (west)

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR NAIRN – SITE NA2 – KINGSTEPS. I am absolutely appalled at the thought of 90 houses in the small field at the back of my home. This is completely out of kilter with the rest of the area of Kingsteps which is composed of houses in half acre gardens. It is being proposed by the owner of the land who has no consideration for the existing residents and whose only concern is to make money from the prime agricultural land which she inherited. Also, the road through Kingsteps is unable to cope with the extra traffic that 90 extra houses would produce.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Please find attached Cawdor and West Nairnshire's Community Council original response to the IMFLDP dated June 2012. Interestingly enough we haven't as yet received a response to this so we won't hold our breaths !!. Whilst some recent events have changed our original response the section relating to Cawdor Village is still in our mind current and indeed more so given the number of proposed units to be built has increased and is therefore valid as part of the updated response to you. Since the original submission we have signed up along with the other Nairnshire CC as per the recent letter dated 19th November 2013 to Steve Barron that there should be a different approach to long term plans for the IMFLDP, to take greater account of local knowledge/aspirations for the local area together with infrastructure to be in place and funded prior to development approval. Other points we would like to raise are as per below

- “In light of the recent economic changes we would question the validity of the aspirational population growth figures and suggest that they be revised before the final submission of the IMFLDP”.
- (In 2012, the annual gain from migration into the Highland Council area was only 87 as opposed to the projected annual gain of 1650, on which the IMFLDP was based. From 2013, it appears there will be a natural population decrease with more deaths than births. The revised Plan should now reflect the change in local demography).
- Planning permission already granted between Inverness and Nairn is for around 10,000 houses but there is very little building activity taking place, which questions the alleged “huge demand for housing in the area” quoted by planners and forming the basis of the plan. There is also a disappointing number of job opportunities in Inner Moray Firth Area in contrast to Easter Ross which seems to be attracting more industry and suggest more of the housing growth should take place there. The
- Inverness Airport Business Park is not attracting the companies which were to provide the job opportunities in the area, as predicted.
- There is a significant loss of areas of prime agricultural land, enlarging towns and villages many with inadequate roads and infrastructure and without job opportunities, thus creating dormitory settlements and putting even greater pressure on A96 as main artery. Cawdor Village
- Cawdor & W N C Council's disappointment that their response to IMFLDP MIR dated 29th June, 2012 which followed consultation with local residents, did not result in any material changes to the plan
- Whilst areas planned (CD1-8) for village expansion are owned and controlled by Cawdor Estates areas (CD9-10) are currently farmed by tenant farmers. Areas (CD1-8) are more easily assessable for the local school and other village services and are more suitable for a reduced level of expansion. Organic development along Newton Road is preferable in order to preserve the historic character of the road. The area of trees between Newton Road and CD9 has specific historic significance
- Residents welcome a degree of expansion, the proposed 600% increase is considered by many local residents and other Nairnshire residents as excessive and would result in loss of prime agricultural land. The proposed housing density is a further concern of residents who highly value the rural ambience of the area.
- Current use of the B9090 as an unofficial Nairn by-pass must defer any major expansion of villages like Cawdor until the A96 from Inverness to Nairn is made dual carriageway, as proposed, combined with a firm commitment to by-pass Nairn, Improvements to the B9090 will also be necessary and funded to cope with increased vehicle, cycle and pedestrian traffic prior to major building work taking place.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Please refer to attached representation. Seeking a change to the Proposed Plan to indicate the identification of land at Mullans Wood, near Tore, for Industrial use.

Representation

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF TORE RECYCLING LTD LAND AT MULLANS WOOD, KILCOY, TORE IV7 7SF Colliers International is instructed by Tore Recycling Ltd, owners of the property known as Mullans Wood, Kilcoy, Tore to respond to the current consultation about the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) – Proposed Plan, published for comments earlier this month. This representation indicates objection to the non-identification of land at Mullans Wood for general industrial use (Class 5). This representation seeks to persuade Highland Council to reconsider the merits in choosing to allocate land at Mullans Wood. In a previous representation lodged to Highland Council to the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) Additional Sites consultation of 28th June 2013, a case was set out by Colliers on behalf of the landowners as to why the site should be identified as a Proposal for general industrial use (Class 5). A copy of that representation is attached for reference. The key factors summarized from the previous submission, listed in support of allocating the site include: • Already has planning permission over 10 acres of the site, for a commercial recycling centre, reference 08/00155/FULRC. • A 10 acre part of the 22 acre site, is now operational, enjoys unrivalled, safe access direct from the A835 via a purpose-built slipway junction. It is therefore very well suited to movements by heavy goods vehicles, plant and other machinery and frequency of visits can be managed suitably. The site can therefore be expanded in capacity without any significant need for improvement to the infrastructure – as opposed to locating a Class 5 use elsewhere in Ross-shire or Inverness with potential risks to road safety. • The site is identified in the extant Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan as located in hinterland and development proposals governed by Policy BP2. This policy allows general support for development of an industrial nature providing no adverse impacts are demonstrated and that the use is compatible with existing use. That would be the case in this matter. • The 22 acres site has around 12 acres of land suitable for expansion of the current recycling use, or for compatible or associated commercial uses (Class 5, 6 or sui generis). Any expansion is unlikely to cause detrimental impact to amenity, natural heritage, cultural or built heritage. This is because an environmental impact assessment that accompanied the planning permission 08/00155/FULRC examined the existence and sensitivity of the site and assessed the impacts of development. It found the site could accommodate the existing development without significant impact and indeed it has brought positive benefit to the local economy and improved road access on the A835, along with a bus stop to increase accessibility by public transport. • The site can be suitably serviced with all relevant infrastructure in place. These matters were all addressed in planning permission 08/00155/FULRC. • Initial market testing for potential future commercial operations has been reasonably positive. Approaches have been made by general industrial operators in the energy / waste / recycling and storage sectors, to examine the potential for use of the land. As a result the landowners confirm the site is marketable and it would not be constrained if proposals came forward to advance operations. On the basis of these matters above, supplemented by the earlier consultation submission of 28th June 2013, it is demonstrated that all matters have been addressed that will assist the Council in its assessment of the future development potential of the land. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the proposal in greater detail at this stage. It is considered that allocation of the site would provide more certainty and clarity to the site operators and also to potential new operators or developers seeking to grow business in the industrial sector.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Our client requests that the land at The Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Site Reference H3) is allocated for residential development in the Proposed Plan. We also request that the settlement boundary is amended to include this site and that the settlement boundary remains the same as the boundary in the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan.

Representation

We refer to the current consultation for the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. We write on behalf of our client the Trustees of Mrs E Clouston. Our client owns the land at The Wards, Fortrose (Main Issues Report Site Reference: H3) and wishes to strongly object to the removal of the housing allocation for this site. We also wish to object to the alteration of the Fortrose settlement boundary which now places this site outwith the Fortrose settlement. The site is allocated for residential development in the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan and was identified as a preferred site at the Main Issues Report consultation stage. We request that this site remains allocated for housing in the emerging Local Development Plan. Current Policy Allocation The site at The Wards is currently allocated for residential development comprising 16 units, within the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan (adopted February 2007). The Background text for Fortrose in the adopted Local Plan (page 72) details that the town maintains a high level of housing demand, particularly from people who work in Inverness or are retired. Housing predictions set out in page 72 of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan details that there is a combined requirement for up to 144 more houses within Fortrose and Rosemarkie by 2011, with a further 96 from 2011 to 2017. We request that this site remains allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Development Plan. The continued allocation of this site ensures that there is an effective supply of housing land within Fortrose. The small scale nature of this site also ensures there is flexibility in the land supply to address the housing requirements for this area. Main Issues Report Allocation The land at The Wards was identified at the Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation stage for the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as a preferred site. The Council recognised at the MIR stage that this site is allocated in the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. The Council also identified that the development of this site would 'round off' the settlement to the north east. Our client submitted representations to the MIR consultation stage to support the continued allocation of this site. As stated in our previous representations, we were seeking a reduced allocation for 8 dwellings at The Wards. Given the topography of the site we do not consider that 16 units could be accommodated at the site. As stated previously, we supported the allocation of this site and the extent of the site boundary identified at the MIR stage. It is considered that the proposed reduction in units would allow the Council to continue to support the development of this site for residential units. The Highland Council has not provided sufficient justification to the change in position and the exclusion of this site from the Proposed Plan. Proposed Plan In preparing the Proposed Plan the Council prepared a Background Paper entitled 'Summary of Comments Received on Main Issues Report and Recommended Responses.' In relation to site H3 at Fortrose the Council has stated that the proposed 8 houses is a more suitable capacity for this site and this would help mitigate the visual impact. The Council has outlined that: "However there would still remain a significant landscape and visual sensitivity to this sites development. It would reduce the gap between Rosemarkie and Fortrose and lies in a prominent position on the hillside which means that even with mitigation measures the site would have negative impact on the character of the village." The Council has provided no justification for the change in the position from the adopted Local Plan and Main Issues Report and why they now consider that the development of this site has 'significant' landscape and visual sensitivity. The site is located within the current settlement boundary for Fortrose and the development of this site for small scale low density housing would complement the existing development pattern and existing land uses. The site has been identified for development by The Highland Council for a number of years without any concerns in relation to landscape and visual impact being raised. The Council has cited in their comments that the East Ross Settlement Landscape Capacity Study 2001 discourages development in this location. We have reviewed the Landscape Capacity Study and it identifies the site as an undeveloped site included within the adopted local plan. As the site is zoned for development the landscape constraints are not assessed in this assessment. It is not identified in the Assessment as an area unsuitable for development. The Council's comments in relation to this site also state that the local road network is problematic and there is no footpath provision. Again, we would reiterate that this site has been identified for development for a number of years and that this is an issue relevant for any future development at Fortrose. This is addressed in the Proposed Plan (paragraph 4.62) which details that: "There is also a need to consider the implications of future development on the local road network and if necessary secure appropriate mitigation." This site has been identified for development for a number of years and the concerns raised by the Council at the Proposed Plan stage have not been previously identified as preventing development at this site. We

consider that the concerns raised by the Council in relation to landscape and visual impacts can be addressed through mitigation and at the detailed planning application stage. The Council's concerns in relation to the local road network are not specifically related to this site and as identified by the Council in the Proposed Plan this can be addressed by securing appropriate mitigation. We therefore request that the Council continues to allocate this site for residential development and that the settlement boundary remains as existing in the adopted Local Plan.

Planning Justification for the Continued Allocation of Site The Highland Council has identified concerns that this site is not an effective housing site as it has appeared in successive Local Plans without securing planning permission to enable its development. Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Supply outlines the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of a site. Paragraph 55 of this PAN sets out the criteria as follows: "Ownership: the site is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development. Where a site is in the ownership of a local authority or other public body, it should be included only where it is part of a programme of land disposal; Physical: the site, or relevant part of it, is free from constraints related to slope, aspect, flood risk, ground stability or vehicular access which would preclude its development. Where there is a solid commitment to removing the constraints in time to allow development in the period under consideration, or the market is strong enough to fund the remedial work required, the site should be included in the effective land supply; Contamination: previous use has not resulted in contamination of the site or, if it has, commitments have been made which would allow it to be developed to provide marketable housing; Deficit Funding: any public funding required to make residential development economically viable is committed by the public bodies concerned; Marketability: the site, or a relevant part of it, can be developed in the period under consideration; Infrastructure: the site is either free of infrastructure constraints, or any required infrastructure can be provided realistically by the developer or another party to allow development; and Land use: housing is the sole preferred use of the land in planning terms, or if housing is one of a range of possible uses other factors such as ownership and marketability point to housing being a realistic option." Assessing each of the above criteria in turn, we consider that this site remains an effective residential site and should remain allocated in the Local Development Plan. Ownership – The site is owned by our client who intends to release the site for residential development. Physical – The site is free from physical constraints that would prevent the site being developed for residential use. The topography of the site has been taken into consideration and we are proposing a reduction in the number of units accommodated at the site. Contamination – the site is currently greenfield and free from any known contamination. Deficit Funding – no public funding is required to deliver this site for housing. Marketability – The site is capable of being delivered during the plan period. It is our client's intention to bring this land forward for development in the short to medium term. Infrastructure – the required infrastructure to service this site can be provided to allow this site to be developed. Land Use – residential use is the most appropriate use for this site. This use would complement the surrounding land uses and there is market demand for housing within Fortrose. We consider that we have demonstrated above that the site remains an effective housing site and should be allocated for residential use in the Local Development Plan. The site is allocated for residential development in the adopted Local Plan and was identified as a preferred site at the Main Issues Report Stage. The concerns raised by the Council at the Proposed Plan stage in terms of landscape and visual impact and access can be mitigated and should not prevent the continued allocation of the site. We therefore request that the Council continues to allocate this site for residential development for 8 units. We also request that the settlement boundary for Fortrose continues to include this site within the boundary.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number 04423 Name Trustees of the late Mrs E Clouston Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable) Alastair Robb MacNeill & Critchley

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph 4.59-4.62

Reference Site H3 in the Main Issues Report Type Change

Comment Changes

We are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan in Part 4 – Development Allocation for Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Our representation relates to the deletion of Area H3 from the previous draft of the Plan, known as The Wards, Fortrose, which is held in the ownership of the Trustees of the late Mrs Eve Clouston. We request that Area H3 be re-inserted in the plan.

Representation

As stated, we are seeking a change to the Proposed Plan in Part 4 – Development Allocation for Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Our representation relates to the deletion from the previous draft of the Plan of Area H3, known as The Wards, Fortrose, which is held in the ownership of the Trustees of the late Mrs Eve Clouston, who died in 2006. We request that Area H3 be re-inserted in the plan. Area H3 is shown on the Main Issues Report plan. The area allocated under heading H3 was shown as a Council-preferred site in the Main Issues Report, in which the significant pros were stated as it having already been allocated at least in part in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan and that it would “round off” the settlement to the north-east of Fortrose. The cons were stated as being - outwith active travel distance of settlement centre, - roads infrastructure improvements required - and potential landscape impact. Area H3 was 1 of only 2 areas shown as Council preferred sites, other than the two areas which are now contained in the Proposed Plan under zoning FR1 and FR2. In the Summary of Comments received on the Main Issues Report prepared by Highland Council, the principal objections to the Plan as then drafted are stated to be preserving the distinct identity and character of Fortrose and Rosemarkie, infrastructure of service provisions, social integration, impact on Conservation Areas, and loss of good farmland. The specific reference to site H3, however, indicates that there was “significantly more limited objection to the Council-preferred H3 site”, and recognised there was some support for H3, with reference to it being poor quality farmland, and that quality landscaping / planting could ameliorate the landscape impact. However, the Council’s response, under the heading “Common Issues Relating to Potential Development Sites” indicates that, in considering the objections regarding preserving the distinct identifies of Fortrose and Rosemarkie, they did not prefer many of the other potential housing options within the gap between the communities. This is reflected in the Main Issues Report in that the Council did not prefer many of the other options within the gap, but did prefer expansion of the cemetery and preferring the Lower Wards Farm site for limited housing development on H3. The Council, however, then state that, in response to the objections, which had already been stated to be “significantly more limited”, they consider that the H3 site should be removed from the Development Plan, because of its landscape impact and other factors. Under the specific heading of “H3 The Wards”, the Council’s pros could be summarised as follows:- 1. Access from the East Watergate main road is preferred. 2. The eight houses proposed is a more suitable capacity than the previous 12-16 houses for which this area was zoned in the earlier Plan. 3. It offers additional choice and flexibility in the housing land supply. 4. It is not prime agricultural land. The negatives are:- 1. Impact on landscape and visibility. 2. Access difficulties. The Council also comment that the effectiveness of the site may be questioned, considering that Planning Consent has not been obtained to enable its development, notwithstanding it appearing in previous Local Plans. We would comment on these points as follows. 1. Landscape and Visual Amenity and Extension of Settlement Boundary As the Council have indicated, this site has been allocated for housing in various past Local Plans and lies within the Settlement boundary shown in previous plans and at earlier stages of the Proposed Plan. Objections and representations regarding the preservation of the gap between Fortrose and Rosemarkie have been made in most consultations, but as is stated in the summary of objections to the Main Issues Report, in the current consultation there was significantly more limited objection to H3 on these grounds. The site lies partly above an existing housing development and the cemetery will also lie above the proposed extension to the cemetery FR3. Suitable mitigating landscaping and planting requirements and careful design can mitigate the landscape impact. This can also clearly be seen from the limited visibility impact of other development carried out on East Watergate road in recent years. It is submitted that this relatively small development, properly designed, will not have a detrimental visibility impact to the extent that it should be removed from the proposed Plan. 2. Access and Infrastructure It is accepted that the site has some challenges regarding development due to its steep topography and additional requirements regarding improved access and drainage. However, previous investigations by a proposed developer indicate that these are matters which can be resolved and are no different from many other housing sites. 3. Effectiveness of the Site for Housing and Housing Demand When earlier zoned, this site was seen as a more long-term area for housing development. Following the death of Mrs Clouston in 2006, it became apparent that the ongoing use of the land for agricultural use was not viable and discussions began with various parties regarding how it might be developed. This involved discussions regarding use of alternative accesses and other aspects. In 2008, a specific developer approached the Trustees with a view to obtaining Planning Consent

for development. At that time, the land was zoned for 12-16 houses, with the preferred access coming from MacKeddie Drive. The proposed developer carried out extensive investigations and preparation of engineering plans, particularly in respect of the road layout and drainage within the development, which indicated that, due to the topography of the site, a lower density of 6-8 houses would be a more practical and viable development of the site, as would access being taken from Watergate instead of MacKeddie Drive. The ongoing process of discussions with the local Planning Department and other interested parties and the preparation of plans took a considerable period of time. In the meantime, the property recession had developed and demand for building land had stalled. That particular developer withdrew from negotiations at the end of 2011 / beginning of 2012, as they did not wish to proceed with further substantial costs at that stage, which would have been involved in a new Planning Application required at that time. Due to financial constraints, the owners require developer input to the process of applying for planning permission and a decision was made to delay until the property market recovered, so that the project would be more attractive and viable to developers, considering the infrastructure and Planning costs which would be incurred in pursuing a Planning Application. This was done also in the knowledge that although then zoned for 12-16 houses, the Main Issues Report indicated that the zoning would likely be reduced to 6-8 houses, still as preferred land. The owners had no prior indication that the preferred status would be removed in the Proposed Plan. Summary The Proposed Plan is intended to reflect preferred zoning for the next ten year period and only two areas in Fortrose and Rosemarkie have been allocated for housing, one being the large partly developed area in the Ness Gap (FR1) and the second being a relatively small, but high density, development in Rosemarkie (FR2). The area at The Wards (formerly H3) offers additional choice and flexibility in housing supply, in offering a lower density and differing location for housing. It seems particularly perverse for this land to be removed from its long-term zoning at this time, just as the economy is recovering and it is likely that there will be an increasing interest in housing development land. There is little doubt that there would be demand for individual houses on this land, in the event that Planning Permission and infrastructure arrangements are put in place. We therefore request that Area H3 be included as housing land in the Plan.

Allocated to	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	General	General	
--------------	-------------------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Land at IN47, IN62 and IN72 should not be allocated specifically for residential, recreational space or education provision and retail; but allocated (for completion of the district centre including) ie development of retail, a care home, residential, community and other District Centre uses. (1) Delete the land allocations at IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 and replace with a composite policy as follows: "Mixed Use: Uses: retail, care home, residential, community, other IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 (denoted as appropriate); Area: 3.4 ha. Requirements: a revised masterplan comprising a minimum of 1,320m² retail floor-space, and 16 houses, a care home and community facilities or other appropriate district centre uses".

Representation

Grounds of Objection 1. The allocations IN47 residential, IN62 recreational space and education provision and IN72 retail are awry with the planning approvals (07/00264/OUTIN - 09/00249/FULIN) and with the landowner aspirations for the land, in that they are allocated for no other purpose and deny development of a care home that is also approved. The PLDP provisions at IN47, IN62 and IN72 are too prescriptive and thus too restrictive; and they are tied to planning decisions taken 7 and 5 years ago whereas the Plan ought to be looking forward to the period 2013-2018/2023. 2. The purpose of this objection is to encourage flexibility in the completion of the district centre which is under development such that the full range of approved uses could be accommodated; avoid over provision of retail especially at a prominent frontage position which - if demand does not materialise - could remain vacant and detract from the "centre"; and enable the site to be considered as a whole as part of an updated and revised masterplan. It should also allow for uses above and below one another, which is also denied by the PLDP. 3. The parcels IN47 and IN72 are wholly owned by Tulloch Homes Ltd; part of IN62 is owned by Tulloch Homes Ltd. Tulloch Homes Ltd interests are contiguous with one another and embrace the land given planning approval under (07/00264/OUTIN and 09/00249/FULIN) for development of a "district centre" (ie. a neighbourhood centre as referred at para. 8 below). 4. 07/00264/OUTIN approves a district centre including retail, residential, restaurant/public house, care home, children's nursery, health care, community facilities and a primary school. It does not appear to provide for residential at the location indicated on the PLDP; and it appears that 07/00264/OUTIN is not correctly referred in IN47. 09/00249/FULIN approves a district centre including retail, residential care, housing children's nursery, community facilities and primary school. It provides for education and recreational space outwith the district centre site to which this objection refers (see approved plan attached); and a primary school, access roads, recreational open space and a first suite of 607m² of retail floor-space is either built or under construction. 5. The landowner proposes to complete development of the centre with a care home, additional retail floor-space and housing and to make provision for community uses/building. In that regard, the individual allocations IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 should be amalgamated and identified for district centre uses comprising all or any of retail, community, a care home and housing. 6. The PLDP allocates (IN62) for recreational space or education provision. That allocation does not refer to either of the above planning permissions, both of which allow development of a "district centre"; nor a further planning permission granted on appeal in 2011 (subject to Section 75 Agreement, but lapsed) for special needs housing. That approved special need is a residential use; as would a residential care home be. Either would be denied on that part of IN62 which lies within the district centre site. 7. The potential to allow a care home would not prevent or undermine a viable district centre; but rather complement the centre; nor would it deny a reasonable mix of community facilities that could be expected to be enjoyed at a district centre, and indeed - on a tried and trusted model and hierarchy for the provision of community facilities across the urban neighbourhoods of the City - proven to be sustainable at a scale appropriate to the resident population at Milton of Leys. 8. However, to deny the completion of the district centre - including for a care home as approved - commensurate with the residential neighbourhood being built out - could leave a vacant site at its heart, with the effect such underused would have on the vibrancy of a community focal point, its appearance and its enjoyment by residents of the neighbourhood and those of any future care home or housing. Retail 9. Inverness is structured on a principle of sustainable development and in that regard a hierarchial provision of services and facilities is located according to five urban districts, each with 3-4 neighbourhoods. The urban districts support a resident population in the order of 9-15,000; each district supports a district centre, generally located at the intersection of the City's main distributor road network, centrally to the district; and each neighbourhood a resident population of 3-4,000 and a neighbourhood centre. In turn, that structure provides for higher order district facilities (larger shops, more choice and a greater range of services) and lower order, more local facilities (smaller shops, less choice and a lesser range of services). That template is set out in successive development plans: Inverness Culloden and Ardersier Local Plan 1997; and Inverness Local Plan 2006. 10. In that context, Milton of Leys is a neighbourhood; the term district centre having been coined in the description of the

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments. The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

proposals (07/00264/OUTIN or 09/00249/FULIN/OUTIN) to develop a centre of services and facilities. That is explained by the (anticipated resident population of Milton of Leys of approximately 3-4,000, and that it is certainly nowhere near 9-15,000); and, in that Milton of Leys is peripheral, not central. 11. Against that background, no other neighbourhood centre within the city (and there are 18 recognised neighbourhoods) offers retail facilities or provisions that are remotely comparable with the allocation for retail development at Milton of Leys. As a comparator - Cradlehall neighbourhood centre (also a modern, suburban neighbourhood of similar scale and character, and in similar proximity to its district centre and nearing its build-out limits) supports one convenience store, one baker, one dentist, one beauty parlour, one day nursery, and one care home; and two units have lain unoccupied (as former offices) for some 10 years or thereabouts. 12. That amounts to some 1,130 m² at Cradlehall; whereas approval in (09/00249/FULIN) for retail at Milton of Leys amounts to 2,240m². Milton of Leys, for a peripheral neighbourhood which - because of its elevated position - has limited appeal to a wider catchment, offers 40% more retail floor-space than Cradlehall. Accordingly, whilst this objection (see diag.) seeks to retain a retail frontage ie. equivalent to 1,320m² comprising part of the development approved under (09/00249/FULIN), the remaining components of the centre should be given more flexibility than the PLDP allows. Conclusion 13. The Plan should provide for a revised masterplan to be prepared for the whole centre based on five land parcels as identified on the attached diag. This will retain part of the approved retail frontage sufficient to provide approximately 1,320m² of floor-space; but will give flexibility for accommodating the remaining district centre uses approved under 07/00264/OUTIN and 09/00249/FULIN on four remaining land parcels. 14. A masterplan as opposed to the development plan would be the appropriate place to consider the configuration of uses and their market viability. That would be a reasonable proposition for completing the centre in a neighbourhood that is approaching the final phases of residential development. (1) Delete the land allocations at IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 and replace with a composite policy as follows: "Mixed Use IN47, IN62 (part) and IN72 (denoted as appropriate); Area: 3.4 ha. Requirements: a revised masterplan comprising a minimum of 1,320m² retail floor-space, and 16 houses, a care home and community facilities or other appropriate district centre uses".

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site area reduction in the in the Inner Morray Firth Ports and Sites 2005 it states that the development site is 176ha in the recent developoement plan it states as 147.1 ha

Representation

It already states in the Inner Morray Firth Ports and Sites 2005 that the Deeplaven development has limited competitive advantage and that therefore it reduced the project fundabilty as well as that the planning permission 02/009003/FULRC has lapsed Also that the cost in 2005 was estimated at £6m is it still an option you consider with the area reduction as well?

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

The Dingwall CARS Stakeholder Group welcomes and endorses the Council's intention to prepare Supplementary Guidance to aid the delivery of the Draft Dingwall Conservation Area Management Plan. In particular, the group wishes to see greater control over alterations to shop fronts in the Conservation area, including a means of deterring inappropriate materials and signage. Its members are strongly in favour of bringing forward the proposed Area of Special Control to complement and enhance recent improvements to the public realm in Dingwall town centre that include conservation of the built heritage through the Dingwall Conservation Area Regeneration Scheme.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like the changes to take into consideration the location of a pub/restaurant and bulky goods from the houses.

Representation

I am seeking changes on the proposed plan for a number of reasons. I live right at the back and this development would be right on my back door step. If i had wanted to be in walking distance of a pub i would have moved in to the town centre. My 9 year old son had some very valid points that he wanted to make but got a little stage fright at the recent meeting. He said quite rightly that we have 3 pubs within walking distance already, The Fluke, The Raigmore Motel and Brewsters why do we need another. Another point he made was that his bedroom is at the back of the house and the noise that will come from the area will more than likely keep him awake a night and that he likes to have his window open and would no longer be able to do this. He stated "if he was kept awake at night he would not concentrate in school and probably wouldnt have a good day. " I think its unfair that my son is having to deal with these worries about his health and education due to a developer wanting to put another pub in the area. He also said that there would be a number of teens and young people who would be drinking and quite possibly swearing and that would have an influence on children in the area. I would also like to address in the change of class in the proposal initially it was class 10 which seems to have changed now to classes 1, 2 and 3? I find it unbelievable that Mr Crawford has said that we are looking forward to the development and we are welcoming it. Until last night I had not met Mr Crawford so I'm a little confused as to how he knew the opinions of myself and the other residents of Woodgrove. I havent even taken into consideration yet the damging effect this will have on the already high traffic levels in the area. I believe this proposal will have a detrimental effect on a well established quiet residential area. I think that the effects of this future proposal will bring higher crime rates that are quite possibly alcohol induced thus in turn causing an already busy police force to become further stretched. I am of the opinion that the developers need to concenrate on bringing our town centre up to a high standard considering we are supposed to be an idyllic tourist location, we seem to be falling far from the mark on this. The development would be far more well received if it actually took into consideration what the residents wanted. A Dell of Inshes Community Centre that gives our children and young people somewhere to meet and gain skills and attend activities would be far more appropriate in my opinion.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04481 Name Veda a McClorey Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference AL12 Type Change

Comment Changes

Deletion of allocation

Representation

Objects because of: insufficient business premises demand evidenced by number of existing units vacant, scale of buildings will dwarf her property, loss of good farmland, flood risk from burn, adverse impact on wildlife, need for set-back from burn.

Allocated to Alness AL12 West of Teaninich Wood

Customer Number 04004 Name Victor Attwood Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 1.Introduction Paragraph

Reference IN23 UHI Institute Type Support

Comment Changes

Representation

Re IN23 UHI Institute = No plan is currently available, but as this building is in sight of my property I would be grateful if I could be kept informed of any developments

Allocated to West Inverness IN23 UHI Institute, Riverside Gardens

Customer Number 03977 Name Victor West Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph Obsdale Road cannot sustain more heavy traffic

Reference AL10 Obsdale Road

Type Change

Comment Changes

No heavy vehicles should be allowed to use Obsdale Road.

Representation

Obsdale Road is already an extremely busy road used by cement lorries,refuse vehicles,aggregate and Tesco Rail lorries plus numerous others. The vehicles are very noisy and often speeding and if a new development of the proposed size goes ahead the road will be dangerous and intolerable to the nearby residents. Traffic would be increased and Obsdale Road could not cope. A new road should be considered perhaps from the A9. What a shame to ruin a beautiful landscape and open space.

Allocated to Alness AL10 Obsdale Road

Customer Number 04348 Name Victoria Pottinger Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations

Paragraph

Reference

Type Change

Comment Changes

That this space is essentially retained as farmland with a small area that relates to the rear of the existing West End cottages having the potential for a small number of houses if needed.

Representation

This land is good quality farmland and should be preserved as such. Any building on this land would be visible from the Western approaches. The hidden nature of the village would be lost. The number of houses in this area alone would dwarf the existing village. A development here , on its own , is entirely out of keeping with the unique village that exists. The history of the village would be lost with the building of a brand new housing area.

Allocated to Cawdor General General

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

CD1 and CD2 should be removed from the development plan and preserved as green space upon which development is not permitted. CD1 should be become the village green.

Representation

Both of these sites represent an integral part of the green space that that is historic to , and interwoven with, the structure of the village. CD1 (the old school playground) is the space to which the other houses relate to .It has always been accessible and open. It shoul dbe developed into a family green. It is the only such green space within the existing village. It must be preserved as such.This is the space around which the village was constructed or has developed.This space should be developed as a village green in such a way that people can use and enjoy it. CD2 is the space that links the village to the Big Wood. The slope of the field leads right into the wood. It is historic rough grazing and borders close to the castle. The elevation would mean any development looked down on the village. It has important conservation value (e.g. barn owls feed here) and it has unique amenity value. You can indeed see the castle from this area, building here would destroy the tourism associated. Both of these open spaces provide the context within which the village sits. The village is a compact settlement but it is also a ribbon development i.e. houses are built along the single street which winds around the playground and beside the field that CD2 is. If you remove these spaces the whole nature of the village is lost. Cawdor Village is hidden until you find it but then , because of the spaces, it opens up. These green spaces are essential to preserve the uniqueness of this village and to preserve it's conservation. Building to such a scale would cause Cawdor to lose it's character, and would immediately affect the people and associated tourist avenues.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

The overall scale of development is not commensurate with conserving the existing settlement. The number of proposed houses should be reduced by a factor of 10 i.e. a maximum of 30 houses and should not be built in the area of the original settlement whatsoever as to destroy the unique area.

Representation

The effect of this proposal would be to destroy the existing settlement. It would constitute a complete disregard for any kind of conservation, the wildlife or people who stay here. The uniqueness of this village would be lost in the face of such a massive development. The proposal represents a whole new settlement. It must be scaled down so that it is in keeping with what is here just now.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04457 Name Virginia Macnaughton Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph 36

Reference IN2 Porterfield Prison Type Change

Comment Changes

1. Brief to be agreed with HC Planning Dept's. Conservation Architect. 2. Widening of Adjoining roads- should not involve compulsory purchase of front gardens of adjoining properties. 3. Consideration should be given to recycling stone of walls.

Representation

1. Re:- Materials, terracing of houses and general conformity to existing conservation area - she is an expert. 2. These gardens are an intrinsic feature of conservation area. 3. Conservation area largely defined by 19ty red sandstone buildings. These weather & need repairing. The quarries are closed. Loss of this source irreperable.

Allocated to Central Inverness IN2 Porterfield Prison

Customer Number 04171 Name Vivian Hardie Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph proposal for 90 houses

Reference NA2 South Kingsteps Type Change

Comment Changes

To allow a considerably reduced development . To consider access to NA2 houses from the current Springfield development.

Representation

KINGSTEPS is a historic small semi- rural hamlet. ROAD It is a single/one and a half carriageway at best. There are several concealed driveways onto this already busy road, with private drives being used as passing places. Usage by walkers, horseriders, cyclists(it is a designated cycle route), forestry extraction and farm vehicles, motorhomes and caravans using the site at Druim; visitors to the Culbin sands, beaches and forest attractions at Cloddymoss and Wellhill ,and RSPB reserves. 90 houses with 2 cars each , plus visitors and service vehicles will put extra strain on an already busy road and the junction with the A96. Linkages to the wider area must be considered as per your Housing Plan. INFRASTRUCTURE. Increased pressure will be put on sewerage, water and waste water management. Clause 4.39 must be considered as per your Housing Plan. I understand that the water treatment plant is already working at almost full capacity. FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT As a watercourse runs through the proposed site, a full and realistic assessment must be made. Extra housing with hard surfaces and loss of green space, could potentially impact heavily on this low lying and already boggy piece of land. Existing houses could be affected by flooding. Very much an issue currently. 4.41 identifies NA2 as a site with "potential adverse effect-in combination.. These sites will be required to ensure avoidance on any adverse effect on the integrity of IMF SPA/Ramsar....alone or in combination through satisfactory provision and/or contribution towards open space, path and green network requirements including mitigation associated with the Inverness and Nairn Coastal Trail. DENSITY There are currently 18 houses in Kingsteps, each on approximately 0.5 acre, some on larger plots. Consistency of development should follow this pattern. 90 houses on NA2 is 14.2 houses/hectare. On other proposed development sites , ie Lochloy ,Sandown and Delnies the proposed density is considerably less. The closest development at Lochloy has a density of 9.5 houses/hectare. In the long established settlement of Kingsteps , I submit the proposed density would be a gross overdevelopment of the site. The Local Plan 2000- continuing 2012 and still presumably extant until this proposed IMF Development Plan is adopted, states; P 17. Settlements and Services.-Rural townships..... limited consolidation is encouraged at..... (inter alia) Kingsteps P19 clause 7 village expansion..... the council will encourage development "CONSISTENT WITH THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF RURAL SETTLEMENTS" I submit the scale of the proposed development does not constitute "limited consolidation" (of which there has already been a considerable amount) , but overdevelopment inconsistent with the scale and character of Kingsteps. It would be a great pity if the ethos in the 2000 Local Plan is superceded by large scale building to lose forever the uniqueness of Kingsteps. TRAFFIC The impact of increased vehicular activity through Kingsteps , Lochloy Road and channelled through Nairn, where the road infrastructure is already creaking at the seams, will be significant I submit further development should not be considered until the building of a by-pass, or improvements to the A96. CONCLUSION This site is unsuitable for a development of this nature. Other existing identified sites for housing with better ,easier and safer access should be developed before NA2 is considered

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

At para 3.12, include Rhicullen/Newmore as a small community where development will be supported in pursuit of the Ross-shire Growth Area Strategy. Other adjustments suggested to criteria in Policy 3. See below for details.

Representation

These representations relate to previous representations on behalf of our clients, at the Call for Sites and MIR stages, regarding land at Rhicullen/Newmore. The Council’s vision for a vibrant Inner Moray Firth depends on many factors. In the case of the Ross-shire Growth Corridor, there is significant potential for employment and enterprise. However, there is also a pressing need to accommodate supporting services, facilities and homes to meet the needs of an expanding workforce and population. Land owned by our clients at Rhicullen/Newmore offers opportunities to meet some of these needs in a conveniently located position with active travel options to a local primary school and easy access to key employment sites. Policy 3 of the LDP designates Rhicullen/Newmore in the ‘Other Settlements’ category. Map 3 confirms Rhicullen is located in the Ross-shire Growth Area but also within the Hinterland area. This status confirms that consolidation of the settlement is acceptable in principle, subject to the criteria set out in Policy 3. This status is supported. Growth at Rhicullen/Newmore will support the adjacent Newmore primary school, which is understood to have spare capacity. Utilising this capacity makes sense in terms of sustainability and Best Value in the provision of Council services. It is noted that the Council is undertaking a Sustainable School Estate Review at Alness and Invergordon. Maximising uptake of capacity at Newmore Primary would appear to be a sensible approach. This can be achieved most effectively by promoting growth of the local population through new house building. The LDP criteria for consideration of new development proposals at Other Settlements are significantly clearer than previously suggested in the MIR. However, bullet point 2 requires clarification and is not supported in its current form. Point 2 suggests new development will be assessed in terms of the degree to which it is “similar in terms of its spacing, scale and density to development within or adjoining that existing settlement”. It is not clear whether or not strong similarity will be a positive or negative factor in this assessment. More importantly, the spacing, scale and density of new development should be led by placemaking principles which are set out by other development plan policies, notably Policy 28 ‘Sustainable Design’, and Policy 29 ‘Design Quality and Placemaking’ in the Highland-wide LDP. These policies should be cross referenced through an additional bullet point. They should be used to determine the most appropriate form and density of development at Other Settlements, with design statements and master plans justifying proposals. It is noted that the LDP Strategy for the Ross-shire Growth Area proposes “development to support and strengthen the smaller communities of Barbaraville, Hill of Fearn, Milton of Kildary, Kildary, and Portmahomack. Like Rhicullen/Newmore, these are all designated within the Other Settlements category. Our clients suggest Rhicullen/Newmore should be added to this list. It is conveniently located for the main Ross-shire employment sites and is significantly closer to these sites than the other settlements which are listed. Portmahomack lies well beyond the Ross-shire Growth Area, whilst Hill of Fearn is also beyond this zone. Rhicullen/Newmore has a primary school with spare capacity, whilst Barbaraville does not have its own school. Hill of Fearn and Barbaraville are compact settlements which appear to be a little larger than Rhicullen/Newmore. However, with a small core and a secondary dispersed population, Rhicullen/Newmore is equally significant in terms of population. In addition, a significant amount of development at Barbaraville is specialist retirement and care provision.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

These representations relate to land at Invergordon High Street, Identified as Site 3 in the Invergordon extract of the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. The inclusion of the site within the Tier 2 Towns Centres designation is supported. The Council's vision for a vibrant Inner Moray Firth depends on many factors. The success of Inverness City, the Inverness-Nairn Growth corridor and the Ross-shire Growth Corridor dominate the development strategy set out in the LDP. This approach is supported. The Ross-shire growth corridor has significant potential for employment and enterprise. However, there is also a pressing need to accommodate supporting services, facilities and homes to meet the needs of an expanding workforce and population. Site 3 offers opportunities to meet some of these needs in a centrally located position with active travel options for some of Invergordon's key employment sites , services and facilities. The LDP includes the site within the Invergordon Town Centre boundary and notes it may be suitable for mixed uses. The aims of para 2.8, para 2.9 and Policy 1 of the LDP to sustain town centres are generally supported. However, it is important that all uses which may add to the vitality of a town centre are considered positively. A flexible approach is important, taking account of market conditions and local demand.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Representation

Ref. dwellings Broomhill, Broomhill Cottage, St Kilda, Balnabruaich, Nigg. IV19 1 QU - The boundary drawn and published in the Nigg Master Plan is not clear when matched with areas on the ground. The Title to the land is held by the owners. The hamlet of 3 dwellings and private land at Balnabruaich between the protected woodland and B9175 has been reincluded as Industrial land. It had this designation removed around 10 years ago, allowing the easing of planning restrictions for the houses, some of which have been there for 200 years, and the new build of St Kilda. The present owners of Nigg Yard indicated that they had no need of this small corner, and indeed have fenced it off themselves along the boundary of St Kilda, earlier this year. Two of the owners of the private dwellings are 5th generation crofters of the original plots, and remained outwith the earlier development of Nigg by their firm refusal to sell their croft right. As this land is surplus to industrial requirements, present and future, could it please be returned to residential use to enable the owners to enjoy their Properties free of planning restrictions caused by inclusion within the Nigg Yard Boundary.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

Additional requirements

Representation

Whilst being a recent resident of Cawdor, there are points which I feel should be considered. When I purchased my Plot, considerable restrictions were set by the Cawdor Estates and your Development Contribution Department with regard to: • Wet harl external finish • Design and finish of Porch • Slated Roof • Venicular Windows. On these Developments I would consider that the finishes be consistent and be added to the Development Plan in the form of a development Brief. The existing road, Newton Road, is unsuitable for additional traffic and access should be off the B9090 to retain Newton Road as it is. However, on looking at the proposals I would suggest that Development on CD9 may be a step too far but in the Terms of Planning I suspect that CD1/CD2 will be priority and the remainder will follow, this is unclear from the plan. Whilst I am not against the Development, extreme care and consideration should be maintained so that everyone is treated in an equal manner as previously demanded by Cawdor Estate.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

I would like the Council to re-consider allocating the site for housing.

Representation

I am concerned that the propeties are not in keeping with the traditional stone housing in the rest of the High Street.The new 3 story flats at the opposite end are an unfortunate case in point and can be easily spotted from the other side of the Firth clearly dominating the village skyline. I believe an alternative for the quarry area should be a green space which would encourage the wildlife environment, which has already been affected by the afore-mentioned flats and massive tree-cutting.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Addition to Sections CB2, CB5 Amendment to Section CB3

Representation

Site CB3 We would like to express our concerns over the proposals in the plan relating to this area. One of us having grown up in the village, we are aware that, in spite of the village having grown considerably, community facilities are, at best, no better than they were in the 1950s. They may even have declined since then with the loss of the village hall and the failure of the new primary school so far to deliver the anticipated benefits in this respect. In that light, we would suggest it would be more appropriate to reserve this whole area and look at ways in which the existing playing field could be enhanced as an open air community resource. We would also urge that there should be no reduction in the size of the available parking area as this would be likely to increase parking in the adjacent residential streets. We also understand that it is not the case that the playing field is owned by the Council as stated in Appendix 1 and that the land was gifted to the village some 60 years ago and is held in trust. Site CB2/CB5 In view of the proposed expansion of housing in this area, we would strongly urge the provision of at least one or more children's play areas. Will Campbell Joan Campbell

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Additional developer requirements to safeguard surface water drainage, car parking and construction effects.

Representation

In response to notification of planned development of Sites(s): IN78 - Land east of Smithton Free Church; As a tenant of 87 Murray Terrace I have a few issues to raise on the proposed site IN78. I note the proposed development will back onto the current car park. I am concerned over access to and the functionality of the car park during and post development. This car park is used to full capacity and the loss of parking bays will add to the congestion and double parking problem present within Murray Terrace currently. Potentially increasing the risk of damage to privately owned vehicles. Could you provide information regarding proposed access to the development during and post construction as well as areas of planned storage of materials for the site? In addition the immediate area is prone to surface water ponding during heavy rainfall due to limited soil porosity of a gloamy clay soil makeup. Further detail is sought on what measures have been put forth in the planning document by the developer to address the risk flooding is not increased both during and post construction. Dust and blow away materials from the site is a concern in relation to maintaining a clean living environment. Runoff of water and other soluble materials from the site is a concern in relation to the risk of pollution upon the immediate area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Site CU2 housing allocation at Carn Mor Dun be deleted from the Plan and the village boundary re-drawn accordingly to maintain this site in the countryside.

Representation

The site CU2 should be deleted for a number of reasons. William Gray Construction Ltd initially generally supported all the sites in the main Issues Report which were identified for development within the Culbokie village envelope. Since the Main Issues Report, a number of factors have changed and William Gray Construction Ltd now see no need or reason to include CU2 for housing purposes. Location The site CU2 is the most remote of the sites from the village centre and the areas that are being earmarked for mixed uses, e.g. CU4 Community Retail, Business & Office, CU5 Community Business and Retail and Office, plus 15 houses, CU6 similar to CU5 with 22 houses and CU7 6 houses. The other housing sites CU1 and CU3 are better placed to meet the needs of Culbokie. Scale The scale of this development, 4 houses on 2.3 hectares, is entirely wasteful of land. It further indicates that there is limited, if any, justification for releasing this site as it will have a minimal impact on meeting the needs of the village, whilst taking up a disproportionately large area of countryside. This release site is totally inefficient in land use terms. Issues The site has issues of constrained development potential as recognised by the Council on page 27 of the Main Issues Report. It further has flood risk and unsafe access issues. Existing Conditions The existing access road should have been improved by the owners by this point, due to the number of new houses constricted recently in this vicinity. The road is in a very poor condition, it has no footways and it is unlit, i.e. there is no street lighting. The development of this site albeit inefficiently for 4 very large houses will make a bad situation worse. In addition, traffic speeds are unrestricted beyond the entrance to this site, and the nature of traffic currently using this stretch of road is agricultural. We have no confidence, based on the past experience of this developer/owner, that infrastructure matters locally will be improved and this is a further reason for this site now to be rejected as a housing release location. Local Supply There is sufficient housing sites allocated on sites CU1, CU3, CU5, CU6 and CU7 to more than meet the housing needs of Culbokie for the foreseeable future. General William Gray Construction Ltd is still supportive of the other initiatives being proposed for Culbokie and this objection only relates to the suitability, viability and deliverability of this unnecessary release at land north of Carn Mor Dun, CU2.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Whilst I understand that development is the key for better facilities. This has to be balanced on design and finishes materials.

Representation

Being an owner of a new house recently built. The finishes spec externally by the landowner (estate). The quality demander was very high. I would therefore expect the same be demanded on any new development. Also Newton Road would not be suitable for any new development and access should be off the main road on to any development site.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

I would like site preferred site H3, which was included in 2012 IMFLP and subsequently removed, to be included back into the current IMFLP.

Representation

Inchmore IV57PX – Site H3 Preferred in MIR 2012 IMFLP Site H3 has a current planning application (Ref 12/00441/FUL). This site was included in the 2012 IMFLP, but now seems to have been removed from the latest version. It is mentioned in the latest IMFLP, that this has been done due to objections from SEPA, who have possible concerns re potential flooding. The neighbouring site, H5 in Inchmore, also appears on the same potential flood map (attached), however it has not been removed from the latest IMFLP. Both these sites were preferred in the 2012 IMFLP, both appear on the same map, with similar concerns from SEPA, therefore I would think it only fair and reasonable that both sites be treated in a similar manner. I would therefore request that preferred site H3 be re-introduced back into the current IMFLP, as it was in the 2012 IMFLP, and be treated in a similar manner to site H5. Any concerns that SEPA may have regarding both sites H3 and H5 can then be dealt with in a similar manner. A flood risk assessment, and any other viable options could then be considered at the appropriate time, in the normal course of any planning application that may be submitted.

Allocated to

Customer Number 04523 Name William Whyte Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference NA1 Type Change

Comment Changes

Retain site NA1 as open space

Representation

I wish to show my objection to the proposed building of housing on the 'Farmer's Showfield' in Nairn. This valuable green space in the centre of Nairn should be kept free of any building developments.

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number 04339 Name William Wright Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 3.Strategy for Growth Areas Paragraph Nairn Farmers Showfield. I object to the loss of g

Reference NA1 Former Showfield East Type Change

Comment Changes

The showfield should remain untouched, and left available for recreational use. The loss of green space should not be allowed, in particular that this was gifted to the community. An agreement should be to the Farmers Society to exchange this as community land with a site in Sandown

Representation

Loss of Green Recreational Space Little practical gain in housing Additional traffic on the already busy Waverley Rd,

Allocated to Nairn NA1 Former Showfield East

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section

Paragraph

Reference

Type

Comment Changes

1. Revise downward the estimated allocation/requirement for housing development in Nairn to align with historical numbers and recognise the need to provide local employment in order to justify and sustain any proposed housing developments. 2.Take account of the fact that the proposed new town development at Tornograin "has the capacity has the capacity to meet the medium to long term housing requirement for the area stretching from Inverness to Nairn" as stated in the Plan.

Representation

The Dev. Plan is currently totally driven by the estimated housing requirements for Nairn – 1,900 houses over the 20 year period. The Plan fails to address the issue of the provision of local employment in order to sustain and justify this number of houses. Historically settlements and towns develop and expand in line with employment opportunities (evidenced by the expansion of Nairn to provide housing following the establishment of the McDermott’s construction yard in 1972). The plan should include proposals for the future development of commerce and businesses which would provide employment within the Nairn area otherwise these new residents will require to seek employment out with Nairn resulting in increased pressure on transport and road infrastructure and in contravention of the Councils “Green Policy”. There are many examples in adjoining towns of the provision of successful business parks which have attracted new businesses providing employment opportunities (e.g. The Enterprise Park, Forres) which could be equally applied to Nairn. It is clear that the existing road infrastructure does not have the capacity to accommodate a further 1,900 houses and consequently any future development will be constrained by the provision and timing of a Nairn by-pass and the upgrading of the A96 trunk road. It is noted in the Plan that the proposed new town at Tornograin “has the potential to meet the medium to long term housing requirement for the area stretching from Inverness to Nairn”. Why therefore is there a perceived requirement for 1,900 houses in Nairn? The estimated need for 1,900 houses in Nairn compares with the actual completion of 976 houses over the 13 year period of 2000-2013. This included a period of what has proved to have been unsustainable high rates of house building. This actual provision equates to 75 houses per annum which if sustained would translate into a provision of 1,500 houses over the twenty year period of the plan. The current economic climate has resulted in a significant reduction in the housing demand as can be verified by the much reduced rate of construction at the Lochloy housing development which currently and in the recent past has been the main area of new housing provision in Nairn. The Development Plan should be revised to:-

- Recognise the need to develop employment opportunities/business development in order to sustain the future growth of housing provision in Nairn.
- Reduce the estimated housing requirements to a more realistic number taking recognition of current and past housing demand.
- Reduce the estimated housing requirement to take into account the fact that Tornograin will provide the required housing demand.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type

Comment Changes

Omit proposed site NA2 from the IMFDLP on the grounds that:- 1. the proposed development of 90 houses adjoining a rural settlement contravenes the Scottish Governments Planning Guidelines relative to rural settlements. 2. The proposed access to the site is unsuitable and does not meet the Highland Councils own standards for access to a development of the type and size proposed.

Representation

NAIRN – DEVELOPMENT SITE NA2 SOUTH KINGSTEPS I wish to raise the following issues in regard to the proposed development of Site NA2 South Kingsteps. The issues listed are all acceptable “material considerations” in accordance with the Scottish Governments published Guidance on Planning Issues and are particularly relevant to the sites rural location and impact of the proposed development on the existing settlement of Kingsteps. A. Proposed Access The proposed access to this site is totally unsuitable for the proposed development of ninety new houses. The existing road through Kingsteps is a narrow country road which is regularly used by both recreational and commercial traffic including but not limited to:- • Walkers (access to Culbin Forest) • Cyclists (it is a designated Sustran route from Inverness to Aberdeen and constitutes part of North Sea Cycle Route) • Horse riders (from nearby stables and horse grazing sites - as evidenced by the warning signs) • Farm traffic • Timber felling operations (serving Culbin woods) • Access to the existing designated caravan site beyond Kingsteps • Access to the commercial nursery operation beyond Kingsteps • School bus route. These uses are in addition to normal road traffic accessing existing housing. The road leading to and through Kingsteps is effectively a single track road as evidenced by the use of private access drives as passing places. The existing road through Kingsteps does not comply with the Councils published “Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments” in terms of road width, provision for pedestrian footpaths, drainage, access for fire vehicles and refuse collection, school bus access etc. etc. and consequently would not be acceptable to the Councils own Roads Department as an access route to a new housing development. (Refer to “Geometric requirements for rural road links”) The Road Engineers estimated additional capacity of this access road to take a further 90 houses is flawed and does not reflect the nature and usage of the road. The only feasible access to the proposed development is through the existing Lochloy housing development accessed from Lochloy Road via Montgomery drive. No access from Kingsteps should be permitted – even as a “secondary” access. B. Adequacy of existing Infrastructure Nairn Road Network:- It is recognised that as stated in the draft Development Plan that the existing road network through Nairn and via the A96 trunk road is incapable of taking additional road traffic and any future development of Nairn is subject to the provision of the Nairn by-pass and upgrading of the A96 trunk road to Inverness. Any development of site NA2 will result in all traffic being routed onto the A96 via Lochloy Road with further pressure on this road which has various danger spots along with the A96 through the town centre. The sensible option would be to develop of direct access route over the railway line to access the A96 - it is understood that this was in fact one of the considerations and planning requirement for the Lochloy development however it has never been discharged together with other planning conditions and the Council have permitted the continued phased housing development. C. Sewage, Drainage and Water Services It is understood that the existing waste water treatment plant is currently operating close to its full capacity. D. Suitability of the Site for Development The site is low lying and has a history of surface water drainage issues – it is therefore essential that the existing water courses through the site are fully retained. The need to retain these water courses will have a significant impact on any proposed development of the site. Any development of the site will result in significant increased run off and any modifications to the existing water courses will result an increased flooding risk. The site with its mature trees and existing winding route of the stream provides an effective natural wildlife and amenity area which warrants its retention and protection from development. In terms of wildlife the site and adjoining woods are currently inhabited by a variety of recognised protected wildlife including:- • Red Squirrels • Badgers • Bats • Sparrow hawks • Merlin • Buzzards The presence of these can be confirmed by appointing an Ecologist to undertake a study of the area as a pre condition of any future development. The site is currently used for horse grazing and as such it provides an effective “buffer” zone between the large housing development of Lochloy and the rural settlement of Kingsteps. Its retention will provide an appropriate amenity area serving both Kingsteps and the Lochloy housing. E. Overdevelopment of the Site The site adjoins the existing rural housing forming Kingsteps (a total of 18 houses) consequently any proposed development should reflect the rural nature of the existing settlement and the low density of the existing housing. The Plan proposes that 90 houses are built on the site which equates to a housing density of 14.28 houses/hectare. This equates to 450% higher density than the existing housing in Kingsteps and is some 50% greater than the existing adjacent housing development in Lochloy estate. It is a higher density than that proposed in the Plan for other development sites around Nairn Sandown = 10.15/hectare Lochloy = 9.52/hectare Delnies = 11/hectare The proposed density of housing for the South

Kingsteps site of 14.28 houses/hectare is an overdevelopment of this rural site and takes no recognition of the nature of the adjoining houses in Kingsteps. A development of this density and urban nature is in contravention of the Scottish Governments Planning Guidelines relevant to rural locations. Any development of the site should reflect the nature of the neighbouring properties in line with the Scottish Government's Planning Policy and advice. Conclusion The site is not appropriate for the type of development proposed and should be retained as an amenity area in order to preserve the rural nature of the existing settlement.

Allocated to Nairn NA2 South Kingsteps

Customer Number 04282 Name Yvonne Laird Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN32 Type Change

Comment Changes

I think there should be changes to remove the proposal for housing in an agricultural area.

Representation

I am concerned about the additional traffic this will create in the area where there are many children using this as a route to the local primary schools. I am concerned about the facilities for primary education in the area which is already stretched without adding additional numbers. I am concerned that this is part of a route that is highly utilised by the local cycling clubs and the incidents the extra traffic may create. I am concerned for the local wildlife, having already been disrupted many times with all the previous builds. I am generally concerned with all the allocated housing schemes in the IMFLDP that it will create an excess of older housing that will lead to more deprived areas of Inverness developing.

Allocated to South Inverness IN32 Knocknagael