

**VERBATIM COMMENTS RECEIVED ON INSHES AND RAIGMORE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF – ISSUES AND OPTIONS AND INSHES JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS PHASE 2 – OUTLINE PROPOSALS**

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
<b>Question 1: What do you think about the constraints shown? Are there any others?</b>	
<b>A Kidd</b>	Transport Scotland's likely connection from the A9 to the Aldi roundabout needs to be protected, as would the onward link between the Aldi roundabout and the SDR. This would be best achieved with a direct link to a new roundabout on the SDR at the rear of the Police Scotland Building.
<b>G Gordon</b>	The bus stop at Raigmore Filling Station is a potential bottle neck judging on how many buses come through that area and this should be looked at again.
<b>D Morrison</b>	Well considered options
<b>A Cox</b>	I cannot think of any other 'constraints'. I am pleased and anxious that green spaces should be retained. I have just thought about the preservation of mature trees as well. I was very sad to see the mature trees destroyed between Matalan and Dobbies recently.
<b>H&amp;I Barclay</b>	The only issue we have is with cyclists on the pavement, not school children who are in the main careful, but young adults. Twice recently my husband who is 83 was very nearly knocked down by cyclists whizzing by, also a neighbour was sent flying when she slipped to the edge of the pavement to let a wheelchair by. We would like to know the position as to who would be liable if a pedestrian was knocked down and injured on the pavement. Would it be the Police, the Highland Council whose leader actively promotes cycling, or the cyclist who in all probability would have no money? At present the cycle lanes on Culcabock Road are seldom used, due to heavy traffic and the narrowness of the road. We hope these matters will be given serious consideration when and if the new proposals are implemented.
<b>Inverness South Community Council</b>	Happy
<b>L Cload</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generally constraints ok. The development brief boundary should be larger than is currently shown to fully include the consideration of the Transport Scotland study for the A9/A96.</li> <li>2. Consideration should be given to changes to the key roads when the new bridge over the Ness opens, and the avoidance of bottlenecks such as roundabouts and traffic lights.</li> <li>3. There is no consideration for traffic capacity in the infrastructure constraints - eg the Raigmore roundabout is already at capacity.</li> <li>4. Old Perth Road does not appear as a key road, but is proposed to be upgraded</li> <li>5. The SUDs pond in Woodgrove Drive area quickly fills to capacity, leading to overland flow issues on Woodgrove Drive and to the Tesco roundabout#</li> </ol>
<b>D&amp;J Whillis</b>	We agree with the constraint of green space, historic importance and significant flood risk.
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage</b>	<p>We welcome the identification of greenspace, e.g. protected open space, 20m buffer of trees across the development brief area. Perhaps the greenspace areas associated with the hospital and accommodation blocks are not fully picked up. We suggest greenspace associated with a major hospital complex has an added therapeutic value.</p> <p>You might indicate that the enlarged Dell of Inshes area in the SE part of the development brief area is potential badger habitat. It connects to the 'green wedge' continuing SE towards Balvonie. In this context we recommend that a badger survey should be required for development at Dell of Inshes (see Q4).</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
Sportscotland	No comments.
GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd	Significant tree belts south of the Police HQ building, east of the Tesco supermarket car park and north of the Woodgrove housing development do not seem to be given much weight when it comes to the development proposals. Where is the justification for their removal backed up by the tree constraints survey information? When we act on behalf of private developers where trees might be affected we rarely receive approval from your Forestry officers. I would like to see the fair and consistent application of the Council's SPG on T trees and Development for the area proposals.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency	<p>Thank you for your consultation email which SEPA received on 21 May 2014, specifically seeking comments on the outline proposals for Inshes junction improvements Phase 2. Please note that this response should be read in conjunction with our response to the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief – Issues and Options (our ref: PCS/133579). Advice for the planning authority</p> <p>1. Flood risk</p> <p>1.1 We welcome the proposal that a key objective of the Inshes Junction Improvements will take into account flood risk associated with the Dell Burn and deliver a solution to flood risk in the area.</p> <p>1.2 We note that the proposed road improvement works could potentially impact on the alignment of the Dell Burn and support the proposals to consider how flood defences and attenuation could be provided in this area.</p> <p>1.3 We would strongly recommend that those areas around the junction improvements that have been flooded previously, are near to watercourses or culverts, or are within the limits of flooding on the SEPA Flood Maps medium probability outlines, including the surface water extent would require a FRA to support new development proposals. This could form a joint FRA with the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief.</p> <p>1.4 We would highlight that a FRA should consider the impact of any potential re-alignment of the Dell Burn and that changes to the watercourse alignment may be limited in their scope for development.</p> <p>1.5 With regards to historical flooding at the site we would reiterate our previous comments (PCS/131848) detailing flooding from the Dell and Inshes Burns in 2002. Areas to the south of Old Perth Road and Culloden Road, where new junctions are proposed, may be at risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>1.6 The watercourses in the development area are culverted in places. As experience has shown in this area, culverts are a frequent cause of local flooding. Watercourses should not be culverted as part of a new development unless there is no practical alternative and existing culverts should be opened whenever possible. New developments should not be built over any new or existing culverts. It is unclear from the proposals on page 15 as whether the proposals include any culverting or deculverting.</p> <p>1.7 We recommend that drainage issues throughout the area are investigated and culverts are properly maintained to reduce the risk of flooding. We presume you have consulted your own flood risk authority colleagues on the proposals as they hold lots of very useful local information and knowledge with regards to this issue.</p> <p>1.8 We have also reviewed the proposed plans for the associated A9/A96 connection. With regards to these we would highlight that any potential new transport links should consider the potential for changes in run off, and alterations to the hydrological regime, and appropriate mitigation measures should be provided to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p> <p>1.9 We look forward to providing additional advice once more detailed flood risk information is available.</p> <p>2. Surface water Drainage</p> <p>2.1 The level of surface water treatment required is dependant on the nature of the proposed development (for example residential or non residential), the size of development, and the environmental risk posed by the development. The environmental risk is principally determined by the type of activity being proposed (residential, industrial, etc), the available dilution, and the sensitivity of the receiving waterbody.</p> <p>2.2 All roads schemes typically require two levels of treatment, except for small scale developments as detailed in point a) above. For technical guidance on SUDS techniques and treatment for roads please refer to the SUDS for Roads manual. We would welcome the opportunity to provide further comments on any forthcoming outline proposals. Should you wish to discuss this letter please do not hesitate to contact me on 01224 266655 or <a href="mailto:planning.dingwall@sepa.org.uk">planning.dingwall@sepa.org.uk</a></p> <p>Thank you for your consultation email which SEPA received on 21 May 2014, specifically seeking comments on the outline proposals for Inshes junction improvements Phase 2. Please note that this response should be read in conjunction with our response to the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief – Issues and Options (our ref: PCS/133579). Advice for the planning authority</p> <p>1. Flood risk</p> <p>1.1 We welcome the proposal that a key objective of the Inshes Junction Improvements will take into account flood risk associated with the Dell Burn and deliver a solution to flood risk in the area.</p> <p>1.2 We note that the</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>proposed road improvement works could potentially impact on the alignment of the Dell Burn and support the proposals to consider how flood defences and attenuation could be provided in this area. 1.3 We would strongly recommend that those areas around the junction improvements that have been flooded previously, are near to watercourses or culverts, or are within the limits of flooding on the SEPA Flood Maps medium probability outlines, including the surface water extent would require a FRA to support new development proposals. This could form a joint FRA with the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief. 1.4 We would highlight that a FRA should consider the impact of any potential re-alignment of the Dell Burn and that changes to the watercourse alignment may be limited in their scope for development. 1.5 With regards to historical flooding at the site we would reiterate our previous comments (PCS/131848) detailing flooding from the Dell and Inshes Burns in 2002. Areas to the south of Old Perth Road and Culloden Road, where new junctions are proposed, may be at risk of surface water flooding. 1.6 The watercourses in the development area are culverted in places. As experience has shown in this area, culverts are a frequent cause of local flooding. Watercourses should not be culverted as part of a new development unless there is no practical alternative and existing culverts should be opened whenever possible. New developments should not be built over any new or existing culverts. It is unclear from the proposals on page 15 as whether the proposals include any culverting or deculverting. 1.7 We recommend that drainage issues throughout the area are investigated and culverts are properly maintained to reduce the risk of flooding. We presume you have consulted your own flood risk authority colleagues on the proposals as they hold lots of very useful local information and knowledge with regards to this issue. 1.8 We have also reviewed the proposed plans for the associated A9/A96 connection. With regards to these we would highlight that any potential new transport links should consider the potential for changes in run off, and alterations to the hydrological regime, and appropriate mitigation measures should be provided to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. 1.9 We look forward to providing additional advice once more detailed flood risk information is available. 2. Surface water Drainage 2.1 The level of surface water treatment required is dependant on the nature of the proposed development (for example residential or non residential), the size of development, and the environmental risk posed by the development. The environmental risk is principally determined by the type of activity being proposed (residential, industrial, etc), the available dilution, and the sensitivity of the receiving waterbody. 2.2 All roads schemes typically require two levels of treatment, except for small scale developments as detailed in point a) above. For technical guidance on SUDS techniques and treatment for roads please refer to the SUDS for Roads manual. We would welcome the opportunity to provide further comments on any forthcoming outline proposals. Should you wish to discuss this letter please do not hesitate to contact me on 01224 266655 or <a href="mailto:planning.dingwall@sepa.org.uk">planning.dingwall@sepa.org.uk</a></p>
<b>B Hill</b>	Constraints entirely justified. High priority to be given to; 1. Drainage and flooding risks 2. Noise insulation for residential and leisure areas
<b>D Donald</b>	Constraints laid down by planners tend to be unrealistic in that they only look at the area defined and do not consider the repercussions that their defined area has on other adjacent areas and tend from experience to belittle the advice of the professional Civil Engineers when it does not agree with their view.
<b>Goodson Associates (Acting on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited)</b>	The main constraints are identified.

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
I Stewart	The constraints insets are too small a scale to easily interpret the information provided. However, all relevant constraints appear to be adequately considered. Reference the larger scale 'sieve map' on Page 7: is the blue mark something to do with flood prevention?
J Shankland	'White area' developments may result in too much 'built up' developments and not enough 'green space.'
Highland Cycle Campaign	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the above projects' options & proposals. HCC wishes to see a modal shift in transport from motor vehicles to cycling and walking. We and other organisations have been making the case for this shift on health, environmental, social inclusion and economic grounds for the past 25 years. We understand that Highland Council (THC) share this aspiration and we welcome this and future discussion opportunities. New build projects, such those proposed here, give opportunities to provide the very best of infrastructure for cycling and walking and to give real support and encouragement to the increasing numbers of citizens of all backgrounds who are taking up these active modes of travel. We hope THC will take full advantage of these changes to ensure major modal shift to active modes. CbyD references refer to Transport Scotland's Cycling by Design. These constraints do not affect cycling and walking adversely rather they provide an opportunity. Cycle and walking facilities fit well in green space, buffer zones and space retained for flood storage. As flooding is of its nature periodic it is likely that routes could be included at the edges of these zones. Other constraints - The width of Culcabock Road near the Fluke is a recognised constraint. It is a pity that Culcabock Road has not been fully included.
A Johnston	The booklet shows Built and natural heritage, Water and flood risk and Infrastructure as main constraint headings. It is of concern that the booklet overlays all of the plan views with a "proposed" road option which in regard to the area to the East of the Inshes Tesco carpark completely ignores all the identified constraints. Are these really constraints or is the identification of constraints only a token gesture and not considered in the design of any development proposals?. The area of flooding in this area is shown as a limited area but from experience a larger area has been prone to flooding. Details can be provided on request. Additionally the residential properties in this area are all shown to be in areas of potential development. As my property is in this boundary I confirm with regards to "development" in the context of road or commercial I request my land boundary (Fernbank) is shown as a constraint. Furthermore not all mature trees are represented in this area. It is stated that "key gateway views over the city must be safeguarded" but again this statement does not appear to have been considered in the options presented.
Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)	This section is a mixture of constraints but also a commentary on the constraints identified and specific issues which must be taken into account in any development. Due to the known constraints there are likely to be a range of alternatives and it is important for the brief to acknowledge that there are a variety of options available which would accord with the principles set out in the development plan policies. The constraints noted also overlap with the brief's overall intention of improving infrastructure as the safeguard land for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 encroaches onto land which is constrained for development. This section should acknowledge on the 'all constraints' map there are likely to be encroachments into areas of constraint in order to fulfil the wider intentions of the brief. In the southern section of the existing retail park the constraints plan should be adjusted to take account of the extant planning permission which exists for further retail warehousing and this should not be constrained land. Discussions have already taken place with planning officers in relation to a new planning application coming forward for development at the southern end of the retail end of the Retail Park.

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
<p><b>Scottish Christian Party – Inverness Branch</b></p>	<p>Questions 1 and 2  The biggest constraint is the A9 Inshes overbridge for motorised traffic, cyclists and pedestrians. We agree wholeheartedly with the plans to improve this.  The most important point for the future is to leave adequate room on the west of the A9 for a strategic grade separated roundabout on the A9 similar to Option A on the A9/A96 Connections Study. Although Option A is not favoured by Transport Scotland, we have proposed that the roundabout of Option A should replace the roundabout of Option D, which we have recommended as the most favourable outline option. The location of the roundabout is possibly too far south. This is necessary to improve access to the new University of the Highlands and Islands Campus from the south, west and north. Our submission to Transport Scotland for the A9/A96 Connections Study includes the following:  Option D  This is the best option but the roundabout on the A9 should be similar to Option A, above the A9 and not to the east of it, to give full connectivity in all directions, especially for access to the University of the Highlands and Islands Campus from the A9. In the long term this will relieve the dangerous queuing on the A9 south carriageway at the B9006 slip road, but in the short term this dangerous queuing can be most speedily relieved by the proposed three lanes of carriageway on the Inshes overbridge, which is a joint responsibility of Highland Council and Transport Scotland. This is urgent in view of the Campus opening to students in autumn 2015 and should be considered as a priority.  Only Option D, with Option A's roundabout, assists access to the new Campus from the south, west and north via the A9. However even this still does not solve the access problems for the Beechwood Campus once traffic has come off the A9 at the roundabout, as there is a tortuous route to the University of the Highlands and Islands, ending up with a right hand turn into the Campus.  Although it is just outside the area of the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief, on the east side of the A9, the Scottish Christian Party supports the Westhill Community Council's suggestion that the University of the Highlands and Islands should have a dedicated 'front entrance' to the Campus site off the near-side lane of the A96/A9 slip road on to south carriageway of the A9, before it reaches the main carriageway. This could be viewed as an enhancement of the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief, on the east side of the A9, and contributing to the Eastern Gateway experience of visitors arriving from the south on the A9.  This has been extensively explained, with the rationale and advantages in previous submissions from Westhill Community Council. We fear that this has not been understood and, worse still, has been misrepresented by senior personnel even within The Highland Council. Instead of the dangerous situation of queuing cars on the 70 mph southbound carriageway of the A9 at the B9006 slip road, this proposal will contribute to road safety on the A9, local amenity and transport flexibility. The Scottish Christian Party supports the proposals already submitted by the Westhill Community Council for this additional access to the Campus.</p>
<p><b>Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed improvements for walking and cycling? Are there any others?</b></p>	
<p><b>A Kidd</b></p>	<p>No most definitely not! It is vitally important that any new road layout and cycle and pedestrian facilities should, where possible separate cyclists and pedestrians from traffic which would increase safety. The proposals would increase conflict and dramatically reduce safety for cyclists and pedestrians, as it introduces a cross junction which would dramatically increase the likelihood of vehicular collisions (5 times increase). Most concerning though is the introduction of very serious T Bone Collisions, these would occur within meters of pedestrians and cyclists who would be very exposed as they stood next to the junction and on islands waiting to cross. The new junction proposals introduce a severe likelihood of death or serious injury for pedestrians and</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>cyclists that is not as likely with a roundabout. The Golden bridge, which has been badly positioned and is not usable by the general public, should be moved or a second less elaborate bridge provided next to the Inshes Flyover, this could and would be used by all the public and not just students, it would separate the cyclists and pedestrians from road traffic and allow the Flyover to be made a T three full width carriageway, this would help relieve congestion on the A9 southbound. I believe that the money being proposed on the Inshes Phase 2 project would be better spent on keeping the existing roundabout at Inshes, with improvements, and providing safer separation for cyclists and pedestrians, by using underpasses or bridges. one innovative proposal which could be used is a smaller but similar version of the Dutch Floating Cycle bridges in Eindhoven and Enschede:  <a href="http://bicycledutch.wordpress.com/2012/08/23/spectacular-new-floating-cycle-roundabout/">http://bicycledutch.wordpress.com/2012/08/23/spectacular-new-floating-cycle-roundabout/</a> A version of this would link into a moved or Second Cycle Bridge and be a fantastic iconic cycle/walking welcome to Inverness directly on the National Cycle Route 1 as it enters Inverness.</p>
<p><b>P Reynolds</b></p>	<p>The following remarks refer to both pedestrians and cyclists. "We have an expensive new footbridge constructed across the A9. It is important that Highland Council produces as a matter of urgency a direct route from this bridge to Stoneyfield Business Park, HIE, and the Inverness Retail Park. I emailed them a couple of months ago but received no response. From aerial maps there appears to be some kind of old bridge across the railway, though maybe some map has this marked as an aqueduct - needs investigating though from Google Maps Satellite View it looks as though there are tractor tracks running from it so it is probably not *just* an aqueduct. I have not been to this area on foot for some time, but last time I did there were fences and ditches blocking pedestrian access between Inverness Retail Park and Stoneyfield, let alone whatever may be beyond Stoneyfield in the direction of the new footbridge. Is there no such thing as joined up town planning these days? A large proportion of the Highland population does not have access to a car, and another large proportion chooses to use bicycles as a means of travelling to work, saving millions in road construction and health bills. Paths should provide clearly marked and well-joined up direct shortest route access between new developments where there is no road access. Another example of this lack of town planning is the Raigmore hospital and adjacent educational complex which must have had fairly recent planning permission yet has not resulted in proper Active Travel routes. My wife took our children on foot from Raigmore Community Centre, Ashton Road, Raigmore Estate, into Raigmore Hospital a couple of weeks ago, and I have since repeated the exercise for a different reason (and not for the purpose of seeing what she was talking about!). Despite the Raigmore complex not being secure, there being a gate/gap in the fence approx. 100 m NW of the corner of the Centre for Health Science building, there is no gap in the fence *at* the corner of the building, and no defined pedestrian/cycle route into the hospital from the Raigmore Estate (housed population) and new footbridge (loads of people shortly to be accessing the estate from the new Inverness Campus), despite a major bus interchange and loads of cycle parking at Raigmore Hospital. You have to walk along a high fence until you find the gap, then walk through a car park and even when you get to paved paths they are intermittent, are interrupted by roads, grass, and a stretch of rough track, with no direct crossing points between each section, making this a challenging route for people with pushchairs and wheelchairs. There is also a well-made path *behind* the Centre for Health Science (near the Stone Circle), but where it leads to is not clear, I don't believe it leads to either the Centre or the Hospital as there are ditches and hedges. My wife took it part of the way before giving up, and I have looked at aerial views on Google Maps. Looking at Google Maps I believe it *only* leads to the front entrance of Lifescan, and thence to the Green House, Carlton Bingo, and Thistle House, but not to Beechwood House or to the Raigmore medical/educational complex. It would help if there were clear signs (1) at the new Footbridge and (2) at the other end of the Raigmore Community Centre and (3) at the Stone Circle, saying where it *does* lead and where it *doesn't* lead. It takes a long time to walk a path to find out where it *doesn't* lead to and then walk back again!" Thank you for your detailed reply. I will try and make contact with Scott Dalgarno, to whom I have been referred by a senior member of Highland Cycle Campaign. I am now rather on the fringes of HCC and am in practice more often interested in pedestrians than cyclists, though I feel the two modes often overlap and that together they can make a case for Active Travel improvements, reducing traffic on the roads and providing health and environmental savings. I was already aware of the potential link across the railway line near the new University building, but whilst this might be good for cyclists it is too far to encourage access by pedestrians living in Raigmore Estate, for instance, who wish to visit the shops or</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	walk to work in one of the large places of work near the A96. Therefore the link by Howdens needs to be opened up if possible, as does a route across the fence/ditches near HIE. It seems to me that these are not expensive things compared to the cost of that footbridge which has been being worked on for a year or so. We know this because, despite living in Tain, our family regularly attends an activity in Raigmore Community Centre. Regarding the Raigmore health complex, I find it appalling that when the Breast Centre, University of Stirling, and Centre for Health Science were added on to Raigmore Hospital, the opportunity was not taken to assess through pedestrian (and cycling) routes, so much so that not only was no through path built or signposted, requiring people to walk through random car parks and roads from the "gap in the fence", but one or other organisation was allowed to build a 10 foot high fence next to the Centre for Health Science blocking the obvious pedestrian route along the front of the Centre. And it is also appalling this has not been rectified at the very time when an expensive footbridge has been built making the area around Raigmore Community Centre potentially much busier with pedestrians and cyclists than just the population of the Raigmore Estate (if it is not "much busier" then the footbridge will have been a waste of money).
<b>D Morrison</b>	Agreed
<b>L Campbell</b>	Remember inclusion of landscaping improves air quality and amenity. Please ensure 'through routes' linking up with other walking/cycling paths.
<b>A Cox</b>	Yes, however there can be difficulties with 'shared use' pavements/cycleways if the cyclists are not as thoughtful as they should be, e.g. not using a bell to alert you to their presence and speeding past you too closely if you are on foot.
<b>Inverness South Community Council</b>	Agreed
<b>L Cload</b>	<p>1. Some good opportunities, especially next to the Police Station, access across SDR and access proposed through the Woodgrove Crescent SUDS pond. Maintaining the cycle access on the road parallel to Old Perth Road is important.</p> <p>2. Some crossings have been missed. An existing crossing is missed at the R of Inshes Retail Park on the plan (p8 of the Development Brief brochure), near Aldi. This is part of a vital safe walking route from the housing estate to the retail park. There is a lack of crossings proposed at the new Tesco roundabout.</p> <p>3a. Some opportunities not considered. For example, dedicated cycle lanes along the whole of Old Perth Road (not a painted line) - three traffic lanes are proposed near the Shell garage, but there is little traffic held up here, so space could be used to widen footway and make a shared use path. Many of the school children to Millburn use the footpath on this stretch to cycle and walk currently to bypass the dangerous fluke roundabout.</p> <p>3b. There is no good and safe cycle / pedestrian connection to Inverness retail park from Inshes / Raigmore - there are steps and dangerous road crossings on the route</p> <p>3c. The pedestrian access across the A9 from the Balvonie Of Inshes road to B9117 should be maintained and improved to provide alternative and interesting routes for pedestrians and runners.</p>
<b>C Dickinson</b>	IMPROVEMENTS SHOULD BE MADE ALONG THE NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE because this gives better and more varied options for entering the city. The proposed route brings the cyclist into contact with traffic for a major super market (Morrison), Longman industrial estate and the town centre in general. There will be too many junctions that will stop the natural flow of the cyclist. If you want to increase cycling, then introduce park and ride and reduce the flow of motor traffic in the town centre. Reduce the general speed of motor traffic within in city area to 20 mph.
<b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b>	There should be a direct and safer walking/cycle route between the Raigmore Estate/Millburn Road and Stoneyfield Business Park. Neither the Council nor Transport Scotland give any recognition to the need to improve these connections, which currently have to be made via the Raigmore Interchange. The Golden Bridge only connects with the Campus site and an opportunity has been missed to link this with Stoneyfield and the Inverness Retail and Business

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	Park beyond. There should also be better at grade pedestrian/cycle/disabled connection across Perth Road between Drakies and Raigmore Hospital.
<b>M Campbell</b>	I do not agree with the proposed junction for Old Perth Road that blocks off our access to the main road next to the Raigmore motel and the ambulance turning. Our house is right on the edge of the Drakies area so that junction is how we come home from work every night and if not we would either have to travel right through Drakies to leave each day or used the proposed traffic light junction which is still an inconvenience as it seems to only be an exit onto the main road. Also without the junction any emergency services like the fire brigade, police or even the ambulance service - as many of my neighbours are very elderly - would have to travel right round the entire drakes are just to reach our house which is visible from the edge of the road.
<b>B Hill</b>	Not enough secure child safe crossings, speed control (not bumps but enforcement) and cycle safe surfaces (not over sunken drainage grids)
<b>D Donald</b>	Whilst I agree to a point with defined walking and cycling routes, these can only be effective if there is a strong Road Safety Education input from a very young age, by this I mean a team of Professional Road Safety Officers visiting and talking on road safety to children in playgroups, nurseries, schools, youth organisations and adults in their clubs and associations. With regard to cycling, again Professional Road Safety Officer input is required together with strong enforcement of traffic legislation by the police. Too many cyclists in this area seem to consider that they are above the law putting themselves and other road users at risk.
<b>S Paterson</b>	Yes. Old Perth Road to Millburn Road could do with improvement for cycling. Quality of surface in particular is an issue and lack of designated cycle lane.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	Proposed cycle routes should be separated from pedestrians and must be in addition to existing carriageways (i.e. not a painted line along existing roads). This will ensure safety for both cyclists and pedestrians.
<b>Goodson Associates (Acting on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited)</b>	Yes. These will be beneficial to the wider area.
<b>I Stewart</b>	I'm not sure what an 'Active travel improvement opportunity' is? Do you mean an internal service road for use by the Police or something else? Suggest that Highland Council ask Stagecoach and other local bus companies to provide bus timetables at all bus stops.
<b>J Shankland</b>	Route shown running behind the police building and then crossing over to the Retail Park would be longer than the present route via the pedestrian crossing at the Inshes Roundabout, for residents at the hospital end of the estate. The part of the estate at the other end of Drumossie Avenue is already served by a pedestrian route from East Mackenzie Park.
<b>L Lee</b>	Great to see any improvements for walking and cycling. We need to support this as much as possible, for health and wellbeing as much as traffic reduction.
<b>Highland Cycle Campaign</b>	The improvements for walking and cycling are hard to discern. The main goal appears to be improving flow for motorised traffic. The accompanying map exaggerates the existing shared use paths. With the exception of the proposed path on Millburn Road and the existing path passing Lifescan, other paths are too narrow for shared use. The path to the West of Raigmore Interchange on the south side of Millburn Rd. is not signed as shared use. The King Duncan's Road path is too steep (and possibly too narrow). The paths in Raigmore Wood are narrow, steep or unsurfaced. NCN Route 1 deteriorates steadily from the existing roundabout at Sir Walter Scott Drive to Culcabock Road. With regard to the various Cross Sections shown • 1.5m Advisory Cycleways on both sides + 2.0m footway on both side [A-A, B-B], • 3.0m Footway/Cycleway on one side + 2.0m footway [E-E, D-D, C-C], • 2.5m Footway/Cycleway on one side [F-F], The 1.5m Advisory Cycleways are on-carriageway with flow cycle lanes as described in CbyD 5.1.3. For these, the



Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>Desirable Minimum Width is 2.0m. A width of 1.5m is the Absolute Minimum and its disadvantages are clearly set out in the final paragraph. These problems, such as motor traffic passing cycles too closely, are frequently experienced on the existing advisory cycle lanes on Culcabock Road. The 3.0m Footway/Cycleway are off-carriageway shared cycleways (for cycles and pedestrians) as described in CbyD 6. Although this width conforms to the Desirable Minimum Width, many pedestrians don't feel safe on shared use cycleways and can themselves create conflicts with cyclists. HCC ask THC to consider a pedestrian pavement and a two-way cycles only 2.0m (or 3.0m) cycleway.</p> <p>2.5m Footway/Cycleway on one side is too narrow but is constrained by the width of the bridge. The solution here would be to remove a lane of motorised traffic or widen the bridge. Crossings at junctions appear to give priority to maintaining traffic flow. A pedestrian/cyclist may need to cross a junction in up to four stages (that is wait for signals up to four times. Cyclists are required to negotiate, alongside pedestrians, right-angled turns and chicanes. This is very poor and particularly awkward or even impossible for tandems, tricycles, bicycles with trailers/panniers. This will result in cyclists joining the road traffic which in turn will annoy drivers and be less safe. Whereas a width of 2.5m or 3.0m might be considered adequate for shared use cycleways this width in chicanes at crossings will only cause conflict. (It can only be navigated inconveniently but safely by a single bicycle.) Pedestrians and cyclists need to be separated completely at crossings, with cyclists closer to the junction and taking a more direct route. The shared use route is shown on the south side of Millburn road and crossing the south ramps of the A9 at Raigmore Interchange. We doubt whether this is a designated shared use route but it is most desirable that it be brought up to appropriate standard as it is a major route for those working at the retail parks. Most importantly it is essential that the crossing of the southbound on ramp be signalised by means of a Toucan crossing. The absence of this protection is the major barrier to cycle commuting in Inverness. It is of vital importance that THC engage with Transport Scotland in order that this facility can be installed at the earliest opportunity. There are steps connecting from Raigmore Interchange up to the small play park near the end of MacKintosh Road. These steps provide a very popular route but are badly in need of renovation. It would be worth considering the conversion of part of the width to a slope for the benefit of cycles and prams. This has already been done successfully from the subway at the end of Innes Street to Longman Road. For further comments see below Inshes Junction Improvements</p>
<b>A Johnston</b>	Consideration of pedestrian/cyclist underpass to access bus-stops on the B9006 to the North of the Tesco store is recommended.
<b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWPPT)</b>	This section should acknowledge that alternative walking and cycling options could be developed upon final development scenarios, particularly as the brief is proposing transportation improvements which will mean that existing walking and cycling routes will change and desire links will also be created which do not currently exist. A note to this effect should be included.
<b>Question 3: What improvements to public transport would you like to see in the area?</b>	
<b>A Kidd</b>	None
<b>J Melling</b>	All bus routes other than that through Drakies should serve both the Hospital and the University.
<b>Anonymous</b>	Have you considered a bus route link between the blue route in Raigmore Housing Estate and that within the area at Raigmore Hospital. (Bus gates could be used for the proposal).
<b>L Campbell</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be consistent with signage; Reduce/remove unnecessary ones, this also applies to roads.</li> <li>• Ensure, where possible, late bus services co-ordinating with shift work patterns.</li> <li>• Where possible, simple accessible bus shelter, appropriate to character of area.</li> </ul>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep on the agenda possibility of re-siting the bus station (in spite of lease) and allowing some more landscaping even trees in tubs in city areas to improve air quality.</li> </ul>
<b>A Cox</b>	Speaking selfishly – it would be nice to have a bus shelter in Drumossie Avenue adjacent to the 'green', i.e. approximately opposite number 49.
<b>Inverness South Community Council</b>	Agreed
<b>L Cload</b>	1. A bus link from Inshes to the airport/ Inverness retail park would be useful.
<b>D &amp; Whillis</b>	Better 'bus links in the Inshes area.
<b>C Dickinson</b>	Introduce Park and ride. Introduce bus and taxi lanes in key city area's. increase number of train stations, by adding one at the new campus and airport.
<b>Sportscotland</b>	No comments
<b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b>	A bus service into Stoneyfield Business Park. The developers of that area had to provide the bus infrastructure as part of the layout and development. Yet after 10 years the bus layby and large roundabout remain unused for that purpose.
<b>B Hill</b>	Our public transport is good and has a wide coverage. More would use the facility if fares were cheaper.
<b>D Donald</b>	Cleaner and better standard of buses. Routes that the travelling public want, not what is only profitable to the bus company.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	Bus gate in Millburn Road is likely to increase congestion problems, particularly at peak times. Construction of an addition entrance to Inverness Campus via a dedicated lane (from Raigmore Interchange sliproad to A9 south - as suggested by Westhill CC) would enable a new bus route through the Campus to be created - particularly beneficial to students since proposed student accommodation is in city centre.
<b>Goodson Associates (Acting on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited)</b>	Increased service to / from Inshes Retail Park.
<b>I Stewart</b>	Suggest that Highland Council ask Stagecoach and other local bus companies to provide bus timetables at all bus stops.
<b>J Shankland</b>	Buses serving Drakies Estate via Drumossie Avenue / Mason Road have to negotiate tight bends in these roads, and vehicles parked on bends. This could perhaps be looked at.
<b>L Lee</b>	There are no buses from Briargrove into town - it is a 20 minute walk to the Tesco's Inshes bus stop and the bus shelter is often full. This does not encourage people to use the bus - in winter you are likely to be soaked. I lived in Sheffield in early 1980 - the subsidized buses ran every 10 minutes through the day and were a very sensible way of reducing traffic. No one minded waiting 10 minutes and you didn't have to worry about missing a bus,

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	there would always be one along soon. Providing park and ride, and creating priority bus lanes so that it is faster to get to work by bus than car would help reduce traffic.
<b>A Johnston</b>	The proposed "new/changed" bus route through the Inshes retail park would assist reduce pedestrians having to cross the B9006.
<b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b>	Buses do not currently utilise the defined route through Inshes Retail park and with improvements already undertaken within the park and further improvements planned, the suitability of maintaining a public transport route through the retail park is questionable. A more appropriate route could be to the east of Inshes Church on existing public roads. However, the brief should maintain flexibility to allow public transport provision to evolve as new development is created.
<b>Question 4: Do you agree with our guidelines for development?</b>	
<b>J Melling</b>	In this area of the town yes- but not in relation to the messed up Southern Distributor/Bypass, where a strategic agreement has been so hopelessly compromised over the last 30 years.
<b>D Morrison</b>	Yes
<b>L Campbell</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encouraging that environmental needs are considered at planning stage.</li> <li>• Air quality and holistic benefits of trees /shrubs increasingly important for now and future generations. Consider the enduring appeal of the islands' trees and landscaping/walkways.</li> <li>• Remember to increase drainage capacity.</li> <li>• Please remember to be inclusive.</li> </ul>
<b>A Cox</b>	They seem reasonable and of benefit to the community.
<b>Inverness South Community Council</b>	Agreed
<b>L Cload</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing brownfield sites of former Blockbuster and development space adjacent (currently used as a makeshift lorry park) should be used before taking over the greenfield site of Dell of Inshes or behind the police HQ.</li> <li>2. Walking routes from Woodgrove Drive housing estate to the retail park and the amenities should be taken into account, with safe crossing provided.</li> <li>3. Protecting green edge and trees is good; access through protected green edge would be good.</li> </ol>
<b>D&amp;J Whillis</b>	Yes
<b>C Dickinson</b>	Greater cycle access to this area is a good thing, I already shop using my bicycle and Tesco area for cycles is always full.
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage</b>	<p><i>A. Dell of Inshes</i></p> <p>As noted, the corridor of the Dell Burn, including mature trees, is a natural heritage feature in this area. It is of course part of a more extensive corridor in this eastern part of Inverness. We therefore would support the development brief seeking to maintain and enhance this habitat corridor as much as possible, by providing positively for Dell Burn and adjacent tree belts. The proposed flood attenuation area to the east of the Tesco/Dobbies car park has significant potential to be of greenspace and habitat value as part of this habitat corridor. We would therefore recommend that one of the criteria for its</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>design should be to enhance local biodiversity. The indicative cross-section G-G in regard to the proposed new access road shows existing trees being retained. We welcome this, although it is not clear that this shows the tree belt nearest to Dell Burn, which should be retained as much as possible. As indicated on the Dell of Inshes plan (page 10), further landscaping is very desirable to augment the existing tree lines here by deepening this habitat corridor, and to compensate for any loss of mature trees as a result of the E-W transport/travel connections.</p> <p>In terms of protected species, as noted above we recommend that a badger survey should be required, given the extent of badger activity around the south and east fringes of Inverness.</p> <p>We also recommend that a bat survey should be required for any mature trees that need to be felled.</p> <p>B. <i>South of Police HQ</i></p> <p>We welcome recognition of the local watercourse/tree belt feature to the south of the existing building, and along the west of the site. We also welcome the proposed requirement that tree loss should be minimised and wildlife habitat improved. We are pleased to see that the brief indicates additional landscaping to tie in with this along the southern and eastern sides. This should assist with the setting of development here, and soften the landscape impact approaching from the SW.</p>
<b>Sportscotland</b>	No comments.
<b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b>	Not all. 1. To the south of Police Scotland HQ please explain how loss of existing trees can be minimised. 2. Please provide the justification for the grossly enlarged roundabout to the south east of Tesco Inshes. Pedestrian/cycle Links between the Woodgrove housing area and the retail park will be severely compromised by this roundabout, which is already a significant barrier to non vehicle use in its current format.
<b>B Hill</b>	Infrastructure should be in place before development. All the proposals have merit and if possible choose those that will be compatible with eventual A82/A9/A96 connection.
<b>Graham and Sibbald (Acting on behalf on Mr &amp; Mr Grant)</b>	<p>Our clients would specifically like to comment on the proposals for the land to the south of Police Scotland and Question 4: Do you agree with our guidelines for development? The Development Brief states that the Council's key aims are 'to enable business expansion, create employment opportunities and develop safer walking and cycling routes to Inshes District Centre'. Our clients fully support those overall aims and the proposed links to Inshes Retail Park. However, it is considered that the site boundary shown in the Development Brief for the land south of Police Scotland is overly restrictive to allow these aims to be achieved. This site has been promoted through the emerging Inner Moray Firth Development Plan process for the site as a whole to be allocated for business use. At the Main Issues Report consultation stage, the Council recognised that the open space in this location provides no amenity value and that the site is commercially viable. The Council raised concerns in relation to the capacity of the local roads network to support additional business space at this location. This concern will be addressed through the proposed junction improvements currently being consulted on. We therefore suggest that the site boundary for the land to the south of Police Scotland is extended to the roundabout at the entrance to Inshes Retail Park and that the site as a whole is allocated for business use. The extension to the site boundary will provide sufficient land to enable business expansion and create employment opportunities. It will also ensure that this site is developed in accordance with the principles of the Development Framework. The northern section of this is specifically allocated for expansion of the Police Headquarters. While this use is fully supported by our clients, the site has been identified for this use for some time without any proposals for Police Scotland coming forward. We request that the allocation of this section of the site provides flexibility for the site to be developed for general business use should Police Scotland not progress with their expansion plans. The development guidelines also identify a new vehicle access for Police Scotland and extending their existing access to this area of land. As above, we request that the</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	Development Brief provides flexibility should the Police Headquarters not progress and the additional access is no longer required. In terms of the guidelines for development for this site we support the creation of walking and cycling links and the proposed link between this site and the Inshes Retail Park. We also agreed that the existing building line should be maintained and any new development on the land to the south should complement the existing building position and massing.
<b>D Donald</b>	No. Years ago land was reserved for improved road lines but these have been totally ignored over the years leading to the problems we are not having on the roads. The guidelines should consider what is practical first then what is attractive. Not the other way round and just because there is an area of unoccupied land the first consideration should not be, is it suitable for an office development, but can it be used for low-cost residential use. Too many office developments slotted into unoccupied land are lacking in parking for employees and their visitors.
<b>S Paterson</b>	Yes. I would note however that it would be good to see the former blockbuster video store and vacant land opposite it developed. The vacant land in particular has been empty since the business park was developed and is a blight on the area.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	Use underpasses and pedestrian/cycle bridges where possible to minimize increasing traffic congestion due to pedestrian crossings. Vehicular access to Police Scotland HQ should be further away from Inshes roundabout junction as traffic is frequently "backed-up" there.
<b>I Stewart</b>	The 'Walking Distances' Inset shows a 10 minute travel time on foot from Culcabock junction to Local Dev Plan allocation IN55. I would suggest you were jogging when you established this figure. Again, scale of insets is so small. Dell of Inshes site occupies a pivotal location with excellent links to A9(T); A96(T) and potentially A82(T). This site would lend itself to a more prestigious use such as a civic purpose, even relocation of the Local Authority HQ and gaining symmetry through proximity with Police HQ; Hospital and Beechwood Business Park.
<b>J Shankland</b>	Not quite sure. Perhaps we need more public green areas? Certainly any more developments need to have adequately sized parking spaces for vehicles. Currently many have spaces sized for small cars, resulting in many vehicles requiring to use two or more spaces.
<b>F&amp;T McWilliam</b>	Any agreement to future retail development in the field between Inshes Holdings and Dell of Inshes will only increase congestion and traffic to this area and cannot be justified. I refer to application n.o 13/04334/PIP. I would point out that we have direct correspondence from the Principle Planner at Highland Council on 17/4/14 who refers to the garden ground at 2 Dell of Inshes and states "It is recognised that this is garden ground however, the green wedges are important to the setting and character of the city and it would not be appropriate to allow their continued erosion." Any proposal therefore to expand this roundabout and support a link road to the A9 that directly impacts on this land at Dell of Inshes is in direct contradiction to this position.
<b>Highland Cycle Campaign</b>	The accompanying photographs are clearly only intended to be indicative. A further opportunity to make comment would be appreciated once more detailed plans have been drawn up. The ideas promoted are all individually desirable but conflicts can arise when taken together. For example, parking for cycles is often unsuitable by being poorly designed or badly positioned. Spill-out space can interfere with cycle paths.
<b>A Johnston</b>	The guidelines for the "Dell of Inshes" land uses appear to solely cater for the area referred as IN55 on the IMFLDP which it is noted is still in preparation. There is a requirement for the council to "produce a masterplan / development brief which it will adopt as supplementary guidance. This will address the need for completion of an / 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." It is noted that no flood risk assessment nor any transport assessment has been provided to support the proposals and combined with the absence of consideration of the previously identified constraints the developable land boundary cannot be determined. Therefore the identified guidelines are nugatory at this time. Note there is a requirement to engage SEPA and prepare a strategic flood risk assessment in accordance with their guidance LUPS-GU11v5 titled "Land Use Planning

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>System". There is no evidence of the necessary early engagement to define the Flood Risk, prepare a strategic flood risk assessment nor and identify any required mitigation measures noting the first step is flood avoidance and then finally establish the principles of development. Similarly no evidence of a transport assessment has been provided other than road layout options along the B9006 (see comments below to Transport Scotland regarding the apparent failings of the transport modelling). Therefore the Development Brief booklet is premature as it is incomplete and does not provide the reader a complete view and understanding of all the issues. It is also interesting to note that the two views purporting to represent safeguarding key views of the site from the A9 and Inshes overbridge appear to include a developers proposal?. It is also noted that the guidelines state that the "development to accommodate proposed road realignment and flood scheme". As these factors are undefined the guideline is pointless. Furthermore there should be a guideline to reinforce the safeguards identified in the IMFLDP IN55 requirements and a safeguard to enforce all the key constraints identified in the development brief booklet and any others proposed and considered relevant. Once these are defined and a flood risk assessment and a transport assessment is undertaken the site boundary for the Dell of Inshes land uses can be determined and only then can guideline to confirmed.</p>
<p><b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b></p>	<p>SWIPPT own land at Dell of Inshes and currently have a PPP applied for. Detailed discussions have been ongoing with the Council officers regarding form and content of the development proposed. The main concern in the brief is the suggestion that commercial uses should be accommodated in formal frontage parallel to the road in small commercial units. Parking is indicated to the rear. Such a restriction on development is not commercially viable as the demand in this area is for larger units set behind surface level car parking. This form of development has been accepted in the remainder of the retail park even in the neighbourhood centre that was permitted on land now occupied by Aldi. To insist on rear car parking means that customers have to walk around the rear of units and service areas and disabled car parking is not then accessible locations at the front of shops. Remote parking to the rear also presents security risks out of hours in particular given the lack of natural surveillance from shop fronts. There is no existing building line on the Dell of Inshes sites and the over riding need is to ensure that there is a viable development well related to the remainder of the centre.</p>
<p><b>Question 5: Do you have any other comments on the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief – Issues and Options?</b></p>	
<p><b>A Kidd</b></p>	<p>The development brief should have mentioned the need to improve existing traffic flow and projected increased traffic flow at the Inshes Roundabout with the completion of the SDR link onto the A82 at Torvean. The Brief should also have mentioned the need to improve safety and help improve safety by reducing the stacking on the A9 southbound, particularly with the increased pressure the opening of the UHI access is going to cause at Inshes Junction and Inshes Roundabout.</p>
<p><b>D Morrison</b></p>	<p>Agreed with proposed option at Inshes A9 overbridge requires to be addressed.</p>
<p><b>L Campbell</b></p>	<p>Simplify</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide safe pedestrian crossing points.</li> <li>• Roadside parking on side roads</li> <li>• Minimise increase in traffic lights, where necessary at cross-roads provide slipways on left.</li> <li>• Use roundabouts for landscaping/trees</li> </ul>
<p><b>A Cox</b></p>	<p>I particularly liked the idea of allotments, these are creative healing and foster a sense of community.</p>
<p><b>Inverness South Community Council</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fluke roundabout – happy with outline proposal.</li> <li>2. Ambulance</li> <li>3. Drakies access – happy with new arrangement* another vehicle access to Blockbusters roundabout from cul-de-sac off Drakies Avenue.</li> <li>4. Inshes roundabout happy with and roads/traffic lights</li> </ol>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>5. Police access? Access at rear may be best</p> <p>6. Tesco entrance &amp; exit OK</p> <p>7. Inshes overbridge – outline proposal to create more lanes PLEASE ASAP whatever the outcome of A9/A96 decision with will be a long time in the future and this improvement is need now. The alternative proposal may be needed at a later date.</p> <p>8. Entrance to the campus and roads. Despite extra lane from A9 traffic still backing onto A9 when campus opens will be worse. More thought to other entrances exits into campus are needed. (1) entrance only from A9 South through existing lay-by (2) entrance and exit from A9/A96 proposed new link.</p> <p>9. Drainage/flooding on Inshes Retail Park will leave to the experts but definitely needs addressing in the area. Retain as many mature trees as possible? Where will the outflow from the S.U.D.S. be.</p> <p>10. Very concerned if Option D for the A9/A96 is adopted, All traffic from A9 will be directed down Dell of Inshes and past Inshes Church and Wester Inshes residents already have difficulty exiting their estate.</p>
<b>L Cload</b>	Increasing the number of cars using the road next to Inshes Church will increase the danger for the children and pedestrians going from the housing estate to the retail park. A convenient safe route is vital.
<b>D&amp;J Whillis</b>	The current Inshes Retail park has several unoccupied sites.
<b>C Dickinson</b>	Plan for parking of bicycles: force developers into providing proper facilities to match the target numbers of users, Tesco's already fails in this area. Don't mix bicycle ways with walk ways for pedestrians. Traffic furniture should not be used against a bicycle in favour of motor transport. A car waits for one set of green lights why should a cyclist wait for two green lights to make the same journey? this bias already exist in the new UHI campus road crossing.
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage</b>	<p>I hope these comments will be of assistance to you in preparing the draft Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact Andrew Brown, Planning Adviser (andrew.brown@snh.gov.uk) in the first instance.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this consultation booklet. The Council proposes to prepare a development brief for the Inshes and Raigmore area and adopt it as statutory supplementary guidance to the Highland wide Local Development Plan. We were pleased to be able to provide some informal comments on natural heritage features and opportunities in the area in the lead-up to this consultation. We highlighted amongst other issues the habitat corridor on the west side of Dell of Inshes, comprising tree belts and Dell Burn. We also highlighted a similar habitat corridor comprising a watercourse and a tree belt to the south of the Police HQ. We are pleased to note that both of these are being maintained as much as possible within the proposals.</p>
<b>Sportscotland</b>	We do not have any specific comments to make on the consultation papers, but we would request that the Council notes that we have reviewed the papers in order to ascertain whether the development sites include outdoor sports facilities, and, using aerial imagery, have found there to be none. However, we would seek to highlight to the Council that should the development sites include any such uses which we have missed, the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 226 with regard to the loss of outdoor sports facilities would apply, as would the circumstances as set out in the Development Management Regulations under which Sportscotland should be consulted on planning applications affecting such uses. We thank you for consulting with Sportscotland, and trust that our response is helpful. Please contact us if you require anything further.
<b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b>	There is no obvious indication of a link to/from the A9, formerly known as the East Link. There is also a lack of joined up thinking over the proposals with those of Transport Scotland. A link into the new over-sized roundabout to the north east of Woodgrove (if that is proposed) is not well founded and will impact significantly on the residential amenity of those living there and at Dell of Inshes.

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
<b>A Owens</b>	Whichever route is finally agreed this will be a very busy section of the highway with complicated junctions so it is essential that all new traffic signs must comply with the Department for Transport Traffic Signs Regulations which state that 'The legibility of traffic signs is of prime importance and where lettering has to be used, the message needs to be condensed into as few immediately comprehensible words as possible' Bilingual signs should therefore not be erected anywhere in this area as it has been proved that displaying unnecessary words on signs can render them to be unfit for purpose and makes them much more expensive which cannot be justified, particularly at a time when public expenditure is being cut so drastically. The Scottish Government's and the Highland Council's policies which require all road signs in the Highlands to be bilingual should be reviewed urgently to ensure that all traffic signs on our dangerous roads will strictly comply with the regulations and that they must not be used for any other purpose.
<b>B Hill</b>	The proposals are sound. The Old Perth Road will be safer and traffic should flow better.
<b>Graham and Sibbald (Acting on behalf on Mr &amp; Mr Grant)</b>	We write on behalf of our clients Mr and Mrs Grant in relation to the current consultation for the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief - Issues and Options. Our client owns the land to the south of Police Scotland Headquarters at Sir Walter Scott Drive. We welcome the preparation of the Development Brief and the opportunity to comment on the proposals. We consider that the Development Brief boundary should be extended on the western side of Sir Walter Scott Drive to the roundabout at the entrance to Inshes Retail Park. This would mirror the boundary on the eastern side of Sir Walter Scott Drive. We request that the Development Brief includes timescales for the delivery of the junction improvements.
<b>D Donald</b>	Why is it called the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief? What is proposed will also affect residents in Westhill as Inshes is their main shopping centre. Once again I say that the planners are thinking in to tight a constraint and not considering the effects it will have on adjacent areas.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	Phase 1 included widening Culloden Road (B9006) at the Campus site entrance. Presently much of the traffic heading westbound (i.e. towards city centre) at non-peak hours uses only the inner left-hand lane - vehicles in the right-hand lane are often regarded as "queue jumping". Signage, both in advance of and at the junction, such as "USE BOTH LANES" in large letters might help alleviate this. Much of the signage heading eastbound is difficult to interpret, particularly for strangers/tourists with some being on the road lanes. These markings cannot always be seen particularly in dark and/or wet conditions thus increasing the potential for accidents - a situation which is likely to become worse when the Campus opens.
<b>I Stewart</b>	If the Dell of Inshes site is developed for commercial uses such as shops then buildings should be restricted to single storey designs to keep a low visual profile and minimise intrusion as viewed from the A9. The Brief includes no provision for formal/indoor sports recreation, much needed at this location i.e. the centre of Inverness' population.
<b>J Shankland</b>	More 'green areas' may be of more value than buildings. Growing plants will absorb water, possibly reducing future flood risk. Commercial developments should have appropriately sized parking areas
<b>F&amp;T McWilliam</b>	Whilst we can appreciate the need to reduce congestion and improve the Inshes Junction, there are several concerns we feel it is important to raise. The outline proposals show the indicative arrangement for a bigger roundabout at the Tesco car park/lane to Dell of Inshes includes connectivity to Transport Scotland's A9/A96 link. Why has this been included in the council's outline as Transport Scotland's Option B does not connect to this roundabout and therefore it would be appropriate to wait and not prejudge this consultation? Enhancing this roundabout to allow for this connectivity with A9/A96 proposal would involve significant disruption to the green wedge area at Dell of Inshes including a direct impact on at least 10 mature trees with preservation orders lining the lane, which have been omitted in the 'Built and Natural Heritage' map on page 6 of the Council's information brief. In addition the requirement to cover a large part of the Dell Burn, would have a vast impact on local wildlife let alone the direct impact on Dell of Inshes properties.



Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
L Lee	<p>Please retain the row of poplar trees along the road outside Tesco's. We sometimes get red underwing moths (usually only found further south) the larvae feed on poplar and willow.</p> <p>Please try and create wildlife corridors wherever possible, and increase biodiversity through habitat creation - e.g. wildflowers on roundabouts, planting native species trees for screening. Makes it a better place for us to live, as well as for wildlife.</p>
A Johnston	<p>Any proposed development expansion of the Inshes retail park will only generate an additional burden on the existing road network. It is my consideration on review of the previous thwarted planning attempts by a persistent developer who owns the land at Dell of Inshes that the council has been influenced to incorporate in the Highland wide local development plan adopted in 2012 a change of land use from green wedge to commercial use (IN55). This is in spite of concerns raised by residents affected by the significant change in land use especially as the site is surrounded by residential properties, fields or local access roads. Although requirements have been set to produce a masterplan and identifies required safeguards it is concerning that none of the safeguards have been demonstrated to have been considered in the information provided in the briefing material provided. Most notable is the absence of recent traffic survey information and the lack of SEPA engagement to prepare a strategic flood assessment plan. This information is vital to determine the site constraints and limit the developable boundary for the areas under consideration. Furthermore the A9/A96 Connections Study by Transport Scotland is equally flawed as it appears to utilise the same traffic data generated in 2009 and prior to many new developments taking place and also noting the information was prepared as a strategic level assessment as it was generated to support the IMFLDP. For consideration of this development plan an accurate model is required and a transport plan proposed to address the future transport needs to at least the same time period as considered under the IMFLDP. Note the transport report generated for the IMFLDP identified future concerns with the Raigmore / Culloden road network and consideration of suitable investment is made once rather than the example of "Sir Walter Scott Drive" where failure to dual on construction and reliance on developer contributions has led to inconsistent road infrastructure and arguably the need to implement piecemeal improvements including the latest plan to upgrade the Inshes roundabout and Old Perth road connections. The "outline proposals" presented in the development briefing material indicate up to 5 signal controlled junctions from the Inshes A9 overbridge to the Fluke roundabout which due to the short queue length available and if not synchronised may lead to blocking of crossing traffic and subsequent short cycle times to clear right turning traffic. Additionally each junction would probably include a pedestrian phase on demand which would also increase the traffic retention period which would also need to be factored into the travel time improvements proposed. On study of the traffic movements at the current Inshes roundabout it is noted that pedestrian movements are limited to crossing the B8082 only. Pedestrian crossings exist on each side of the roundabout on the B9006 but a considerable distance from the roundabout. Only the pedestrian crossing to the East of the roundabout is heavily used as it serves the bus-stop on the East bound lane of the B9006 as well as the main pedestrian access to and from the Beechwood Business park. These pedestrian crossings appear to be retained and incorporated in the outline proposals. It has been observed that crossing pedestrian traffic is a significant contribution to the pulsing streams along the B9006 which enter the Inshes roundabout and restrict exit from the Inshes retail park until the traffic has cleared. This pulsing is caused by a combination of the pedestrian crossing signal and the signals at the Inverness Campus entrance. However at peak times the B9006 West bound traffic backs up over the Inshes overpass and the only break in the traffic is when the pedestrian crossing is in use. The proposed outline proposals indicate a new elevated access road to the B9006 from the Inshes Retail park the position of which lines over an area of flood risk which impounds annually which includes an area including my property, Fernbank. It is my view that the proposed new access road would only compound and increase the current flood risk to my property which is unacceptable as it is contrary to the first principle of flood prevention and that is avoidance. It is also contrary to the aim of the IMFLDP not to increase the flood risk. Additionally the flood attenuation basin system proposed covers an area currently tree lined and forming an attractive border to the Inshes retail park and the residential and agriculture area immediately to the East. This is contrary to the proposal to safeguard key views. The proposal also isolates the Tesco filling station and</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>provides a new junction to the proposed new access road. Across from the filling station junction is proposed a junction which would lead to my property but there is not recognition of the existing tree lined border to my property in this elevation. It is concerning that the proposed new access road and junctions would be on an incline and an elevated embankment adjacent to my house with potential loss of privacy and amenity. The outline plans also identify a link to the A9/A96 connection along with an indicative arrangement for the retail park roundabout which would destroy any remaining existing avenue of trees which is again contrary to the proposal to safeguard key views. With a view to provide some positive comment and assistance I have identified in my reply to the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connectivity Study which I have copied into my response to question 6, an alternative proposal which maybe worth further consideration. In summary a partially submerged tunnel to carry the B8082 under the B9006 would be constructed with the existing roundabout or signalled controlled junction above. The B9006 would remain elevated from the Inshes A9 overbridge and would allow a pedestrian underpass and increased culvert to be installed avoiding the need for a pedestrian crossing and flood attenuation systems respectively. Slip roads from the B8082 would be accommodated on the approaches to the roundabout although this is practical South of the Inshes roundabout, on the North the Tunnel entrance may need to extend to the A9 slip road to allow access to the Beechwood business park above. Additionally if required an additional lane could be provided to the existing A9 Inshes overbridge and a dedicated South Bound access slip road similar to the North bound slip road formed to the Inverness Campus junction on the B9006. The benefit of this alternative proposal is that the Culloden road width could be locally increased to accommodate the local and trunk road traffic as it will accommodate the effect of the A9/A96 connection proposals without any need for another A9 crossing. The alternative proposal also separates the current confluence of East/West and North/South traffic flow at a busy junction. It is recommended that further traffic surveys are undertaken to determine the actual current demand and future modelling and a transport assessment is prepared. It is also recommended that a formal flood risk assessment is undertaken and strategic flood risk assessment is prepared.</p>
<b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b>	<p>SWIPPT agree with the general approach the Council is seeking for Dell of Inshes, but is concerned regarding the prescriptive nature of the guideline. SWIPPT is working with the adjacent land owner Tesco to ensure that accessibility and infrastructure improvements undertaken will enhance overall accessibility in the area and will also create a development site which will enhance the overall appearance and functionality of the area. The new development should complete the commercial centre of Inshes. Commercial considerations should be allowed for and variations on development scenarios to ensure that as and when detailed designs are drawn up for road improvements, flood attenuation and commercial development, the brief can be complied with and the ultimate development supported.</p>
<b>Question 6: Do you have any comments on the Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 – Outline Proposals</b>	
<b>A Kidd</b>	<p>I totally disagree with the proposal to replace the existing roundabout with a cross over junction on the grounds off firstly Safety for road users, pedestrians and cyclists, secondly traffic congestion and environmental issues and thirdly on cost and disruption. I will explain my reasons for objecting in more detail; Safety - it is well documented and clearly identified in the National "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 6 Section 2 Part 3 Geometric Design of Roundabouts" that road junctions are not as safe as roundabouts. The Design Manual clearly identifies that serious accidents are FIVE (5) times more likely to occur, however more concerning is the fact that road junctions are extremely likely to create very serious life threatening T Bone Collisions which, do not occur at roundabouts. The Design Manual is quite clear and specific about this and therefore it is quite absurd that the proposal includes a 4 way Junction to replace a Roundabout, effectively designing in more accidents and the potential for fatal accidents. When considering pedestrians and cyclists at a four way junction you now increase the likelihood of fatalities due to the speed at which the traffic can cross the intersection at green, it is clear in the Design Manual that although accidents are common at roundabouts where cyclists and pedestrians are involved, these accidents are rarely serious due to the lower speeds involved at roundabouts, when compared to cyclists and pedestrians at junctions where very often the results are fatal. I would reiterate my statement regarding cycle safety improvements, is clear that the Introduction of T Bone Collisions with Cyclists and Pedestrians in close proximity and</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>on islands is a severe life safety hazard that the proposal would introduce. This again leads me to very emphatically reject the council's proposal. Traffic Congestion and Environmental Issues - the Design Manual clearly identifies that roundabouts have a greater capacity for traffic flow than junctions, the very design of a roundabout means it keeps traffic moving at a dramatically reduced speed. This is not disputed anywhere in the world and America which is the home of cross over junctions is increasingly introducing roundabouts at busy junctions. Another major concern is that roundabouts are known to be much more environmentally friendly than junctions, in that they allow traffic to move more freely more of the time, which maintains momentum and is more greatly more fuel efficient. Compare this to junctions where all the traffic has to stop and start which is vastly less fuel efficient. I teach fuel efficient driving for goods vehicles and it is well documented that maintaining even 5 MPH at a roundabout versus stopping gives a 19% saving on fuel, due to the effort of moving off from rest. Cost and Disruption - The proposal intends to construct 6 new junctions and provide 8 sets of traffic lights (including the two on the SDR next to Police Scotland, as well as widen the entire length of the road between the Fluke and the Inshes Flyover. This would be done at a significant cost and disruption. The end result I believe would be to create a more dangerous section of road which would not cope with the traffic as well as the existing road. This vast amount of money could be spent on improving cycle and pedestrian safety facilities and less dramatic minor alterations to the roads giving far greater value for money and more importantly being safer and more environmentally and esthetically pleasing. My preferred option - it is clear that Inshes Junction, Inshes Roundabout and to a lesser extent the Fluke roundabout are struggling to cope with existing traffic, which is about to be compounded by the introduction of the UHI access and SDR link with the A82. The fundamental problem with Inshes Roundabout (which was agreed with, by Transport Scotland and Jacobson engineers at the Road Show this week) is that it is a SIX (6) way roundabout with FIVE (5) sets of pedestrian crossings. It is little wonder the roundabout is struggling to cope with existing traffic. One simple improvement (which could easily be tried and surveyed for traffic flow) would be to make both the Police and Tesco's legs access only, this would effectively make the roundabout a Four (4) way roundabout with FOUR (4) pedestrian crossings, overnight. This was partly done last year when the road was widened and the bus stop created and made a marked difference to traffic flow over the 6 week period. The math's speaks for its self, removing two access points and one pedestrian crossing must make the roundabout more efficient. This simple and virtually cost free improvement could be done next week and would ensure Tesco's traffic could still access directly off their roundabout but would have to exit back onto the SDR at Harry Ramsdens roundabout. The Police Scotland traffic would likewise still be able to access directly off the roundabout but would have to exit through Drakies, as there is no Front Line Emergency Response policing undertaken from the premises now, that should not be a problem. The second phase of my proposal would be to separate the cycle and pedestrian traffic from the vehicular traffic, this could be achieved by providing a cycle pedestrian bridge or underpass, possibly in the same way that this was done in Eindhoven with the innovative Floating Bridge, this could be done by a design competition as I am sure there are many ways of separating the traffic from cyclists and pedestrians. The end result would be a completely separate and safe system for cyclists and pedestrians and a free flowing safe and environmentally friendly FOUR way roundabout with NO pedestrian crossings. If this new and exciting Floating Bridge was paired with moving the Golden Bridge (or providing a second less elaborate bridge) to just north of the Inshes Flyover, as it has minimal usage potential in its existing bizarre location, it would be used by all students and general public. A cycle pedestrian bridge in this location would allow the Inshes Flyover to be made a Three Full width carriageway which would alleviate the stacking on the A9 southbound and accommodate the increased UHI traffic. The end result would be a magnificent safe entrance into Inverness for Cyclists, Walkers and Drivers, particularly the National Cycle Route 1. I am sure the cycle pedestrian route would be well used by local people and Students to access Inshes Retail Park and the Town via the cycle route through Kingsmills and not through the somewhat odd protracted route over the Golden bridge through Raigmore housing estate and along the not very safe Dual Carriageway (Millburn Road) which I am equally sure very few students will use. I would strongly recommend that until the Inshes Flyover can be widened to full three lane width that the new second lane leading to the flyover from Inshes Junction is coned off. It is blatantly obvious to me and the Jacobson Engineer at the road show, that the second lane is causing the increased convergence delay of traffic getting away from the stacking on the A9 Southbound. This stacking is the single most</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	serious Life Safety Dangerous Condition in Inverness and will result in a Major and possibly Fatal accident unless an immediate control measure is put in place. This is an issue now whilst the Inshes Junction is a three way intersection and will be made drastically worse when the UHI traffic is included and the junction becomes four way. The originally planned Roundabout should never have been scrapped in favor of the New Junction as the situation has got worse not better. THIS SHOULD BE A LESSON TO THE STAGE TWO DESIGN TEAM, AS IT IS CLEAR THAT THE STAGE ONE DESIGN TEAM GOT IT DRASTICALLY WRONG WHEN THEY CHANGED THE DESIGN FROM A ROUNDABOUT TO A FOUR WAY MULTILANE JUNCTION AT INSHES JUNCTION.
<b>R Newmark</b>	In view of the continuing resentment felt by Inverness residents in the manner that traffic lights were installed at Longman roundabout could any change at the Inshes roundabout, whatever they are, be accompanied by the following: 1) A publicised study of the traffic / congestion levels showing the average time to negotiate the junction at different times of the day, days of week etc BEFORE any changes 2) A publicised study of the traffic / congestion levels showing the average time to negotiate the junction at different times of the day, days of week etc AFTER any changes 3) Publicised contingency plans and the funding that is in place, and the time scales involved to implement them, should the average time to negotiate the junction actually increase as a result of the modifications to the junctions.. taking all directions, total number of vehicles, all times of the day into account. Most people believe that the changes at Longman Roundabout have resulted in overall longer journey times, except during short rush hour periods.. It is quite possible they are wrong, but they don't want opinions of officials who simply dismiss their complaints, as has been highlighted by the editor of the Inverness Courier. This time, could the public have some accessible accurate facts and figures, including the raw data.
<b>P Reynolds</b>	Having looked briefly at your booklet one thing I would say is that I think the existing traffic light junction at the main entrance to Raigmore Hospital is extremely efficient, though no doubt it could be improved further by giving priority to ambulances first, and buses after that. I have used the junction most days over the past month (though my need to do so is now over) and have also observed it on occasions from the tower block.
<b>Anonymous</b>	Please get a move on; whilst I still have a car and am able to drive it - not getting any younger!
<b>J Gordon</b>	The proposals are long overdue, but in the meantime potholes should be filled in properly.
<b>L Campbell</b>	Keep all night street lighting (& road/motorway) to a safe minimum. Try to avoid/mitigate concreted surface 'wasteland' as in under-landscaped Matalan shopping/retail park area. Please ensure that, where possible, longer stretches of roadway include gentle bends.
<b>A Cox</b>	I looked at these very closely but I lack the knowledge to make any informed comment on the proposals. However, as a car driver I can say:- (i) Closing off the Old Perth Road seems to be a good idea because (a) it is a dangerous (R) turn out of Drumossie Avenue at present due to racing cars coming from the (L) (rat-running) and (b) the confusion of traffic moving on upper and lower roads (if you understand me). (ii) The big roundabout near the Police HQ seems to cause a great deal of confusion to motorists in its present form, as well as having an anomalous arrangement for the road from Police HQ. The inner lane only serving the town centre instead of left and 'straight ahead'. I have to do the imposed manoeuvre regularly i.e. outer lane and then taking the exit for the N bound A9 and it is dangerous. Therefore I shall be very pleased to see an improvement here.
<b>R&amp;C Mackenzie</b>	We do not think that one entrance into Drakies estate is a good idea. There would be too much traffic on Drumossie Ave not in favour of closing off motel entrance to estate. Something needs to be done about Inshes roundabout but it should be done urgently not in ? years down the road. Would it not be possible to put lights there now. Where is all the money going to come from for all those suggested "improvements"?

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
<b>L Cload</b>	<p>1. The proposals do not appear to resolve the key traffic issue that I observe. The key bottleneck appears to be the traffic lights at the Raigmore Hospital junction. In the morning these back up cars to the Inshes Roundabout and up towards Culloden. In the evening, cars back up from the junction down past Fluke Roundabout. In both cases after the Raigmore junction the traffic appears to flow freely. The proposals do not appear to resolve this but add additional lights, which would make the issue worse. Could there be a dedicated junction off the Raigmore roundabout to the hospital, utilising the wide space available?</p> <p>2. As per point 1, a single dedicated lane bypassing the junction into Raigmore Hospital off Raigmore roundabout for right turns from Culloden, then banning right turns to and from Raigmore.</p> <p>3. As point 1, but make the Fluke roundabout bigger to allow U turns, then ban the right turn from Raigmore junction.</p> <p>2. The proposals need to consider the new Ness bridge for the west link road, which will create a lot of new traffic flow to the south. The new roundabout proposed at Inshes Retail Park would push traffic through the other roundabouts creating new bottlenecks and increasing the hazard to local residents, especially the junction from Woodgrove Drive to Inshes Church Road. Creating a link using Stevenson Road would avoid many of the roundabouts and create a more attractive route, avoiding Inshes retail park.</p>
<b>D&amp;J Whillis</b>	<p>We wish to object to the proposals for the A9/A96 connections study, particularly option "B". This proposal fails to properly address the problem of congestion at the Inshes roundabout, by merely diverting a small amount of traffic elsewhere, and failing to reduce the traffic on either road (A9 or A96). It is unlikely to be an attractive route for most drivers using the area. It proposes a new road through an area previously considered a green corridor, very close to two listed buildings. It also increases significantly the traffic at the Inshes School, which is currently an unsafe area due to poor parking by parents at key times of the day. Both options "C" and "D" run through green belt land and very close to new housing development as well as a listed building. The area at the Tesco's roundabout is already very busy during the rush hour as many drivers use this as a "rat run" to avoid queues on the Southern Distributor Road. The real problem is that the Inshes roundabout cannot cope with the current volume of traffic. These plans do not address the problem seriously, they are just papering over the cracks.</p>
<b>C Dickenson</b>	<p>A bicycle should be able to move along the same route without having to give-way anymore than a motor vehicle. The current ring round allows cars to flow round roundabouts while bicycles are forced to stop and start. The existing approach does not promote commuters to give up the car for the bicycle. Inshes overbridge will not work in increasing traffic flow because of the roundabout soon after will cause a bottleneck, there is also a good chance it would cause more accidents. Access to the north bound lane would on the other hand help a lot, and this would reduce the traffic using the roundabout altogether.</p>
<b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b>	<p>Yes. 1. I welcome the removal of the Inshes roundabout. This is a living nightmare for residents of Drakies trying to access it in a vehicle, at any time of the day or day of the week. 2. I also welcome the prospect of removing the rat running of extraneous traffic along the Drakies residential access road parallel to Perth Road. However, the western (Raigmore Motel) end of this access road should remain open for residential traffic only. This will reduce congestion at the proposed junction at the north end of Drumossie Avenue. 3. I question the prospect of 6 further sets of traffic lights on Perth Road, which will only slow traffic even further and cause drivers to seek alternative routes such as via the A9 and Inshes flyover junction.</p>
<b>M Campbell</b>	<p>I do not agree with the proposed junction for Old Perth Road that blocks off our access to the main road next to the Raigmore motel and the ambulance turning. Our house is right on the edge of the Drakies area so that junction is how we come home from work every night and if not we would either have to travel right through Drakies to leave each day or used the proposed traffic light junction which is still an inconvenience as it seems to only be an exit onto the main road. Also without the junction any emergency services like the fire brigade, police or even the ambulance service - as many of my neighbours are very elderly - would have to travel right round the entire drakes area just to reach our house which is visible from the edge of the road.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
P&R Douglas	<p>1. As residents of the Inshes area we appreciate that something really needs to be done about the escalating amount of traffic we have in the area and as there is proposed development in the field between Inshes holdings and Dell of Inshes this will only increase congestion. 2. The proposals show that the arrangement for a bigger roundabout at the Tesco car park /lane to Dell of Inshes ,includes connecting the Transport Scotland A9/A96 link, why has this been included in the councils outline as Option B does not connect to this roundabout. 3. Making this roundabout much larger will involve the disruption of mature trees which have preservation orders on them lining the lane as well as having a large impact on wildlife and an even larger impact on the properties in dell of Inshes.</p>
J Machin	<p>The Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 considerations relate to roads which we have used for some 35 years, during which we have never been questioned as part of a traffic survey. Please advise us of the references for the traffic surveys on which the proposals are based. Omitted, we think, from the narrative is the additional lane and "intelligent" traffic signals at the hospital entrance, which, with the phase 1 works, have been highly beneficial. Our impression is that existing arrangements work reasonably well for around 80% of any 24 hour period. The roundabouts at the Fluke and Inshes appear efficient. However, a completely different dynamic operates for the other 20% of the time when dominant flows commandeer each junction: westbound pre ~09.00, then eastbound after ~16.00. At other roundabouts, traffic signals, which work only when peak flows become dominant, can allow non-dominant streams proportionate access. Doing away with roundabouts without having tried to better control their use seems a drastic move.</p> <p>In our opinion, the radical and draconian solution proposed, imposing 6 sets of traffic signals over some 690 metres, is highly risky. The section G-G (pg. 17) of the proposed flood attenuation basin indicates that existing trees be retained, appearing to show those presently on the east boundary of the Tesco site and the poplars in the central reservation between the 2 present lanes. On both banks of the Dell Burn there are most attractive trees and we suggest that every effort be made to incorporate these on the eastern side of the basin, so as to create a spacious and attractive visual amenity, separating two development areas. If Transport Scotland adopts option D of its A9/A96 Connections Study then this may present a great opportunity for Highland Council to widen the Inshes Overbridge to provide an additional lane in each direction. A collaborative project here should secure some economies of scale. We strongly support such a joint initiative.</p>
Scottish Environment Protection Agency	<p>Thank you for your consultation email which SEPA received on 21 May 2014, specifically seeking comments on the outline proposals for Inshes junction improvements Phase 2. Please note that this response should be read in conjunction with our response to the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief – Issues and Options (our ref: PCS/133579). Advice for the planning authority</p> <p>1. Flood risk</p> <p>1.1 We welcome the proposal that a key objective of the Inshes Junction Improvements will take into account flood risk associated with the Dell Burn and deliver a solution to flood risk in the area.</p> <p>1.2 We note that the proposed road improvement works could potentially impact on the alignment of the Dell Burn and support the proposals to consider how flood defences and attenuation could be provided in this area.</p> <p>1.2 We would strongly recommend that those areas around the junction improvements that have been flooded previously, are near to watercourses or culverts, or are within the limits of flooding on the SEPA Flood Maps medium probability outlines, including the surface water extent would require a FRA to support new development proposals. This could form a joint FRA with the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief.</p> <p>1.3 We would highlight that a FRA should consider the impact of any potential re-alignment of the Dell Burn and that changes to the watercourse alignment may be limited in their scope for development.</p> <p>1.4 With regards to historical flooding at the site we would reiterate our previous comments (PCS/131848) detailing flooding from the Dell and Inshes Burns in 2002. Areas to the south of Old Perth Road and Culloden Road, where new junctions are proposed, may be at risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>1.5 The watercourses in the development area are culverted in places. As experience has shown in this area, culverts are a frequent cause of local flooding. Watercourses should not be culverted as part of a new development unless there is no practical alternative and existing culverts should be opened whenever possible. New developments should not be built over any new or existing culverts. It is unclear from the proposals on page 15 as whether the proposals include any culverting or deculverting.</p> <p>1.6 We recommend that drainage issues</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>throughout the area are investigated and culverts are properly maintained to reduce the risk of flooding. We presume you have consulted your own flood risk authority colleagues on the proposals as they hold lots of very useful local information and knowledge with regards to this issue. 1.7 We have also reviewed the proposed plans for the associated A9/A96 connection. With regards to these we would highlight that any potential new transports links should consider the potential for changes in run off, and alterations to the hydrological regime, and appropriate mitigation measures should be provided to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. 1.8 We look forward to providing additional advice once more detailed flood risk information is available. 2. Surface water Drainage 2.1 The level of surface water treatment required is dependant on the nature of the proposed development (for example residential or non residential), the size of development, and the environmental risk posed by the development. The environmental risk is principally determined by the type of activity being proposed (residential, industrial, etc), the available dilution, and the sensitivity of the receiving waterbody. 2.2 All roads schemes typically require two levels of treatment, except for small scale developments as detailed in point a) above. For technical guidance on SUDS techniques and treatment for roads please refer to the SUDS for Roads manual. We would welcome the opportunity to provide further comments on any forthcoming outline proposals. Should you wish to discuss this letter please do not hesitate to contact me on 01224 266655 or <a href="mailto:planning.dingwall@sepa.org.uk">planning.dingwall@sepa.org.uk</a></p>
<p><b>C Hawkes</b></p>	<p>When my wife and I attended the public exhibition at Inshes Church, Transport Scotland representatives kindly showed us documents which showed detailed predictions of changes in traffic levels based on the 3 options available (Options B, C and D). Both options C and D included the construction of a proposed link to the A9/A96 at the Tesco's roundabout. As a resident currently living directly opposite Inshes Retail park I am most concerned at the likely increase in traffic levels that these plans would bring to the road linking the roundabout at south end of Inshes retail park with the roundabout at the entrance to Tesco's. I.e. the road between Inshes Church and the residential area accessed via Woodgrove drive. This road has no name I am aware of but for the purposes of this communication I will call it 'Church Road'. It is my understanding that this road falls under the control of Highland Council and any impacts on this should therefore be considered as part of the local planning. The figures we were shown, which were not on open public display, indicated a 300 – 400% predicted increase in traffic levels along Church Road if Transport Scotland's proposed options C or D were implemented (due to traffic heading for the proposed A9/A96 link). This represents an increase which is on a huge order of magnitude in comparison to any other changes on traffic flow in the area, and this along what is already a busy road concerns me on a number of levels: 1) There appears to be significant underestimation of current traffic levels along Church Road. The figures we were shown were produced a few years ago, I don't remember the exact date but it was roughly 2010/2011. Since then Inshes Retail Park has seen a significant expansion (with the addition of Dunelm, Aldi and Dobbies), consequently traffic levels along Church Road have increased considerably. The documents that we saw indicated peak time traffic flows of 100 cars per hour which is frankly absurd. As someone who works from home and watches Church Road every day I can assure you the real figure is now far higher than this. Perhaps an accurate figure would be a minimum of 300 cars per hour, at almost any time of the day. Therefore I would strongly urge that traffic levels on Church Road are reassessed and the data feed into future planning as basing any decision on existing data would be flawed. 2) This area contains numerous residential properties, a significant number of which, including my house are located just metres from Church Road. The level of traffic increase brought by options C and D would result in a near constant stream of cars headed for the A9 and A96. This would occur at all hours of the day, when currently traffic levels do tail off in the early morning and late evening this would no longer be the case. It should also be considered that currently the mix of traffic on Church Road is largely cars with a low number of HGV's. It is reasonable to assume that if a link to A9/A96 is created from the Tesco's roundabout an increased proportions of HGV's would use Church Road. This combined with the large increase in traffic, and associated disturbance, on what is already a busy road, would make life almost unbearable for residents of these properties. Indeed it would be easy to argue that residents whose properties reside along Church Road, and who already cope with high traffic levels, are being unfairly penalised. 3) As the main entrance into the Inshes housing development the Woodgrove Drive junction is located directly next to Church Road and is used by a large number of local school children and families going to and from Inshes Primary School and the Retail Park. From my observations even with current traffic levels, it is only a matter of time before a serious accident</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>occurs due to the number and speed of cars travelling along Church Road. Multiply traffic levels by a factor of 3-4 times and this obviously greatly increases the risk of an accident. 4) Residents of the Inshes housing development who use the Woodgrove Drive junction to access Church Road would face increased difficulty in exiting the estate due to the near constant flow of traffic headed for the proposed A9/A96 link. The installation of traffic lights at this junction would mitigate the access problem however this in itself would then cause a high level of noise pollution for adjoining properties due to the vehicles stopping and starting at all hours of the day. 5) The increase in traffic levels along Church Road would obviously have a significant negative effect on the value of the adjoining properties. 6) Finally having talked to various neighbours in Dellness Road, Woodgrove Drive and Woodgrove Crescent there seemed to be, and still is a low percentage who are aware of the proposed changes and the direct implications to traffic flow next to their properties. I feel that more direct consultation is required with residents of these streets rather than a passive approach where they were/are expected to attend exhibitions etc. Based on the above observations I feel strongly that the creation of an A9/A96 link from the Tesco's roundabout would have serious negative impacts on the quality of life for many of the local Inshes residents. Church Road is in no way a suitable route to sustain a 400% increase in traffic, nor carry any large HGVs and therefore I would therefore advocate the adoption of the proposals in option B where any changes to traffic levels on Church Road are kept to a minimum.</p>
<b>Graham and Sibbald (Acting of behalf of Mr &amp; Mrs Grant)</b>	<p>Our clients fully support the proposals to improve the transport network to relieve congestion and to create additional capacity on the roads network to support additional development. The outline proposals show a proposed location of an alternative access to the Police Headquarters, through our clients' land. Our clients are supportive of the inclusion of this additional access, should the Police Headquarter expansion progress. However, as detailed above, the Development Brief should allow for flexibility should the expansion of the Headquarters no longer be required. We request that the alternative access road is specifically identified as only a requirement for the Police Headquarter expansion and not if the site is developed for general business use.</p>
<b>D Donald</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would like to know how long the staff of the consultants spent in the area before coming up with this hotchpotch. Having lived in the area for 45 years and seen things change as a result of planning decisions, I get the impression that that arrive on a Monday morning and left on a Tuesday morning having learnt nothing.</li> <li>2. Much of the problems at the roundabout at TESCOs has been caused by the planners allowing buildings to be constructed too close to the junction restricting the space for roundabout enlargement, at the same time permitting additional junctions on to a roundabout, too small to cope with the volume of traffic they are directing towards it.</li> <li>3. Moving the exit from TESCOs closer to the A9 Bridge is a recipe for congestion on the road out from TESCOs. The difference in level between the B9006 and TESCOs Car Park on the new line will create problems in the winter when adverse conditions occur on a steep gradient.</li> <li>4. Also at this new junction, with the single Filling Station entrance and exit, the tailbacks could be considerable as a result of traffic failing to exit the Filling Station being blocked by the traffic from the main TESCO etc car parks, with the resultant tailback of traffic wishing to enter the Filling Station blocking traffic wishing to exit at the lights.</li> <li>5. I would also ask whether the owner of the bridge over the A9, which I would assume to be Transport Scotland, are happy that it is proposed that it carries 3 lanes of traffic, when it is generally recognised that the existing areas of deck under the footway/verge have a certain width of edge stiffening to counteract vehicles mounting these areas.</li> <li>6. Considering that the B9006 carries a considerable volume of HGVs, the provision of 3 substandard lane over the bridge with a cycleway, no sign of pedestrian provision as shown in section B-B will be an area where I will be extra vigilant as HGVs can run at a width of 2.9m without special authorisation, and this does not leave them much space to keep within a 3m lane on a bend, albeit a gentle curve.</li> <li>7. Is it the view of the consultants that no pedestrian provision has been provided over the bridge because no pedestrians from the UHI Campus will all exit over the Golden Bridge. What about those who wish to use the shops at Inshes Retail Park?</li> </ol>



Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>8. I notice that there is to be a large roundabout constructed adjacent to Aldi's. Wouldn't have been better if the planners had had some foresight and required one to be built where the cross roads is proposed.</p> <p>9. Are the planners once again ignoring what the Roads Engineers are saying? To the south of the Police HQ the Roads drawing shows and alternative access to the Police HQ whilst the planners show, either a space for offices or light industry.</p> <p>10. At the Fluke roundabout, has there been any pedestrian surveys carried out to justify controlled crossing, especially on the leg down to Millburn roundabout, as it would appear that pedestrians are being directed across to an area where there is no footway and never any justification for one.</p> <p>11. Pedestrian Crossing are recommended to be located 20m from a junction, yet it is proposed that one be sited between the exit to the Shell Filling Station and Culcabock Avenue. Drivers turning south out of the Filling Station invariably turn left out of the Filling Station, go round the roundabout before heading to the A9, as this manoeuvre tends to be quicker than waiting for a gap in traffic to turn right. A driver's attention is more to their right for a gap in traffic approaching from the right when exiting the Filling Station. What will happen when they are looking right for a gap and a pedestrian phase starts on the crossing and a pedestrian steps out just as the driver decides that there is a safe gap in the approaching traffic. Maybe it is just as well that the Ambulance Station is two minutes away.</p> <p>12. Drumossie Avenue at present has an access only Traffic Order on it. I would assume that since Drumossie Avenue is to be the main access to the estate, it will be revoked and you are prepared for the eruption that will come from the residents. To get the access only Order in the first instance they created quite a furor. I would expect them to move heaven and earth to get it retained.</p> <p>13. I would suggest that this scheme be consigned to the litter bin and the whole concept started again, with the requirement that the consultants staff spend several visits in the area each of a considerable period so that they can see what is actually happening trafficwise and that planners are told that there are design criteria that have to be met to make a road system fit for purpose and the titification of the area is only done after the scheme has been constructed and that meets design criteria, particularly with regard to visibility.</p>
<b>S Paterson</b>	<p>The loss of access to the Drakies estate from Old Perth Road is a concern. This access services a significant portion of the estate who will now only gain access through the proposed single access. This will greatly increase the volume of traffic on Drumossie Avenue. Concern comes from on street parking that currently poses issues which would only be exacerbated. As well as the loss of access for priority vehicles and waste disposal / collection. I believe that disconnecting OPD and Drumossie Ave is appropriate with the proposed changes. I do not however think that the loss of access to Drakies Avenue is beneficial to any of the residents to the estate. Given the scheme objectives are to relieve congestion, I do not believe the closure of OPR junction will achieve this aim for existing residents. A counter proposal to the closure would be The alternative proposal for the Fluke Roundabout is adopted with retention of the roundabout.</p> <p>The existing crossing outside the Raigmore motel is removed, with the introduction of the controlled crossing at Culcabock Road, allowing two lane access along OPR up to the Hospital traffic controls. With a note of a right turn to the estate for residents. The Ambulance Junction becomes one way beyond the residential properties except to priority vehicles. With exit from the Hospital only from the main entrance. The Drakies turn off is moved along around 20 yards (alternatively it could remain the same spot and just widened)</p> <p>The main congestion comes at peak times for the Ambulance junction and OPR towards the Hospital. The current proposal will not relieve any congestion on OPR by retaining a single lane to the Ambulance junction. By removing the Ambulance junction as an exit option and providing dual lanes up OPR then this would allow a more constant flow of traffic.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	If there was any possibility to widen the road to allow 4 lanes from just beyond the Ambulance junction to the Fluke roundabout then that would improve the flow.
<b>J Home MBE</b>	<p>Having attended your public consultation drop-in exhibition held in Inshes Church on 30 May, 2014 and also the Culcabock and Drakies Community Council meeting which Mr. Stott and Mr. Smith attended on 17 July, 2014 I am very concerned with regard to the effect this will have on the residents of Drakies Estate. The intention is to close the two entrances/exits to Drakies Estate and replace this with one at the bottom of Drumossie Avenue. When I came to live in Old Perth Road there was only one entrance to the Estate and residents have seen emergency vehicles crossing the green verge to access the Estate - this situation cannot be allowed to happen again. Old Perth Road has been used by people attending/visiting Raigmore Hospital, despite the fact that it is restricted to residents only, and this had been reduced but now due to the loss of traffic wardens this is a problem once again. If Old Perth Road to Drakies Avenue becomes a cul-de-sac/turning point it is a fact that people going to the hospital will continue to use Old Perth Road or alternatively will move further up the Estate on Drakies Avenue, Drumossie Avenue and some of the adjoining streets, eg. Balvonie Avenue. This will cause all kinds of problems not only for emergency vehicles but also cleansing and recycling vehicles. Many residents use the buses and with the traffic exiting/entering by Drumossie Avenue this will surely result in unacceptable delays with buses trying to keep to a timetable. We should also remember that there is a primary school on Drumossie Avenue. Too many vehicles leaving and entering Drakies Estate from one entrance/exit will cause much congestion considering how many residents of the area work in Raigmore Hospital and Lifescan and possibly also in the future at the UHI. THE TWO ACCESSES AS AT PRESENT SHOULD BE KEPT OPEN. It would appear that there is a complete loss of the green verge on Old Perth Road with the exception of the frontage of houses at 50-60 Old Perth Road and the frontage at Police HQ and 1 Drumossie Avenue. As I advised you the feus of the houses on Old Perth Road (inner Estate road) go right up to the pavement on the Old Perth Road (Upper part of Old Perth Road) and I certainly wish to have it confirmed that there will be no reduction in the green verge which is part of the feu of my home.</p>
<b>Culcabock &amp; Drakies Community Council</b>	<p>DRAKIES ESTATE If this development proposals are approved how will restrictions to stop motorists parking on the new scheme for the Old Perth Road. Again if this scheme goes ahead since there is at the moment restricted access to Residents only - are there plans afoot to maintain this and police it to stop it becoming a rat run. We would mention that since the change in traffic wardens - we understand there are only 2 wardens in Inverness - closing the entrance to the Drakies Estate at 50 Old Perth Road will make this area like a cul-de-sac only used by the immediate residents and create a perfect place for parking for visiting the hospital. This will without doubt cause difficulties for emergency services and cleansing vehicles. Should motorists visiting the hospital decide not to park on Old Perth Road between 50 - 60 Old Perth Road it is a certainty that they will park their vehicles in Drumossie Avenue, Drakies Avenue or some of the connecting streets eg. Cuthbert Road thereby causing further congestion. If you proceed to have one access to and from Drakies Estate it will impact on residents who will have to make longer car journeys resulting in higher carbon emissions which goes against the current trend to reduce this. Many residents use the buses and with all the traffic exiting the estate by Drumossie Avenue this will surely result in delay in buses keeping to a timetable and resulting in even more traffic congestion. It should also be remembered that there is a primary school on Drumossie Avenue. Too much traffic leaving and entering Drakies Estate from one entrance will cause too much congestion considering how many residents of the area work in Raigmore Hospital and Lifescan - THE TWO ACCESSES AS AT PRESENT SHOULD BE KEPT OPEN. In the past before Police Headquarters were built there was only one entrance/exit to Old Perth Road and residents have seen emergency vehicles crossing the green belt to access the Estate - this cannot be allowed to happen again. It would appear that there is a complete loss of the green verge on Old Perth Road with the exception of 50 to 60 Old Perth Road and the frontage at Police HQ and 1 Drumossie Avenue. It is understood that the green verge is in fact part of the feu of the houses in Old Perth Road. With regard to the removal of the little roundabout near the Fluke this is going to cause even more delays for residents of Wimberley Way which leads to a very large housing estate. They have great difficulty getting out at this junction at the moment and on many occasions although heading into town or the Crown area they are forced to go to the little roundabout, go right round it and back onto Culcabock Road. Will your plans include traffic</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	lights at this T junction? The other residents who experience difficulty are those living in Culcabock Avenue and some thought should be given to this and at the same time erection of a sign that cars do actually enter and exit this Avenue. There appears to a considerable number of traffic lights incorporating pedestrians and cyclists could be suggest that they are also able to meet the needs of the elderly and the disabled e.g. at the moment some buttons are too high for people using wheelchairs to reach. With regard to the Flood Attenuation Basin whilst this is welcomed can we be assured that this is not the entire flood prevent scheme for this area as the flooding did not only come from the Burns but also came down the A9 and the B9006.
<b>K Summers</b>	I have been studying the plans for the infrastructure of the wider Inshes area and have the following comments to make: The proposed new retail developments will add to an already overcrowded road system. This is also a residential area with already poor air quality due to the fact that it is fairly low-lying and enclosed. The proposed connection coming down through Dell of Inshes from the A96 and A9 will add a tremendous amount of extra traffic, not just from vehicles travelling longer distances, but mainly from people making their way from one part of Inverness to another for work and retail purposes. That proposed new roundabout with the above connection is going to end up with an incredible amount of traffic. One small bump could mean the whole area becoming gridlocked. The pollution levels for people living and working in the area will be intolerable, and no doubt above recommended safety guidelines. I hope the final decision made for this part of Inverness will be taken in consideration for people, not cars.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	Creation of 4/5 sets of traffic lights from the Inshes Overbridge to the Fluke roundabout will NOT help traffic flow. Although considerable congestion occurs at Inshes roundabout during peak hours, problems are minimal during the remainder of the day. Thus there is no need to remove the roundabout but alterations to lanes, accesses and exits could greatly improve its functioning - the proposed new Tesco junction being a prime example. Allowing an exit into Police HQ (and thereby access to the Old Perth Road - U4256) but no access onto the roundabout, together with left turn only/filter lanes may also help flow. Use of traffic lights at peak hours only - as at Raigmore Interchange - along with allowing left turns on a red light (although this may require UK legislation) should also be considered. The proposed signal controlled junction with ambulance priority at the main hospital junction plus widening to accommodate extra lanes enabling ambulances to negotiate the traffic would appear greatly preferential to the proposed "ambulance junction" further west since the former is much closer to A and E. Traffic lights at the Fluke roundabout would increase congestion there causing further tailbacks to the "ambulance" and towards the main hospital junctions. Better lane markings could help here. Highland Council has indicated these improvements are to be phased. It is vital that the additional lane (preferably 2/3 lanes) at the Inshes Overbridge is constructed first helping relieve congestion at the Campus junction (and onto the A9). Construction of an additional access into the Campus via a dedicated lane from the left-hand lane of the Raigmore Interchange sliproad onto the A9 south (as suggested by WCC) would also help alleviate the problems of queuing traffic on the A9. Although this is the responsibility of Transport Scotland this would also relieve congestion on Culloden Road (B9006) and could be a combined project for HC and TS. WCC has repeatedly expressed its concern about the potential of a serious accident in this area due to queuing traffic. We would welcome the opportunity of future meetings with TS and HC to explore this idea. We welcome this opportunity to comment on these proposals and look forward to working constructively with HC.
<b>G Tuley</b>	<p>INSHES JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT PHASE 2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION A9/A96 CONNECTIONS AND INSHES JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT</p> <p>In the long term there must be a bypass for Inverness which links the A96 via the A9 to the A82 but no outline route has been proposed by either Transport Scotland or The Highland Council. Inverness Civic Trust has proposed a route to the south of Milton of Leys with options to link it to the A96 and the A82. A bypass should be a dual carriageway with grade separated interchanges and not a series of roundabouts linked together like the Southern Distributor Road. Major road investment should be working towards these aims and I believe a dual carriageway high level bridge option into Torvean Quarry could be the final link in the West Link and the first part of a proper bypass.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>Walking and cycling must be promoted as an alternative to the use of vehicles in Inverness if it is to be a carbon neutral city by 2025. These different users have different priorities which may not be met by a combined footpath/cycleway – walkers want as direct a route as possible but cyclists wish to minimise changes in elevation. Both dislike waiting at light controlled crossings. Provision for these users should be included in initial planning and not added in at the last minute which can produce ridiculous arrangements like the 6 light controlled crossings to cross the single carriageway section of Millburn Road from Crown Road to Morrisons supermarket.</p> <p><b>PROPOSED INSHES DEDICATED CYCLE ROUTE</b></p> <p>National Cycle Network routes 1 and 7 are routed through the site and if the Council is serious about becoming a carbon neutral city by 2025 and creating routes for cyclists then it should start by producing a dedicated cycle route through this area. It should be separated from the road and from walkers along Culcabock Road (B853), along Old Perth Road (B9006) to Culloden Road (B9006) on the east side of the A9. The cycle route should be built so that cyclists can use it to go east and west and will not need to use the road or pavement. The surface of the cycle route should be a different colour to the road and pavement.</p> <p>At the west end the cycle route will be on the north side of the pavement on the south side of the road. It will be at the same level as the road but separated from it by a kerb so that vehicles cannot drive or park on the cycle route. This will replace the white lines painted on both sides of the road as at present [but these stop to west of the existing traffic lights]. At the Fluke Junction the cycle route will not be restricted by the traffic lights which will control the motorised traffic apart from when the public have requested that the traffic stops to allow them to cross. The traffic lights on the east side of the Fluke Junction will allow cyclists to cross the road and in due course I hope there will be a dedicated cycle route on the east side of the Old Perth Road down to the Millburn Roundabout.</p> <p>The Culcabock Avenue junction is where the cycle route changes from being next to the road to being south of the pavement. It will be necessary to make this clear to both walkers and motorists that this is happening [coloured surface and signs] and that cyclists have priority. The cycle route continues to the south of the pavement in front of the petrol station and the motel. There is an area of ground behind the existing bus shelter which appears to be not part of the petrol station but it may be owned by them. It may be necessary to compulsorily acquire this ground and a narrow strip in front of the motel.</p> <p>To the west of the motel the cycle route goes through the grassy area at an angle down to the cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac should have the dedicated cycle route on the north side of a single carriageway road and separated from it by an appropriate kerb so that it is not used for car parking. At each end of the cul-de-sac a turning head can be constructed across the cycle route but it must be made obvious that cycles have priority and that it is not for car parking. There must be a route from Draikes Avenue for walkers and cyclists up from the cul-de-sac to the light controlled crossing of Old Perth Road to Raigmore Hospital. There should be ramps from the east and west for cyclists as well as a flight of steps directly to the light controlled crossing.</p> <p>Where the cycle route crosses Drumossie Avenue it must be clear that the cycle route crosses the road by means of a different coloured surface and signs. The Old Perth Road (U4256) can become an emergency access route to the Police HQ but it should be coloured as a cycle route on the north side and a footpath on the south side. This marking should continue to the new entrance to Police HQ and thereafter it becomes the combined cycle route on footpath/cycleway. There must be a separate fork towards the new Inshes Junction of the separate cycle route alongside the footpath.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>At the new Inshes Junction there must be a phase in the lights where all motorised traffic is stopped. Walkers and cyclists will be able to cross directly and diagonally across the junction. A cycle route will be marked diagonally across the junction from the south west corner [near the Police HQ] to the north east corner [near Kintail House]. At the east end of this junction the cycle route will be on the south side of pavement on the north side of the road. It will be at the same level as the road but separated from it by a kerb so that vehicles cannot drive or park on the cycle route. This cycle route will continue on the bridge over the A9 to the entrance to the University of the Highlands and Islands.</p> <p>With the current proposals someone travelling east on the cycle route on the carriageway of the Old Perth Road wishing to go across the A9 will have to use 8 [eight] separate controlled crossings in a distance of about 400 metres. These are Drumossie Avenue [2 way traffic – no lights], proposed new traffic lights [3 separate light controlled crossings], proposed new Tesco entrance [2 separate light controlled crossings] and B9006 [2 separate light controlled crossings].</p> <p>INSHES OVERBRIDGE – [this has been sent to Transport Scotland and The Highland Council]</p> <p>The current bridge over the A9 is narrow and the Highland Council propose to reconfigure the lane arrangement to allow an additional lane westbound. There will be one 2.0m wide footpath/cycleway and 3 traffic lanes 3.0m wide. This is inadequate and an additional bridge should be built alongside the existing bridge to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Existing footpath/cycleway made into a footpath only and to be 2.0m wide</li> <li>II. New dedicated cycleway 2.5m wide next to the pavement which is separated from the traffic by appropriate kerbing</li> <li>III. Two lanes of traffic eastbound 3.25m wide on the existing overbridge</li> <li>IV. Three lanes of traffic westbound 3.5m wide on the new bridge</li> <li>V. Footway 3.0m wide on the new bridge</li> </ol> <p>I believe Transport Scotland should pay for the new bridge because it and the other improvements listed above are an alternative to all the Options proposed in the A9/A96 Connections Study.</p> <p><b>ERRORS IN OUTLINE PROPOSALS</b></p> <p>I believe there are the following errors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are inaccuracies in the map on page 8. I do not believe that all the solid purple lines have been subject to traffic orders redetermining the use of pavements and paths to include cyclists. It is claimed that the solid purple lines are “Existing shared use path” – this is not a consultation but a statement of fact.</li> <li>2. In the Council’s response to my Freedom of Information request about the purple lines it states that the Inverness &amp; Nairn Core Paths Plan (The Highland Council, 2001) was one of the sources of information but in that document all of the purple lines are called “paths” which indicates footpath rather than “track” which might indicate that they are suitable for cycles. I do not believe that the Inverness Active Travel Audit (HITRANS, 2011) and the Sustrans Website have any legal status in regards to providing access for people using a cycle.</li> <li>3. King Duncan’s Road is not a “Committed new shared use path” because it is to be white painted lines on a roadway which is really too steep to be a</li> </ol>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>cycle route.</p> <p>4. Culcabock Road (B853) – the existing cycle route is a white line on each side of the road [advisory cycleway] and not “cycle route on footpath/cycleway” as shown on the map on page 15.</p> <p>5. The map on page 15 appears to show 2 “cycle route on carriageway” to the south of the Old Perth Road where cross section B is indicated but in the Section B-B on page 17 there is only one “advisory cycleway”</p> <p>6. The map on page 15 show a “cycle route on carriageway” on the cul-de-sac to the south of the Old Perth Road where cross section C is indicated but in the Section C-C on page 17 has no “advisory cycleway”</p> <p>7. The map on page 15 show a “cycle route on footway/cycleway” to the south of the Old Perth Road where cross section D is indicated but the Section D-D on page 17 does not extend far enough to show this part of the proposal</p> <p>8. The map on page 15 show a “cycle route on footway/cycleway” on the south of the Old Perth Road where cross section E is indicated but in the Section E-E on page 17 it is a 2.0m footway</p> <p>9. On page 17 the Cross Sections A-A and B-B indicate cyclists are going in the opposite direction to the traffic in the “advisory cycleway”.</p> <p>10. On page 15 there is a cycleway on the south side of Old Perth Road (B9006) at B-B but by C-C is has disappeared.</p> <p>SUGGESTED CHANGES TO OUTLINE PROPOSALS</p> <p>A. If the dedicated cycle route is not to be built then advanced stop lines should be included at all traffic lights even where the Outline Proposals indicate that cycles should be on the pavement.</p> <p>B. Where cycles are permitted on the pavement then there must be appropriate signs to indicate this to both types of user</p> <p>C. Agreed that the existing access from Tesco to the roundabout should be eliminated but it should not be replaced by a new road up a steep slope. All access to Tesco and Dobies etc. should be from the roundabout to the south of Matalan.</p> <p>D. A new bridge should be put across the A9 immediately south of the Inshes Overbridge. It should be wide enough for 3 lanes of traffic moving westwards and a pavement. An additional bridge would be cheaper than a completely new bridge and it would be possible to repair/renew the current bridge at some future date.</p> <p>E. Would it be possible to combine the new entrance to the Police HQ with the pedestrian crossing and have a service road in front of the Police HQ to the car park?</p>
<b>J Marr</b>	<p>REFERENCE LAYOUTS FOR OUTLINE PROPOSALS AND ALTERNATIVES - 01: In general it is noted that there are 6 no. controlled signal junctions proposed between the Fluke roundabout and the proposed new entrance/exit to the east of the Tesco/Dobbies development. These, together with the existing lights at the A9 access/exit and at the turn off to the Cradlehall Business Park means that there will be 8 no. sets of signal controlled junctions for pedestrians/cyclists and traffic over a 0.8 mile stretch of roadway i.e. on average one set at every 176 yards. As someone who travels between the Fluke roundabout and Westhill daily, with further lights at the main Cradlehall junction and pedestrian lights above that for the Birchwood development, your proposed layout means a total of 10 no. traffic lights along a 2.3 mile length of the B9006. 02: I watch traffic queues building daily down Old Perth Road from the Fluke roundabout past Balmoral Terrace and quite often down towards the Cameron Barracks entrance caused not by the Fluke roundabout, but by the lights at the main Raigmore Hospital entrance/exit, as the volume of traffic now exiting this development is so great at peak times that the section of road to the Inshes roundabout is full. Equally, at peak times travelling down the B9006 from Westhill, traffic is held up by traffic exiting the southbound lane from the A9, which in turn is held up by the pedestrian lights between the Tesco development and Beechwood Business Park. Once one gets through</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>these lights the way to the Inshes roundabout and beyond is generally clear. You will gather as a driver and part time pedestrian I, along with others, have a slight problem with pedestrian lights, especially where they are located close to exit roads from roundabouts. I regret I cannot offer a solution without some considerable cost. 03: In more detailed terms it follows that a signal controlled junction at the Fluke roundabout will do nothing for traffic flow and therefore, in my view, the Alternative Proposal for the Fluke roundabout is preferable to the Proposed Layout with the additional bus lay-by included on Old Perth Road just before the Fluke roundabout as shown. 04: The Alternative proposal for the Ambulance junction is preferred in as much as it removes the need for an additional set of traffic lights and, with the 2 no lanes going westward, it might allow the local access from those properties on Old Perth Road facing northwards onto the B9006 to be retained, albeit for a left turn exit only as is almost always the case today. 05: The Inshes overbridge outline proposal with additional lane westbound would appear a major improvement on the current situation involving a contentious merging lane and is considered more appropriate than the more expensive alternative proposal. 06: Closing off the inset Old Perth Road at Drumossie Avenue is deemed satisfactory given the proposed road layout, as it would stop the current racetrack by some trying to beat the lights at the current hospital junction. However if the current local access/exit at the west end of this inset road is not deemed acceptable/possible, as in 4 above, could the new hospital entrance/exit arrangement be made to operate 4 ways? This would allow access/exit to the 17 no existing properties with frontages along the inset Old Perth Road, closing it off at the entrance to Drakies Avenue as well as Drumossie Avenue. This appears possible by utilising some or all of the existing grass verge running along the south side of the B9006 down to the inset Old Perth Road. As it is believed this verge is currently owned by these proprietors along the inset road, could it be used as a means of negotiation to provide a right hand turning lane into the inset road when travelling in an easterly direction. Finally it would only be fair to say that at first glance the proposals appear to substantially favour pedestrian/cyclist uses over assistance to car traffic flows for both current and future commercial and residential developments in the area. It is accepted that cycling along the B9006 is not currently a safe option given the size of present day vehicles, the numbers of vehicles, the widths of the road and indeed the increasing numbers of cyclists using the B9006 as a training and indeed a competitive route. One has only to travel along this road to witness lines of vehicles being held up behind cyclists travelling at their speed until it is safe to pass, so it would be appreciated if some further thought could be given to vehicle/cycle segregation for the future. I trust the above will be of interest and if any clarification is required please just let me know.</p>
<b>Goodson Associates (acting on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited)</b>	<p>Goodson Associates have been commissioned by Tesco Stores Limited (TSL) to consider the implications of the A9/A96 Connection's Study and Inshes Junction Improvements – Phase 2 proposals with respect to their existing stores at Inshes and West Seafield. Firstly, TSL are aware of the constraints associated with the existing trunk and local road network in east Inverness and are supportive of investment in local infrastructure. The proposed road alterations will likely lead to a considerable change in travel patterns adjacent to the aforementioned stores and TSL wish to ensure that the implications of the proposed changes on existing businesses are fully considered.</p> <p>TSL are encouraged that Transport Scotland and The Highland Council are promoting a joint approach with regards the proposed infrastructure improvements as it is clear that the A9/A96 connection proposals will have a significant bearing on the local road network which will require improvement and investment. We understand that The Highland Council propose to introduce a series of linked traffic signals on the Old Perth Road / Culloden Road corridor to improve the flow of traffic and manage queues. A large lozenge shaped roundabout is proposed to the south of Inshes Retail Park which will join with the proposed crossing of the A9 and the Link Road to Smithton. It is our understanding that no detailed junction capacity analysis has been undertaken at this stage and the proposed improvements are of a preliminary nature. Given the proposed alterations to strategic routes in the area and the increase in traffic associated with allocated sites in the Local Development Plan, it is clear that capacity will be a critical consideration, as such, the following comments are related to the concept of the improvements and we reserve the right to comment further following the completion of capacity assessment. The removal of Inshes Roundabout and the direct access to the retail park from this junction will result in a longer journey with increased</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>delays as a result of the traffic signal junctions. Traffic currently reaching the roundabout, with the exception of those travelling west on Culloden Road, will now have to negotiate the traffic lights at the Inshes Junction, the new Retail Park traffic signal junction and then also the new internal junctions which will likely be much busier given the diversion of strategic traffic from the Smithton Link Road. TSL have concerns that the additional distances and delay will impact considerably on pass-by trade and make the store less attractive to existing customers. We would ask that capacity analysis and journey time comparisons be undertaken to indicate the likely increase in delay to customers entering / exiting the store to allow TSL to fully understand the implications on trade. Given the extra delay, we would ask that access to the northern part of the store car park be introduced in to the proposed design which will reduce the need for customers entering from Culloden Road to travel further to the southern entrance. The petrol filling station (PFS) enjoys a visible location on the local road network which ensures it attracts considerable pass-by trade given the ease of entry / exit. The proposed layout introduces a convoluted access to the PFS which will likely impact on trade and even the attractiveness to customers of the store. We would ask that a left in / left out arrangement on to Culloden Road be introduced to enhance pass-by trade and that the PFS can be accessed from the northern part of the car park to ensure store customers can access the facility. We are happy to work with the council to ensure an appropriate design is developed which enhances circulation within the site but restricts rat running to avoid the main access junction to Culloden Road. We note that access to the southern part of the car park has been maintained from the proposed roundabout which we support. We are concerned with the size and location of the SUDS pond as it utilises an excessive amount of land which TSL would wish to utilise for parking. We believe the ponds can be separated in to smaller ponds which would reduce land take and ensure an efficient system. Summary- TSL wish to work with the council to ensure that investment in the local road network can be undertaken for the benefit of all parties in the area. We would highlight that the efficient operation of the network is of paramount consideration for TSL and we would wish to consider analysis of the proposed alterations at the earliest opportunity. Mixed Use Development - Land Adjacent To Inshes Retail Park, Dell Of Inshes – 13/04334/PIP. TSL are currently in discussions with the applicant of the above proposals in an effort to agree an access strategy for the retail park which would satisfy all parties. Although discussions are on-going and heading in a positive direction no agreed solution is available at this time which would inform the consultation process. Both parties will continue to work together and will advise the council of progress when appropriate. In summary, TSL are supportive of investment in road infrastructure, however, the proposals will have a considerable bearing on the traffic volumes and travel patterns in the area which we believe requires to be carefully considered. The current options for both the A96 / A9 Connector study and the Inshes Junction Improvements focus on areas with longstanding capacity issues, however, we believe that detailed information on capacity, traffic routing, etc will have to be made available once the preferred options have been selected to allow interested parties to fully understand the implications. The impact on TSL's store during construction of the preferred options will be of critical importance to trade and TSL would wish to be involved in the process and consulted to ensure the impact is minimised. TSL wish to continue to work with TS and THC in the future and we look forward to further engagement / information as the process develops.</p>
<b>I Stewart</b>	<p>1. Commend the outline proposal for improvement of the Fluke Roundabout junction. 2. Ambulance Junction – subject to closure of the Drumossie Avenue slip road access onto Old Perth Road opposite Raigmore Gardens (ambulance access road) there would be no benefit in having traffic lights at this junction. There would be 3 sets of lights between Culcabock Junction and Hospital access i.e. 3 sets of lights in about 200yds and would cause traffic congestion without any obvious benefit. 3. I support the proposal to close vehicular access between Drumossie Avenue and Old Perth Road. 4. Commend closure of vehicular access to Beechwood House. 5. I'm supportive of the Alternative Proposal to widen the Inshes Overbridge to 2 lanes in each direction. NB Outline Proposals Map doesn't have a scale.</p>
<b>J Shankland</b>	<p>Closure of the Old Perth Road 'Rat Run' opposite the hospital is sensible. I would suggest that, if possible, the exit from Drumossie Avenue on to Old Perth Road should have two lanes for exiting traffic (one for turning left and one for turning right) with one for entering traffic to improve traffic flow. (Unless this will be dealt with by means of appropriately phased lights.) It may also be necessary to lengthen the two lane section of Old Perth Road, at the Millburn</p>



Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	Roundabout, to avoid delays caused by the amount of traffic using this junction resulting in restricted traffic flows at The Hospital / Inshes end of the road.
L Lee	If Transport Scotland's Option C or Option D is chosen, traffic from the Culloden side of the A9 will have to go through 4 roundabouts in quick succession to get onto the SDR. I do not see how this can work as a free-flowing route. It will mean a main road cutting housing off from the Church and the shops. If Transport Scotland's route B is chosen, arrangements must be put in place to safeguard children on the road past Inshes Primary School - general traffic should have to follow Stevenson road down to the SDR and not be allowed past the school.
Highland Cycle Campaign	Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 - We have already commented on the widths of cycle lanes, shared use paths and excessive number of crossing points at junctions in Q2 above. We are aware of Mr Graham Tuley's suggestion of a segregated cycle route from Culcabock Road to Culloden Road with a crossing point to the east of the flyover. We think it very worthwhile to explore the possibilities of providing this infrastructure and ask that you do so. Along with this document, please find a sketch (based on your map on page 15) showing the suggested route. The filename is "segregated_route.jpg" and, like the original, it can be zoomed to see the detail. (Our suggested crossing arrangements are quite rough and just intended to get the general idea across.) Development should not be catering for the currently perceived needs but should be building the travel networks desired for the future. We exhort the Council to take this opportunity to provide top quality facilities for cycling and walking and thereby make a significant change in travel habits.
A Johnston	<p>It is noted that comments received from the public consultation exercise supported by the "Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief, Issues and Options" booklet will inform a draft development brief and more detailed designs for improvements to the local transport network. It is welcome that the public consultation by Transport Scotland of the A9/A96 Connections Study has been undertaken in parallel noting the close interfaces and common objectives. I have provided separate comments directly to Transport Scotland and I replicate these below as they apply to both proposed schemes. Comments issued to Transport Scotland - It is disappointing that few positive conclusions can be assessed from the information presented by Transport Scotland. As a Civil Engineer it is understood that information presented for public information should be comprehensible and adequate to inform the reader of the issues under consideration. Additionally the information presented should convey the complete picture to avoid unnecessary challenge and to facilitate informed choice. It is my consideration from review of the information prepared by Transport Scotland regarding the A9/A96 Connections Study that the assessment presented is incomplete and potentially invalid, due to lack of objective definition and the use of historical traffic modelling data. Additionally it is my considered view that there is lack of clear project objective and undefined assessment criteria resulting in non-optimum traffic flow and poorly considered route mapping assumptions. I summarise below my comments by topic of concern and provide a conclusion along with an alternative solution for consideration.</p> <p>Connections Study Undefined Objective: The A9/A96 Connections Study is stated to be have been undertaken in line with the STAG although it is difficult to confirm this from the limited information provided. Indeed there is a lack of any definitive statement of requirements which undermines the value and purpose of the options presented to the Public for consideration. Some information is provided in summary form of the identified problems and opportunities. However no information is provided of the study objectives nor of the option generation process. There is a summary pictorial provided of "How are the options are assessed" which only identify aspirational selection criteria. No selection criteria weighting is stated and combined with the lack of a definitive objective/problem statement to address any comparison of the options proposed becomes subjective to assess. Indeed the stated aim of the proposed new link road to improve connectivity is vague and unclear in purpose. If the objective is to relieve congestion on the Raigmore interchange then a comprehensive traffic survey should be undertaken to determine the trunk and local road user requirements. The apparent absence of user functional requirement capture information is concerning noting the advanced assessment and optioneering presented. As the study objective is undefined and the apparent lack of a user requirements then it is concluded that the subsequent assessment is potentially invalid as there is no measure to confirm</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>adequacy, compliance and acceptability. Low Traffic Flow improvement: It is stated that from the Scottish Government 2008 STPR a dual carriageway trunk link road connecting the A96 and the A9 South of Inverness was proposed. However the proposals at this latest study are for a single carriageway solution with a new link road from the A9 at Inshes to the A96 at Smithton. The stated aim is to improve connectivity while integrating with local planned developments with route options developed in consultation with The Highland Council. It is noted that The Highland Council also presented in parallel with Transport Scotland their plans for developments to the Inshes/Raigmore road network from the B9006 Culloden road at the A9 overbridge. Comments on The Highland Council development proposals have been provided separately directly to THC. The traffic flow figures presented indicate at best a 16% (600) and 25% (1000) reduction in A96 traffic flow between the AM and PM peaks respectively. However the maximum number of traffic movements on the proposed new link road are stated to be 1450 and 1600 between the AM and PM peaks respectively which indicates an increase in local traffic. It is not stated what is the assessed cause of this increase in traffic nor any confirmation of the user need for a A9/A96 direct link as the main improvement appears to be increased connectivity from the Culloden area to the Inverness Retail Park. Indeed the traffic flow contribution through the Raigmore interchange along the A96 to the Inverness Retail Park is a particular local issue which is one of the main causes of traffic delays and congestion which does not appear to have been taken into consideration in the connections study. Furthermore in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development plan the area around the route of the proposed new link single carriageway road is all identified for future development and only two access junction have been identified which is considered to be potentially inadequate. The new link road should be designed as a dual carriageway for accommodate future traffic demand which will need to be assessed and local junctions provided and sited accordingly. Traffic Model data unrepresentative: It is understood from discussion at the public exhibition held on the 30th May, with THC and their Transport Modelling Consultant representative that the traffic data was collected in 2009 for the production of the "Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan" and concentrates on the "travel to work" area. The associated "IMFLDP Modelling Report", Rev 4 Aug 13 states that the Multi-Modal model is at strategic level and has limitations in assessment at local level. The report recognises that further data is required to assess local issues. The report also confirms that no improvement to the local traffic flow within Inverness City can be achieved. It is understood that the 2009 data has not been updated to reflect recent developments but has been used to determine the traffic flow and travel time comparisons in the Connections Study. The increase in local traffic associated with recent retail and residential developments in the Inshes and Southern Inverness areas do not appear to have been incorporated into the modelling assessment. Therefore the reference data to underpin the connections study is considered representative as it has not been validated with recent traffic survey information. Options Assessment: It is stated that Option A is not proposed to be considered further. The remaining options each provide a link from a future proposed improved Smithton Junction to either a new junction at Castlehill road or Culloden road along with new A9 overbridges and link road to the Inshes area or to Stevenson road. On review of the options it is clear that none of the connections provide any significant benefit to the traffic crossing on the link to and from the Smithton Junction as the most direct route either into the City centre or along Sir Walter Scott drive is to travel along Culloden road. Furthermore both link roads to the Inshes area (Options C and D) indicate a circular return route back to Culloden road which renders the purpose of the A9 pointless. It is therefore concluded that there is no benefit of routing any A9 crossing link road into the Inshes area as all City traffic will return locally back to Culloden road and the quickest route to the same point would be remain on Culloden road throughout. The only considered use of the link to the Inshes area would be to serve the Inshes Retail area and this should be provided by The Highland Scotland and not through Transport Scotland. Conclusion: Transport Scotland must provide viability and access to appropriate information to inform the public so enable them to have an informed consideration of the options they are being asked to consider otherwise the public consultation exercise is worthless. Therefore it is concluded that if a new link road is determined to be required then it should be dual carriageway and incorporate adequate local junctions to accommodate future development access which are not developer led designs. Similarly if it is considered that a link to Inshes area then none of the options proposed indicate any significant improvement. This is subjective without up to date traffic modelling information although it is clear there is no benefit from a direct link to the Inshes retail area (Options C and D). If a link to Stevenson road was</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>proposed (Option B) then consideration of dualling this section including the existing road up to Sir Walter Scott Drive, B8082. Alternative options which may have already been considered by Transport Scotland but have not been mentioned previously would be to widen the A9 South bound carriageway between the Raigmore interchange and incorporate a new exit slip road to the existing Inshes Junction on the B9006 at the new Inverness Campus site. Additionally retain the A9 entrance South bound sliproad from the Inshes junction. Reconfigure the existing A9 overbridge to 3 lane traffic (as proposed by The Highland Council) and provide a grade separated type junction at the Inshes Roundabout with a partial cut and cover tunnel section to allow unrestricted through traffic movement along both Culloden road and Sir Walter Scott drive. A further alternative would be to extend the bridge width to add an additional lane with allow the Culloden road section between the proposed new link to the Smithton junction to be Dual carriage throughout from the Inshes Roundabout. The improved Culloden road section would require to be locally elevated as present from the existing A9 overbridge and would be required accommodate a pedestrian underpass including an improved stormwater drainage culvert to alleviate fluvial flooding in this area. Local access would be provided with either retention of the existing roundabout arrangement or adoption of traffic controlled junction as proposed by The Highland Council. Access slip roads to join the B8082 could be created in the approaches to the junction to the B9006. This alternative proposal provides the least permanent disruption and minimises additional land use. It is recognised the cost of a partial cut and cover tunnel section would be expensive and disruptive to implement but it would provide the desired trunk route connection and local route connectivity while allowing potential future expansion such as dualling of the B8082. I would welcome any feedback on the issues I have raised as well as discussion should you wish to consider my comments further.</p>
<p><b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (acting on behalf of SWIPPT)</b></p>	<p>SWIPPT have undertaken a full analysis of junction capacity and accessibility in the Inshes area as they are one of the major landowners in the area. They agree with the overall approach to the junction improvement scenarios. However, the plans should be clearly noted as being indicative at present and subject to change and improvement as detailed design work continues. Now that the Council's overall intentions are known, SWIPPT have now instructed detailed design analysis and are liaising with Tesco and their consultants to fully assess the implications of the road improvement plans as set out in the brief. It is anticipated that the results of the joint analysis will be issued to the Council for discussion with all parties shortly with a view to reaching agreement with the Council to allow full detailed designs to be drawn up. The improvement options as currently indicated in the brief does take account of the operational requirements of all interested parties. The road improvement options can be improved to deliver a solution that is both feasible and deliverable which and which will suit operational requirements in the area. SWIPPT are working with Tesco on a revised potential option and phasing, and the results of the joint analysis will be issued to the Council as part of on going dialogue.</p>
<p><b>Scottish Christian Party – Inverness Branch</b></p>	<p><i>Inshes Overbridge</i> We approve of increasing the capacity of the Inshes overbridge, especially westwards. This pinchpoint is the most urgent need of the area, to reduce the dangerous queuing of cars on the 70 mph southbound carriageway of the A9 at the B9006 sliproad. The upgraded sliproad from the A9 fails to function adequately for two reasons – 1. the overbridge pinchpoint leads to tailbacks on to the A9; and 2. the road hatching on the sliproad forms another pinchpoint preventing cars for the right hand lane from clearing the junction, only adding to the tailback. Each of these matters needs urgent attention and should be addressed immediately as a top priority. When the hatching is corrected on the sliproad, the very sharp turn off the A9 should also be addressed with more gentle curves and lane markings. There needs to be improved signage on the B9006 east of the overbridge for westward traffic to 'Use both lanes – merge in turn' so that drivers on the nearside lane do not consider those in the offside lane to be 'queue jumping'.</p> <p><i>Inshes Roundabout</i> A four-way junction with traffic lights is not necessary; the roundabout functions adequately most of the day except for a short period during the rush hour at each end of the day.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Verbatim Comments
	<p>The new proposals for the petrol station and egress from Draikies estate will reduce the six entry roundabout to a four way one, making it even more manageable.</p> <p>Traffic lights on small roundabouts have been proven to be an unmitigated disaster, as witnessed by the traffic lights on the Longman junction roundabout. Stopping the flow of traffic on the roundabout has only resulted in gridlock with vehicles trying to squeeze into the available space and blocking progress for others.</p> <p>We do not agree with a proposal by some locals that the exit arm to the police station could be retained, while preventing entry to the roundabout. This would lead to driver confusion, both on the roundabout and on advance signage.</p> <p><i>Improved east-west Inverness connectivity and relief of the trunk road network</i> The Highland Council's Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief should not be considered in isolation from Transport Scotland's difficulty in removing local traffic from the trunk road network.</p> <p>I take the opportunity to mention a proposal I put informally to The Highland Council planners and to Transport Scotland at the recent consultations, and which I was encouraged to submit along with this feedback.</p> <p>At present, the absence of good east-west connectivity for local traffic across Inverness results in local traffic using the trunk road network.</p> <p>Transport Scotland has shown a willingness to assist in developing local roads in the A9/A96 Connections Study in order to relieve traffic on the A96 and the Raigmore Interchange.</p> <p>I suggested that they could contribute to the debate to improve Inverness City Centre and the local transport links.</p> <p>A group of stakeholders are looking at resurrecting plans of the previously moth-balled cross-rail link from the dual carriageway on Millburn Road to join Longman Road. Plans for this were drawn up in the mid-1990s but shelved after resistance from Network Rail. Evidently this would take considerable relief off Longman Road leading to the Longman Junction, the Junction itself, and the A9 southwards – the busiest section of road in this area.</p> <p>The Scottish Christian Party will welcome the opportunity to explain more fully how this could integrate improved use of Millburn Road, a transport hub, Inverness City centre development, Academy Street, east-west local connectivity and relief of trunk road congestion. Meanwhile, the point here is that the benefit to Transport Scotland could be used as leverage to persuade Network Rail to heed the desperate need for a workable solution to the gridlock in the centre of Inverness.</p> <p>There is a head of steam to develop the centre of Inverness once and for all with a comprehensive</p>

<b>Customer/ Organisation</b>	<b>Verbatim Comments</b>
	<p>strategic plan. We welcome the campaign by The Inverness Courier and the recent initiative by The Highland Council to work on this.</p> <p>The biggest obstacle is Network Rail, which has all the land it needs and does not feel the need to negotiate with Inverness City to improve road transport links. It would be helpful if Transport Scotland could join its influence to a Highland Council-led approach to Network Rail to assist in relieving the traffic gridlock in Inverness, which would in turn help the trunk road network.</p> <p>This proposal has been included in our submission to Transport Scotland on the A9/A96 Connections Study and it will come to more prominence as the debate progresses in Inverness.</p>