

**THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, EUROPE & TOURISM**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**15 November 2006**

Agenda Item	10
Report No	

**A96 CORRIDOR STRATEGY – UPDATE**  
**DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK OPTIONS**

**Report by Director of Planning & Development**

**SUMMARY**

This report updates Members on the A96 Corridor studies, notably consultation responses to the Development Framework options which were published in September. The Council's consultants have since refined a preferred set of proposals for the long term expansion of East Inverness and Nairn together with a complementary green framework for the wider Corridor's setting. Authority is sought to proceed with further evaluation of transport and other infrastructure investment required to support current development proposals throughout the Corridor. Work also needs to get underway by Halcrow to establish the overall funding/developer contributions framework. A further report on these outcomes will be made to the Committee in January 2007 which will then be asked to authorise a final round of public and agency consultations.

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Members will recall that at their meetings on 25 January and 31 May 2006, Committee agreed to endorse various consultancy appointments to take forward Phase II of the A96 Corridor Study. Further work was required on the preparation of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), transportation, water and drainage, electricity supply, future developer contributions and infrastructure procurement and, in particular, the preparation of alternative Development Frameworks for East Inverness/Nairn and the Corridor's rural setting.
- 1.2 Messrs Halcrow were appointed by the Council to lead on the masterplanning activity. Infrastructure commissions have been awarded to Scottish & Southern Energy (electricity), Faber Maunsell (traffic) and Scottish Water term consultants (Mott Macdonald and Biwater on potable/waste water arrangements respectively). Various working groups of stakeholders including officers, key agencies and landowners have been formed and a series of local workshops undertaken which also engaged local businesses and community representatives.
- 1.3 At its meeting on 16 August 2006, PDET Committee considered schematic Development Framework options which had been prepared by the stakeholder groups for 'polar growth' in Nairn and East Inverness, together with a draft Green Framework produced by Halcrow. Committee agreed that this material should be publicised during September and local communities be invited to comment on the scale, composition and configuration of long term development in each case. A verbal report on the preliminary results was provided at the Committee's meeting on 27 September 2006. Since that time, both Nairnshire and Inverness members have heard informal briefings on the findings and anticipated recommendations as to preferred Development Frameworks in each case.

## **2. Consultations**

- 2.1 In accordance with their remit Halcrow were tasked to co-ordinate three aspects of gathering consultation responses to the Development Framework options for Nairn and East Inverness. They drew together the technical evaluations and considered preferences of a range of consultants in terms of comparative marketability, deliverability, urban form, traffic and planning merits. Halcrow also organised separate *Stakeholder* group evaluations in the Spectrum Centre and at Nairn Community Centre which were held on the 20/21 September. These followed the ‘collaboration for success’ format of scoring and ranking options using a range of sustainable development criteria and were well-attended. Discussions by the respective Framework Planning Groups were also captured to provide qualitative feedback on the options. These comments are summarised in Halcrow’s interim assessment attached as Annex A to this report.
- 2.2 Further to the August Committee’s instructions, the development options report was advertised in local newspapers and put on deposit at a wide range of offices open to the public. A press release was issued and various interviews given to stimulate media coverage. All supporting documentation was published on the Council’s web-site and circulated electronically to statutory & other key consultees with the advertised closing date of 25 September. Manned exhibitions were held at Inshes (the nearest city location as requested by the Committee), Culloden and Nairn. These were open from lunchtime through to 9.00pm to maximise the opportunities for attendance. More than 400 persons visited during these sessions and arrangements were made to provide extended local viewing for a further week at both Nairn library and Smithton primary school. Pro-forma leaflets summarising the options and inviting structured comments were freely distributed. A listing and summary of all the responses made to the Planning and Development service is attached as Annex B to this report.
- 2.3 The Halcrow report provides an overview of all the consultation results (pp 15-18 for Nairn and pp 30-31 for East Inverness) in Annex A.

## **3. Preferred Option – East Inverness**

- 3.1 The technical consultants’ preferences were divided between options A (marketability), C (delivery and urban form) and E (traffic and planning), reflecting the range of strengths and weaknesses in each case. A number of common themes emerged however. These included the creation of a compact place with good mix of housing densities, the need to balance new employment opportunities with future population growth, the opportunities to integrate education, research and related business activities as a development cluster, and the selection of an A9/A96 bypass route which also furthers accessibility by non-car transport modes.
- 3.2 Stakeholder participation took place through a series of workshop sessions and discussion at the East Inverness Framework Planning Group. The highest ranked options were A, B and D. Additional points of emphasis here related to the scope to strengthen retail and community provision for the established Culloden community within a new District centre for East Inverness, opportunities to facilitate further bulky goods retailing adjoining the existing Retail Park, consolidating wedges of parkland and flood risk zones as major open space corridors, and the merits of Beechwood as a university campus location offering high levels of accessibility.

3.3 No clear overall preference for a particular option emerged from the public's responses. Different options appeared to perform better on certain aspects of development suggesting that a hybrid overall solution would best match local expectations. The strongest messages concerned the wish to retain Balloch as a freestanding community within a green setting, support for urgent upgrading of the trunk road network and availability of coherent transport alternatives, together with the need to address significant deficiencies in key public services locally. The main agency comments covered rail services, green wedges, the new Inverness College/UHI campus and the impact on birds and sensitive coastal habitat.

3.4 Figure 1 illustrates the 'preferred' Development Framework proposals for East Inverness as recommended to the Council by the Halcrow team. The principal features are as follows :

- Dual carriageway bypass route linking from an upgraded A9/TLR junction at Inshes northwards across the railway to connect with the A96 in the vicinity of the Smithton interchange. Direct access for adjoining business, retail, campus and residential developments.
- Park and ride scheme with bus links adjoining the Smithton junction, and provision for a transport interchange facility to serve the Campus including a longer term rail halt option at Beechwood.
- Upgrading of the Culloden distributor from the A96 as far as the new District Centre to be situated centrally by Smithton, including provision for a major supermarket outlet.
- Hotel developments at Stratton Lodge and at the A96/Bypass gateway site where there is scope for an iconic entrance building.
- Bulky goods outlets (regional retail) between the bypass and the existing West Seafield Retail Park.
- New Inverness College/UHI campus comprising faculty, research/incubator and student/staff accommodation with buildings held to the north-eastern flanks of the site in a high quality parkland setting, and segregated pedestrian links spanning west across A9 into the city and the railway into East Inverness.
- An Innovation Park for spin-off businesses and high growth technology enterprises opposite the Campus at West Seafield.
- A major Regional Sports complex situated at East Beechwood
- A formal Town Park and adjoining structural open space at Smithton/Resaurie including informal landscaped areas, core footpaths and flood alleviation measures connecting through to adjoining countryside green wedges and the projected coastal trail.
- A reserved site for a secondary school close by the Park and District Centre.
- A compact new residential quarter lying to the west of Culloden and offering a range of mainstream and affordable dwellings with a graduated density mix with lower intensity housing towards the northern margins by Milton of Culloden.

3.5 The ‘headline’ statistics for East Inverness are a future population of 7,000, some 3,300 new housing units and the creation of approximately 3,500 jobs.

#### **4. Preferred Option – Nairn**

4.1 Again, the technical consultants’ assessments pointed towards different option outcomes in the case of Nairn – preferences were stated as option A (marketability), B (traffic and planning), C (delivery) and E (urban form). Common development principles which emerged included the strong desirability of locating new population growth such that it can help to reinforce a strong nucleus of town centre functions, the acute requirement to stimulate additional employment opportunities in Nairn to avoid reinforcing the current high dependence on unsustainable levels of net commuting, and the selection of an effective trunk road bypass route that also serves and integrates expansion into the fabric of the wider town.

4.2 Stakeholder participation took place through a series of local workshop sessions and discussion at the Nairn Framework Planning Group. The highest ranked options were A and B followed by C. Although broadly similar to the technical outcomes, important issues were identified in relation to the avoidance of flood-risk zones, resistance to low density housing development on the western approaches, and a strong awareness of the very high intrinsic amenity of lands adjoining the River Nairn and overlooking the Firth at Delnies – these areas reflected both the original market town/service centre and later coastal (fishing, links golf and mass tourism) traditions of Nairn.

4.3 The levels of public interest and participation in Nairn were particularly high and there was a noticeable appetite for the town to take fresh stock and move forward. Option B (southern expansion) was strongly favoured in the written responses received. There was a high level of support for a town bypass and the earliest possible implementation. Town centre regeneration was important including solutions to the current access bottleneck on the Cawdor Road, together with well-planned and resourced green space. A number of contributions from various local landowners predominantly indicating their willingness to make ground available for development were also lodged. Agency comments on Nairn itself were quite muted, although Network Rail indicated that works to increase service frequency and improve facilities for a growing passenger base would require investment which should be considered under planning gain arrangements.

4.4 Figure 2 illustrates the ‘preferred’ Development Framework proposals for Nairn as recommended to the Council by the Halcrow team. A reasoned justification is set out on pp.16-17 of Annex A whereby differences in feedback from the community and other collaborators require to be resolved – these particularly affect the choice of preferred bypass alignment, the best location for future business and industrial development, and the case for including western expansion of Nairn although as a longer term growth option. The principal features are :

- A96 bypass starting from Drumdivan in the west, crossing the river at Howford and connecting back to the existing trunk road at Auchnacloch. This also enables a direct link for future development at Delnies.
- Two intermediate junctions on the new bypass where it crosses the A939 Grantown route and at a convenient point for access to serve proposed development at South

Nairn.

- Eventual doubling of the town's size with total expansion capacity for an additional 9000 persons.
- A new neighbourhood at South Nairn representing the first phase of town expansion, including new District centre facilities located towards the north, from which improved pedestrian links will facilitate use of town centre shopping and other functions.
- Development of additional riverside and woodland based leisure and recreational facilities utilising adjoining floodplain lands.
- Site to be reserved for a secondary school.
- Longer term residential and community development at West Nairn (Delnies), clustered around the proposed third golf course and ancillary uses, and connected to the projected coastal footpath link from Nairn to Whiteness/Inverness.
- Major business and industrial land allocations on the eastern flanks of the town at Balmakeith.

4.5 The 'headline' statistics for expansion of Nairn are a long term population increase of 9,000, an additional 4,300 housing units and the creation of at least 4,500 jobs.

## **5. Green Framework**

5.1 Public response to the draft Green Framework proposals has been generally supportive. There is particular recognition that the 'quid pro quo' for taking forward major development in the A96 Corridor must come from a strong protective policy framework for the rural hinterland. Concerns were expressed about urban sprawl and future coalescence of settlements in the absence of appropriate safeguarding measures.

5.2 Several representations also pointed to the opportunities associated with development to secure enhancement of the landscape and improved public access. SNH also commented on the potential for creating new areas for bio-diversity, enjoyment and amenity as well as safeguarding the Corridor's existing natural heritage assets. Whilst supportive of ideas for improved public access, detailed proposals do however require careful assessment in particularly sensitive locations associated with the Firth.

5.3 It is hoped to present a revised Green Framework plan reflecting these points to the Committee at its meeting.

## **6. Infrastructure**

6.1 Further to para. 1.2 above, the Council has awarded investigation of the requirements for reinforcement of *electricity* supplies in the Corridor to the grid owners, SSE. The consultants have made an initial evaluation of the likely scale of long term power requirements in different locations and related this to the existing supply network which comprises six main sub-stations. SSE are planning significant reinforcement of local supplies around south Inverness in early course and further investigation of requirements for Culloden is proceeding. Their expectation is that a new supply will also be needed to serve the centre of the corridor. This will involve the construction of a major sub-station in that area and connecting link from the existing 132kV line in Strathnairn. Halcrow will be

examining possible siting options in relation to their evolving Green Framework plan.

- 6.2 Faber Maunsell were commissioned specifically to extend the existing Visum-based Inverness *Traffic Model* (TEC services) to cover the whole of the A96 Corridor as far east as Nairn and Auldearn. This work has been completed and the consultants issued a calibration and validation report in July 2006. The operational model has since been used initially to examine a number of 'do nothing' scenarios. A 'worst case' situation is to test the capacity of the current road network across the Corridor against significantly larger projected peak hour traffic flows for the year 2041. These simulations clearly highlight the adverse network impacts as drivers increasingly seek alternative routes to the existing A96 due to severe congestion and almost total breakdown in flow at the A9 Raigmore junction. Projected peak hour traffic flows rise to 100+% of route capacity on all sections of the A96, B9006 and B851 west of the Airport/Croy under these conditions. Projected network improvements such as dualling the A96 west of the Airport provide relief on these routes but these improved flows also serve to increase the level of delays at A9 Raigmore itself. More recently, the consultants have examined provisional peak hour flows and junction turning movements for the range of draft Framework Development options at East Inverness and Nairn. Detailed traffic modelling will follow confirmation of the overall preferred development Strategy for the Corridor and close assessment of available network improvement and public transport options in consultation with Trunk Roads and other partners.
- 6.3 Mott MacDonald are responsible to Scottish Water for developing a potable *water supply* strategy for serving the future needs of the Inverness-Nairn corridor. This area is now supplied entirely from the Loch Ashie and Duntelchaig sources. The consultant's interim report identifies a number of key uncertainties in relation to demand but also highlights the impact of the Water Directive Framework which is expected to reduce available water draw down from existing sources, and the efficacy of measures taken to reduce the (high) levels of leakage experienced in future. Demand management/water saving policies particularly as these might be applied to new development are a further consideration. Nevertheless, demand is likely to rise from 29m. litres/day at present to 40 m. litres/day by 2041. The report points to the future development of Loch Ness as a major supplementary water resource for the city and corridor. There are significant pumping, treatment and distribution/storage network upgrades required across the Corridor including three new service reservoirs with a provisional indicative total cost of £17m. A proportion of these costs will be funded by Scottish Water, others falling on builders. Approximate developer contribution levels based on the current Corridor projections do however appear affordable. More detailed evaluation of water requirements including phasing considerations will proceed once a preferred development scenario is supplied.
- 6.4 Biwater are the waste water contractors for this study. The A96 Corridor has been divided into three areas for the purpose of devising future drainage options – broken down roughly as Inverness East (including the Allanfean PFI treatment works), Central and the Nairn areas. Ten feasible sewage treatment design options have been prepared, These allow various possible permutations of different elements forming agglomeration solutions, for example, the construction of a single new works/outfall to serve development from any two or all three areas. Dependent on which grouping of options is chosen in agreement with Scottish Water, provisional total costs in the range of £14-21m. are indicated for the Corridor as a whole. The likely environmental standards imposed on future outfall discharge arrangements for treated wastes into the Firth are critical and a workshop is being

convened on 22 November with Scottish Water and the appropriate regulators including SEPA. This is intended to get a better understanding of the current options and consensus about which are most realistic under future consent regimes.

6.5 A wide range of *community* facilities will be required to service and support the additional long term population of the A96 Corridor. In certain cases, this provision rests fully with public agencies and their priority needs assessments. In others, such as retail, facilities are wholly dependent on the entrepreneurial judgements of private business or, as in sport and recreation, provision may originate from many different sources. Strong population growth can also help to invigorate failing services or to bring forward previously shelved investments. Whilst the preferred Framework Plans do safeguard land for a wide range of potential future community facilities, there is an expectation from some key providers that the planning gain framework will assist with capital funding support. Halcrow have held preliminary discussions with the Education service where the likely mainstream requirements may include up to three new secondary and ten new primary schools across the Corridor during the period to 2041. These requirements will be teased out further in the next phase of investigations.

## **7. Other Corridor Developments and Studies**

7.1 Members will be aware that arrangements are being made to determine the planning application relating to a new settlement/resort masterplan as submitted by the *Whiteness* Property Company for the former Ardersier fabrication site. A special meeting of the Committee has been scheduled for 28 November 2006. If approved, the proposals include provision for 1950 new dwellings to be constructed during 2008-18 which suggests an eventual population of approximately 4000 inhabitants on completion.

7.2 Moray Estate's proposals for a new community by *Tornagrain* were the subject of a well-publicised 'charrette' design process which was held at the Drumossie Hotel between 5-14 September 2006. The Estate have subsequently met with their masterplanners (DPZ) to review the design outcomes which remain 'work in progress'. It is intended that the plan and supporting building codes will be finalised in January/February 2007, following which the Estate will publicise these locally by circulating a post-charrette newsletter. Whilst a number of significant design amendments have been made as a result of the charrette (most notably with the integration of the Airport Business Park and A96 bypass realignment), it is understood that the key size characteristics are relatively unchanged at a little under 4700 dwellings/10,000 population when fully developed by 2041.

7.3 Expansion of several *existing* Corridor villages is another key component of the draft Strategy – these are identified as Culloden Moor, Croy, Ardersier, Cawdor and Auldearn. Each of these communities has the benefit of existing Local Plan land allocations for residential and community uses, although those made under the Nairnshire plan are now somewhat out of date. These commitments comprise almost 500 additional dwellings in total, with capacity for up to 1000 additional residents overall. It is intended to check the adequacy of housing/community land provision in some of these settlements in the near future. Any proposals to increase or amend these allocations will need to respect Council guidelines controlling the margin of expansion to no greater than +25% during any ten year period, and should undergo full public consultation in early 2007.

7.4 Other key developments in the Corridor at this time include the new Castle Stuart golf course/hotel/lodges and £12m. replacement visitor complex at the NTS Culloden Battlefield

site. Activity and passenger throughput at Inverness Airport continue to increase with several airlines announcing additional services/destinations in recent weeks. Consultants have been instructed to progress the first phase of the airport Business Park and early commitment to a hotel facility is also anticipated. A closing date is being applied by the agents for the Nairn Common Good landholdings at Sandown where there has been a high level of developer interest.

- 7.5 There are several major transport investigations underway at the moment. Scott Wilson have been commissioned by the Council to work up detailed proposals for the Inverness Trunk Road Link which includes the bypass arrangements between A9 Inshes and the A96 at Smithton. A preliminary report covering the initial STAG work and timetable will be provided at the TECs Committee meeting on 16 November with detailed recommendations expected in March 2006. W S Atkins have been appointed by the Minister of Transport to advise on design options for upgrading the A96 between West Seafield and the Airport. Scott Wilson are also responsible for the HITRANS-NESTRANS Inverness-Aberdeen transport corridor study which commenced recently. A joint meeting of the above consultants together with Halcrow, Faber Maunsell and Transport Scotland personnel was held in Glasgow on 4 October 2006. It was agreed that these studies would share the same information base, principally as formulated for the Inverness Traffic Model, and that regular liaison would take place between the various teams.

## **8. Conclusions and Next Steps**

- 8.1 The current state of play with development proposals for the Corridor as a whole can therefore be summarised as follows :
- a) Polar growth – E Inverness and Nairn expansion : 16,000 population
  - b) Village consolidation : 1-2,000 population
  - c) New settlements : Whiteness and Tornagrain : 14,000 population

The A96 Corridor capacity assessment based on a target population of 30,000 additional people therefore remains intact. If the Committee is satisfied with the work to date, then the next step will be to pull together a revised development profile and timings for each of the A96 Corridor zones. This will then be issued for final testing by the transport and infrastructure consultants. That activity will interface with the Halcrow team which will be evaluating the phasing of development proposals in relation to the required build up of infrastructure investments across the Corridor. This work will involve close liaison with affected landowners, service providers (including THC) and the development sector.

- 8.2 The consultant's work programme is currently being reviewed. Although delivery of the preferred Framework Plans is approximately one month behind the original schedule, it is anticipated that much of this time can be made up during the next stages (above) which are timetabled for completion by the end of January 2007. The current expectation is that a draft final report can be tabled to the Areas and PDET Committee at its meeting on 30 January 2007. It is intended to seek Committee approval for a further round of public consultation together with referral to statutory bodies and other stakeholders. Feedback from that consultation in the form of recommended amendments to the draft Strategy would then be reported to Areas and the PDET Committee meeting on 14 March 2007.

## 9. Resource Implications

9.1 There are no unbudgeted financial implications arising from this report.

## 10. RECOMMENDATIONS

**The Committee is asked to :**

- (a) approve the preferred Framework Plans for Nairn and East Inverness together with the finalised Green Framework as the basis for remaining feasibility and programming investigations by the consultants.**
- (b) note the proposed timetabling of remaining work to complete the A96 Corridor Strategy including suggested provision for another round of public consultations to take place in February 2007.**

Signature:

Designation: Director of Planning & Development

Date: 8 November 2006

Author: Mike Greaves, ext. 2260

Ref: CMTTE151106A96/mg

### Background Papers

1. Interim Report on Options for Development and Green Frameworks : Halcrow : July 2006  
Complete report can be downloaded from :  
[www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentbriefsandframeworkplans/](http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentbriefsandframeworkplans/)
2. A96 Corridor Update reports : Planning, Development, Europe & Tourism Committee : 16 August and 27 September 2006

**THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL**

**PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICE**

**A96 CORRIDOR MASTERPLAN: STAGE 2**

**INTERIM REPORT – PHASE 1**

**OPTIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND GREEN FRAMEWORKS**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT : NOVEMBER 2006**



## CONTENTS

### Page

- 3. Introduction
- 4. Consultation responses from Community Councils
- 7. Consultation Responses from Partner Agencies and other Interest Groups
- 13. General Comments
- 16. Responses on the individual Options
- 31. Option Preferences
- 32. Responses on the Green Framework
- 33. Appendix : List of Representations

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The National Planning Framework, Highland Structure Plan, Inverness City Vision and Local Plan all point to major development opportunities arising in the area east of Inverness. Highland Council has commissioned consultants to assist with the preparation of stage II of the A96 Corridor Strategy – this will show how the area between Inverness and Nairn could accommodate an additional 30,000 population together with employment, infrastructure and supporting community facilities to be developed by 2041. The draft Strategy proposes a threefold approach : ‘polar’ expansion of Inverness and Nairn, continued growth of the five main village centres within the Corridor, and the creation of two new settlements at Whiteness and Tornagrain.

As part of the supporting planning studies, Halcrow consultants undertook a stakeholders-led workshop which resulted in five different options being generated for East Inverness and South Nairn in July 2006 (the ‘polar’ growth elements above). The Council agreed that these options would be publicised for comments by the communities and key agencies in September 2006, in addition to their evaluation by the consultants and local stakeholders groups.

**This report brings together a summary of the public and agency consultation responses to the Draft Framework Plan options, together with views expressed on the accompanying Green Framework for the wider Corridor.**

151 responses have been received from a wide range of interested parties, public agencies and the wider community. The detailed list of respondents is shown in appendix 1. This report provides a summary of the main outcomes arising from the public consultation.

A total of 71 of the formal feedback forms were received, 17 of which related to Inverness East and 54 of which related to Nairn South. The rest of the responses were received in letter form, including some with detailed appendices and supporting materials.

The report sets out firstly the detailed comments received from Community Councils in the area and public agencies or other interest groups. A summary is then given of the general comments received in relation to the A96 Corridor Masterplan Stage 2 process as a whole, development in Inverness East as a whole and development in Nairn South as a whole.

The report then provides a summary of the detailed comments received on each of the five options for Inverness East and Nairn South, and detailing the preferences put forward by the community. The report concludes by providing a summary of the responses received in relation to the Green Framework.

## 2. CONSULTATION RESPONSES FROM COMMUNITY COUNCILS

### Balloch Community Council and Balloch Village Trust

The residents of Balloch have great concerns about the East Inverness proposals for the A96 Corridor development.

- First impressions of Inverness, approaching from the airport are of a ‘green city’, still retaining links to its agricultural background in a very visual way. This is both pleasant and integral to the quality of life here. We are concerned that an insensitively conceived ribbon of housing sprawl along the eastern end of the A96 would eliminate this green entrance to Inverness.
- Agricultural land in this locality is of prime quality and is inherent to the urban/rural landscape setting and character of Inverness. We are of the opinion that agriculture should have its own place in the Halcrow criteria and that further work should be done on a agricultural and landscape impact of the A96 proposals.
- Balloch is a community geographically distinct from Culloden and Smithton by the green wedge of woodland and agricultural land that separates them. Residents feel strongly that the distinctiveness and ‘sense of place’ of Balloch should not be lost by merging villages with greenfield housing. A selection of letters attached demonstrates the strength of feeling on this issue.
- Balloch gains much of its distinctiveness by its landscape context of agricultural fields and woodland. This is highly valued by residents. Building on the fields to the north of Balloch imposes a large landscape impact on the majority of residents due to its sloped topography. In a public consultation carried out in 2005, open space and rural setting was one of the qualities residents valued most about Balloch. This is re-iterated in the selection of letters attached.
- We are of the opinion that the limit of built development on the East Inverness plan should be the eastern boundary of Culloden and Smithton.
- We welcome the proposal to have a public park and recreation area (Option A). This is our preferred option for open green space and are of the opinion that it would benefit more local people than a golf club for members only.
- We would welcome a strong design element to future planning along the A96. a commitment to:
  - a, providing infrastructure and community facilities first;
  - b, a mix of size and range of housing; and
  - c, impose a planning code and style to future development.
  - This is more likely to be welcomed by local communities than segregated areas of high, medium and low density housing.

- We have taken part in the focus group meetings organised by Halcrow and are encouraged by the consultation process. We understand and welcome that the final option will not be a rigid choice of A to E, but a hybrid of the best features from each option. New urbanism, where you allow communities to be built and not just houses would benefit is all.

### **Inverness South Community Council**

- Inverness South Community Council is concerned about Traffic Problems when the A96 meets the A9 especially at Inshes Roundabout and the extra traffic onto the Southern Distributor Road.

### **Nairn Suburban Community Council**

- As far as the bypass is concerned, the long options following the south side of the railway line to a new Howford Bridge and back to the A96 somewhere between Auldearn and Nairn are the best, This route will take all east/west traffic destined for Inverness and the north well clear of Nairn, Heavy commercial traffic for Gordon's Sawmill, Tulloch Sawmill, JF Job at Granny Barbour Road and Whiteness Head can be routed off/on the bypass at strategic roundabouts..
- If the A96 is to be dualled from Inverness to Nairn, then there are advantages in the long bypass south of the railway line. Firstly, there is a saving in not having a railway bridge Secondly, there is a saving in not dualling the section of the A96 from Gollanfield fly-over to Delnies and this will almost cover the cost of the equivalent section south of the railway line. Thirdly, access to the proposed Whiteness Head new town can be accommodated on the existing A96 and the access road to the site.
- The best solution for additional housing is to group and design "Centres of Population" which are closely associated/linked to Nairn town, services, school and hospital (with all the doctors' clinics grouped within its site). There must be safe walking and cycling routes as well as local bus routes to cut down on unnecessary car journeys.
- The siting of business and retail facilities must complement Nairn rather than draw people away from Nairn to "green field" peripheral sites.
- The creation of "jobs" must be carefully planned so that they are directed at primary industries rather than unsustainable service facilities.
- The indicative planning of new housing, business and retail with new or improved access to town and to the bypass allows for the planning and retention of well planned and resourced green spaces.
- Along the River Nairn to the Howford "new" Bridge can be a superb park land with links to the town, Maggot and beach. The flood plains can be extended upwards to higher elevations and the new park can link all new housing centres
- On the south west side of Nairn, the water course from Loch of the Clans through the extensive wetland site at Moss-side to Loch Dhu, the Alton (or Black) Bum and down to the, sea should be a main environmental feature, It

should not be drained or built upon because it is an important environmental wetland and prevents Tradespark from being flooded. The moss acts as a giant sponge an environmental hydrologist should be involved at some stage

- The workshops on the 20th September all reached different conclusions, Although the combined results showed the order of preference A, B, C, D and E, there needs to be a considerable degree of mixing and matching of best features and concepts.

### **3. CONSULTATION RESPONSES FROM PARTNER AGENCIES AND OTHER INTEREST GROUPS**

#### **sportscotland**

- Sportscotland makes no comment on which options should be favoured.
- Whichever options are progressed, it will be important that adequate indoor and outdoor sports facilities are provided to fully meet demand from the new and expanded settlements.
- Consideration therefore needs to be given to the appropriate types, numbers, size and locations of the facilities to be provided, how they will be funded and how they will be managed.
- The best means of resolving such issues is by undertaking a comprehensive sports facility strategy

#### **Communities Scotland (CS)**

- Welcome that the Council are working on a long term vision for the A96 Corridor
- A number of practical considerations still need to be addressed, particularly the criteria of ensuring proposals will work and be attractive to the market
- From the projected population analysis given, there is currently little information provided on actual up-to-date housing market analysis, and that work is still required in order to create the right balance of good housing in the right locations, to the right scale, that is well designed, accessible and appropriate to meeting local peoples needs.
- The Council must ensure that future development of private and affordable housing in both Inverness and Nairn is focussed towards creating strong, vibrant mixed communities.
- Whilst there may be a requirement for a new settlement in the A96 Corridor, the Masterplan has yet to demonstrate clearly that the criteria set out in paragraph 47 of SPP 3 are being met.
- The Masterplan when finalised should provide clear phasing and timing for implementation, integrated across the Corridor.
- Discussions which will be undertaken on developer contributions must obviously include reference to the need for an adequate supply of affordable housing in line with the Council's Affordable Housing Policy, and the CS Affordable Housing Investment Framework.
- Role of the A96 Corridor growth within the city region context would also be useful as part of subsequent reporting.

#### **Network Rail**

- all proposals for increased stops between Inverness and Nairn have implications for timetabling of existing services, the provision of new signalling and track infrastructure and for the need for longer or additional trains;
- the short distance between the proposed Beechwood rail halt and Inverness Station, and nature of uses (university campus and bulky retailing)

proposed for the vicinity of the rail halt may reduce the potential number of users of a rail service;

- the site of the proposed Beechwood (or any other) rail halt would have to have a gradient of less than 1 :300;
- a sprinter train service between Beechwood rail halt and Inverness Station would require provision of a turnback facility or installation of bi-directional signalling;
- a rail halt at Stratton raises similar issues to that at Beechwood in terms of need for signalling infrastructure as the line between Inverness and Nairn is a single signal section;
- the park and ride facility and road improvements proposed to be provided alongside the Stratton rail halt may in fact discourage its use by facilitating car and bus use;
- the proposal to realign the railway at Culloden and provide a rail halt at Smithton would be a costly but in many ways simpler and more beneficial option than those proposed for Beechwood or Stratton as it could largely be constructed without impact on existing services. We must make it clear that, contrary to your assumptions, this could not be financed by Network Rail without initial or on-going Transport Scotland funding; and
- given the likely increase in population in and around Nairn and the distance between Inverness and Nairn we agree that there is likely to be an increased demand for rail services. This would likely manifest itself as a demand for more frequent services which would necessitate upgrading infrastructure including passing loops and signalling. In addition Nairn Station may require upgrading, additional car parking etc to cope with increased demand. We assume that as this will be a result of new residential development consideration will be given to seeking developer contributions towards these works

### **Scottish Natural Heritage**

- SNH support the many references within the document regarding the need to recognise, safeguard and capitalise on the existing natural heritage assets of the corridor.
- SNH are pleased to see that the Green Framework suggests way to enhance and develop the natural environment and access to it where this is possible. However we consider that there is even more scope to create new areas for biodiversity, enjoyment and amenity than currently suggested in the consultation document.
- Specific comments are made on the designated sites, the European Protected Species and nationally/locally protected species that are present in the corridor
- Development frameworks – SNH do not comment on the individual options presented in detail, although Options A in both Inverness East and Nairn South would superficially appear to be the best options from an environmental stand point. SNH would like to see more a more detailed analysis of each option against the additional criteria of protected and LBAP species, habitat and open space.
- SNH note that the Green framework recognises the sensitivity of the shoreline to disturbance from access takers (especially dog walkers) but the measures to manage and regulate these are not described. It is recommended that access

close to SPA/Ramsar/SSSI sites and the proposed coastal park at Alturlie Point are re-considered or, alternatively, further thought is given to how these are made compatible with the interests of the designated areas.

- SNH welcome many of the other proposals mentioned in the Green Framework.
- Detailed comments on landscape impacts and particularly the relationship of the masterplan to the existing landscape/seascape character assessment (LCA) are made.

### **Greeninverness**

- Question whether enough is being done in any of the options to preserve or enhance the green wedge as it currently stands and that some of the options are not incorporating enough greenspace areas. In addition the options do not identify specific details about potential greenspace use.
- A final masterplan should ensure that the greenspace provision:
  - Provides links between each of the greenspace areas Includes a large park area and golf course
  - The campus area should incorporate greenspace as a key element
  - Existing greenspace areas being retained should be clearly defined
  - Potential greenspace areas should identify how they will be utilised such as formal/informal parks, sustainable urban drainage schemes, gardens, allotments etc

### **Highlands and Islands Enterprise – Inverness and East Highland (HIE-IEH)**

- HIE-IEH draw attention to significant influencing factors in respect of the development of Inverness East. These are Lifescan, Inverness College relocation, UHI aspirations, the Centre for Health Sciences and the overriding HIE –IEH strategy itself.
- Stress the scope for a much wider campus than currently identified, which will provide a planned opportunity for college, university and commercial research activity over the next 20-30 years.
- Options D and E as set out most closely reflect the aspirations of HIE-IEH for the following reasons:
  - It is the most proximate land to existing Lifescan operations, Raigmore and the Centre for Health Sciences
  - It is of a scale that would allow for development to be created in a parkland setting
  - The buildings would have a better prospect of being of a high quality that could benefit the southern approaches to Inverness
  - It could help consolidate the strategy and provide any impetus for a Raigmore Interchange by-pass
  - It could help promote the opportunity for a rail halt at the site and a pedestrian crossing of the A9; and
  - It could help provide the opportunity for shared sports facilities.

## **RSPB Scotland**

- Encouraged to note that such words as sustainable, environmental and green were used throughout the document with respect to the standards that any developments should aspire to. However, whilst there are many excellent ideas within the proposals for providing green space and corridors RSPB feel that they were not sufficiently carried through. In essence, the ideas seem to be development-driven with the environment being accommodated into areas that are left over, rather than being considered as an equally important land-use in its own right.
- This was particularly the case with the proposals for Inverness East. At present, the land between the A9 and Smithton is farmland and holds good numbers of nationally declining species such as yellowhammers and tree sparrows. In addition, the area is heavily used by walkers and cyclists either at lunchtime or on their way to and from work and, as such, forms an extremely important amenity area right on the edge of Inverness. Five options are outlined for this area but even the most 'green' of these (Option C) results in most of it being developed.
- Such levels of development would not only lead to a loss of bird interest but also to a decline in the number of people using the area in this way, as it would become less attractive. This would appear to be contrary to the Executive's stated aim of improving the health and well-being of residents through, in part, encouraging recreation on the fringe of urban areas.
- In addition, the adopted Inverness Local Plan (March 2006) identifies much of this area as Green Wedges where there is a presumption against development. Each of the options therefore appears to be a significant departure from the Local Plan. We feel that all the options need to be more critically examined with respect to the area's existing and potential amenity value and those considerations used to inform which is the most acceptable proposal.
- We also have concerns regarding the potential coastal path between Inverness and Nairn. Section 9B (p43) alludes to this and notes the necessity of controlling dogs in winter in order to reduce impacts on birds. However, sensitive times are not restricted to the winter months and the proper management of people and dogs needs to be considered at all times of year. This is particularly so given the designation of much of this coast as a Special Protection Area and the stringent legal requirement to ensure that any development should not have a significant adverse impact upon the qualifying interests. We feel that this proposal needs to be more fully thought through at this stage to ensure that it can be made compliant with the legislation.
- Finally, the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 places a duty on all public bodies and office- holders, in exercising any functions, to further the conservation of biodiversity so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions -this appears to be particularly relevant in this case.

## **Scottish Association of Public Transport**

- There is no doubt that Inverness requires completion of the Southern distributor road. This will link the A82 (road to Fort William from Inverness) to the A9 and eventually the A96.

- The new road will also serve an expansion of the retail park adjacent to the A96. In one of the options it is suggested that the Inverness to Nairn railway line should branch off the Inverness to Perth line on a level piece of track near Smithton (just outside Inverness). It will then run past the retail park and rejoin the existing line near the Smithton roundabout. It will have to go under or over the dual carriageway to Nairn.
- A new station would be built to serve the retail park. The line would be very expensive to build. It would however allow the Milburn Road level crossing to crossing and free some land (behind the old Safeway store) for other use.
- The closing of the level crossing would be of considerable benefit as long queues of traffic can build up when it is closed to allow trains (20 per day) to pass. The new line would add a few minutes to the rail journey. The cost of the diversion of the line would need to be known before any comment can be made. On balance there would be benefits.

### **Historic Scotland**

- The historic environment does not appear to have been given as high a priority within the Smart Growth principles as would be desirable. This should be addressed in the development of the Masterplan.
- A detailed appraisal of the impacts in both the Inverness East and the Nairn South proposals has been attached as appendices to the letter. These potential effects are on the potential for loss or damage to scheduled ancient monuments (including those proposed for scheduling) and/or listed buildings and/or gardens or designed landscapes and the potential for effects on the settings of these features.
- In terms of the Green Framework Strategy there is no mention of the many historic environment features within the study area other than those that are already visitor attractions (mainly properties in care). It is unclear exactly what role the historic environment has in the Green Framework and what implications the Green Framework is likely to have for the historic environment.
- The impact of new planting schemes on the historic environment should be taken into account. For example, we generally discourage planting in the vicinity of a scheduled ancient monument, and the consent of the Scottish Ministers would be required within the boundary of the designated area. Woodland planting may also affect setting. This point should also be taken into consideration when progressing proposals for woodland/green space identified in the 10 options contained in the Inverness East and South Nairn frameworks.
- Historic Scotland undertook a review of scheduled ancient monuments in the Inverness and Nairn area in September 2005. As a result, a number of sites are proposed for scheduling. Spatial data on their locations has been provided to Halcrow Group and those potentially affected by the Masterplan proposals have been identified. Potential effects on these sites should be taken into consideration when progressing the Masterplan proposals in line with the advice provided in NPPG5.

### **Inverness College**

- The following are criteria considered as essential for the new college location:

- Adjacent to a good road network;
  - Close to a centre of population
  - Close to similar research organisations
  - Close to public transport routes
  - Visible to visitors approaching the college from all directions
  - Located on a large site to allow good sports facilities such as pitches, including a network of paths for the public to enjoy.
- Options B and C meet the College’s criteria least well. Of the remaining options, D and E appear preferable, particularly as the new Health Science building and Lifescan, allowing research collaboration, are close by. With sensitive design of landscaping and pitches, the sought after “green wedge” could be preserved.

#### **4. GENERAL COMMENTS**

A number of general comments were received on the principles underlying the development of the corridor as a whole, particularly in relation to the 30,000 population growth figures. In addition, a number of respondents have sought clarification of how the work being carried out by Halcrow fits in with the proposals for Tornagrain and Whiteness Head. One respondent also raised the question as to how this strategy relates to the decentralisation strategy promoted through the Highland Structure Plan. Another questioned the age profile of in-migrants the area is attracting, and the implications for health and social work service delivery if these were in the older age groups.

Many responses drew attention to the importance that must be placed on the development of infrastructure which will support the levels of growth that are forecast. Many respondents drew attention to the fact that lessons have to be learned from previous developments in the Highlands and elsewhere that have placed pressure on service or infrastructure providers.

The positive opportunities for the provision of infrastructure are however also brought out in many of the responses, notably in relation to transport. Of particular significance is the emphasis placed on the role for linking up the A96 with the A9 and A82, and the prospect of a bypass around Nairn.

##### **Inverness East General Comments**

The options identified for Inverness East generated a number of general comments which are summarised in this section.

Many people recognise the positive effect that the provision of a new road can make in this area, with the benefits that will accrue in respect for traffic circulation around the city as a whole. Some respondents who live adjacent to the existing A96 did however question whether there was any scope for a new line for the A96 beyond the Smithton junction which would lie further to the south than the existing line. The potential for rail halts was generally welcomed, as well as the potential for improved bus routes and cycle ways into the city centre. In addition, the prospects for walking and cycling routes which would link up Inverness with Nairn (particularly along the coast) is seen as positive.

The prospect of growing pressure on the city infrastructure in terms of transport, health and education was mentioned by many respondents. The need for these potential deficiencies to be addressed hand in hand with development is clearly expressed.

The continued role of Balloch as a free standing settlement was raised by many respondents. The impacts of the options which have been developed in terms of the loss of agricultural land, the loss of the rural “feel” to the village, and the importance of maintaining a green entrance to Inverness were all spelt out in this respect. In addition, the recreational value of the forested areas surrounding both Balloch and Culloden was emphasised.

It is worth noting that Balloch Farm Limited, who own large areas of land around Balloch have also responded to the consultation. They recognise that there is scope for community recreational land in the area, and that this could be provided as part of a carefully planned extension to the community.

The specific impact of development in the Beechwood area was particularly raised in one response from a resident in that area. Specifically this draws attention to potential impacts on bats, buzzards and badgers, as well as drainage difficulties that exist in the area.

In respect of development interests, Inverness Estates Limited provided some provisional comments in advance of the infrastructure studies. The bypass routes shown in options B or D offer the most robust long term solution to traffic needs in their opinion. In respect of major retail investment, they feel that this should be located at Stratton or on the site to the south west of the existing Retail and Business Park. Beechwood is regarded as being the best campus location.

Moray Estates have also commented on the configuration of land uses at this end of the corridor, mainly in respect of the implications for Tornagrain. In terms of retail development, they stress that the most sustainable future for Tornagrain convenience retailing is for all that convenience shopping to take place in the town itself, with comparison shopping occurring in the regional centre. A careful analysis of need is therefore required. Mention is also made of the importance of creating a district centre with any expansion of Inverness East.

### **Nairn South Options**

A large number of responses to the options developed for Nairn commented on the important role that a bypass could play in regenerating the town. There were different views on the proposed alignment and on the impact that these proposed alignments would have on individual properties and the environment. Many of these comments are referred to in the next section of this report.

Concerns were raised around the allocation of land around Balnaspirach, particularly those areas of land that lie on the floodplain where there is a high level of groundwater.

The impacts of development on south Nairn were drawn out in many of the responses. In particular the role of access from this area into the town centre under the railway bridge was raised and the need for a solution for pedestrian access stressed.

The importance of regenerating the town centre before any development of out of town retail development was also noted in a number of responses.

Cawdor Maintenance Trust have submitted a response which raises a number of issues relating to the speed of the process, the lack of stated objectives of the Masterplan in advance of the infrastructure studies, the preference of Options A and D and the role of Tornagrain. A suggested framework for land to the west of Nairn is

also put forward which includes the development of a golf course, heritage/visitor attractions, a mixed range of housing and public access.

Cawdor Estates also raise a number of specific issues in relation to the time given for responding to the consultation, the change of emphasis for the growth of Nairn to the west (as expressed in the last local plan) to Nairn South, a lack of faith in the development options generated and the absence of conclusions from the infrastructure consultants to inform the process.

Moray Estates have stated in their response that they do wish to see Nairn thrive, flourish and grow. In respect of competition with Tornagrain, they state that on the basis of any analysis, Tornagrain will take some 15-20 years before it has the critical mass to provide the types of services that already exists in Nairn. They also state the need for residential development to be as proximate to the centre of Nairn as possible, as the community focus should be on the town centre.

Mr and Mrs Nicolson who own and farm the area at Househill Mains, Nairn also made specific representation on their land interests. The concerns relate largely to the potential loss of woodland in some of the options, the dismissal of land within their ownership on the basis of it being located within the flood risk area and the view that Whiteness and Tornagrain are receiving favourable consideration over Nairn. The development of their land has been considered within the submission made to Halcrow directly on behalf of the Nairn South Owners Group.

## 5. RESPONSES ON THE INDIVIDUAL OPTIONS

Responses on the feedback forms asked for specific information on the best features of each of the options for Inverness east and Nairn South, as well as whether respondents wished to comment on anything they particularly disliked about them. The following sections summarise the responses received for each of the options.

### INVERNESS EAST

#### **The best feature of OPTION A is**

- The by-pass to the Raigmore interchange and the potential for removing traffic from the A96.
- Good pedestrian/cycle linkages.
- Community use of land at the bottom of Wellside.
- New housing around Balloch widely distributed.
- Green space to east, but would prefer parkland which is much needed.
- The District centre is well placed in relation to the high density housing.
- Protection of agricultural nature of land round Balloch and associated landscape buffer
- Green space between Culloden and Balloch is maintained.
- Has a good element of greenspace provision with the element of a large park area which would be beneficial within the masterplan.

#### **Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION A?**

- Housing on the north side of Barnchurch road at Balloch Junction appears to be badly placed in relation to breaking up existing open space within this area.
- The parkland is too far from the existing housing and would not be well utilised. In addition, there are children's playparks and woodland in other areas already
- Development is too dense and too many houses are proposed.
- The bypass roundabout on the A96 is too close to the existing two roundabouts

**The best feature of OPTION B is**

- Balloch remains separate from Culloden, and the designed landscape between the two settlements is maintained
- Most development is concentrated, making best use of land
- The A9 - A96 connection
- Proposed siting of retail & commercial developments
- Offers good links between the greenspaces and this should be a key element in the development. I presume that although there is no mention of it as in Option A that existing greenspace will be preserved.

**Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION B?**

- Bypass roundabout makes 3 in a line stretching too far up the A96
- Campus seems isolated from the community by the A9/96 link road.
- The high and medium housing is located on the finest agricultural land alongside Barn Church Road
- The medium/high density housing north west of Balloch would destroy the rural feel of Balloch.
- No new community space is proposed at Balloch although there is considerable new housing.

**The best feature of OPTION C is**

- A96/A9 link road runs close to existing retail park which minimises the barrier effect of a busy road.
- College Campus location
- Distributed small pockets of housing around Golf Course.
- Green space maintained between Balloch and A9 preserves Balloch as a village
- Smallest number of homes

**Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION C?**

- Additional housing between Moray Park and Balloch, meaning the two settlements are no longer separate
- Infringement of buffer zone between Culloden and Balloch with med-density housing at Chapeton and Balloch Farm - Golf Course
- Campus location is shown on a restricted site.
- District centre is cramped with amenity development.
- District Centre is not centred in the housing areas.
- Housing would be better where business location is planned as the other side of the road is proposed for commercial business
- Medium/High Density housing location should be swapped with the commercial/business areas zoned next to leisure/hotel area.
- Does not offer enough greenspace provision with very little incorporated into the main areas of development however the green wedge maintained by the A9 is identified which is beneficial.

**The best feature of OPTION D is**

- This is the best location for the District Centre.
- The campus is located near the town, and land is left to expand in the future.
- Community facilities beside school would make sense by extending existing facilities rather than have separate centres.
- Housing planned beside established housing
- Smaller number of homes and more realistic job predictions
- Maintains some of the green wedge by the A9 and incorporates greenspace provision into the campus area which should be a key requirement for the campus.

**Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION D?**

- Considerable new housing in Balloch with no new community provision
- Housing spaced throughout the area but should be focussed around District Centre.
- Question whether golf course would be truly functional.
- Housing on prime agricultural land between Balloch & A96.
- The light pollution will be considerably increased by this and any of the other schemes.
- Greenspace provision is not adequate
- Lack of buffer zone between Culloden and Balloch.

**The best feature of OPTION E is**

- Balloch remains separate from Culloden
- The campus is in a better location for extension
- Hotel/Leisure Area
- Proposed alteration of Inverness - Aberdeen Rail line to unite with Inverness south line as far around Cradehall then divert NE serving Smithton and Culloden. This will make the Millburn level crossing redundant which will relieve traffic bottlenecks
- Seems to offer the most realistic and sustainable balance of jobs and houses

**Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION E?**

- Additional housing in Balloch with no green space/golf course or community use.
- Housing at Balloch is too far from a new District Centre,
- More housing in an already congested area.
- Cost of the proposed railway line and proximity to existing home owners.
- The view is lost and Balloch ceases to be a village due to its size.
- Whilst a green golf course is preferable to a housing estate, there can be no justification for three in such close proximity.
- Segregated greenspace provision and no golf course means that this option would not be suitable.

## NAIRN SOUTH

### **The best feature of OPTION A is**

- Allows for the development to the west of Nairn, north and south of A96 and is the best fit with Sandown & Whiteness Developments.
- Open space provision is much better than Option E
- District centre is in a good location
- Generic growth with a mix of land uses
- Good bypass route. Mainly low density housing
- Green space reserved at Moss-side
- Large area of woods and recreational ground to the south of Nairn
- Large volume of people/homes contained within coastal fringes of existing town. Less good farmland involved.
- Like possibility of a future link with Whiteness and has a nice compact feel about it.
- Like how Carse of Delnies nestles well with possible future housing
- Proposed line of bypass
- Plenty open spaces
- Proposed development north of railway along the existing A96 road.
- That it maintains a good proportion of open space/environmental areas and that these are integrated into new development
- The town expansion is screened by trees from the southern aspect.

### **Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION A?**

- Scale of development is too large
- The line of the by-pass close to Moss-side
- Development around the Delnies area, and particularly the cumulative effect this will have on habitats/disturbance to coastal wildlife.
- Expansion of housing development around Auldearn periphery, which is currently mostly greenfield areas.
- Development north of A96 at Delnies - this will inevitably lead to a sprawl joining Nairn to Whiteness and eventually Ardersier.
- Dysfunctional separation of housing, retail and business. This option does nothing for central Nairn, and will require many more car journeys to schools, events and shopping.
- Housing developments are too spread out, thereby creating separate communities.
- Housing to east of Househill
- The location of the River Nairn crossing . The route crossed R Nairn at a separate crossing point from Howford Bridge. The R Nairn is a lovely Valley and should not be severed at a second crossing point
- Out of town retail
- Overall shape - long and thin not conducive to good community relations.
- Play/Parkland is not ideally suited to this part of lay-out

- Spreads town too far to west, and encroaches on SSSI and the championship golf course.
- Limits southern development which would round off town and landlocks the best beach in Nairn (Hilton).
- The proposed bypass route and junction with the existing B road which does not take into account the low railway bridge at Nairn station.
- There appears to be more people but less jobs in this option. Also crossing railway line could be a major problem.
- This option is not an economic bypass of Nairn or an option with a flowing road alignment. Additionally it will detract from the existing town centre
- Too large a population increase
- Too close to Nairn Town and for a 30 year option, does not give adequate capacity for future growth after 30 years.
- Too much housing near Househill
- Unnecessary amount of housing proposed and too widely dispersed. The extent and positioning of the development south east of the river and at Delnies. Population and housing increase far too much.
- Very high density housing
- Will be constrained too quickly i.e. need to expand to other side of by-pass
- We stand to lose our house with Option A. Our house is at Kildrummie Smithy, Moss-side
- Important first view at Foynesfield junction of Ben Wyvis and Spires of Nairn and the firth, for visitors to area approaching Nairn for the first time would be spoiled.
- Promotion of green spaces in all plans is misleading. These already are amenity spaces.

### **The best feature of OPTION B is**

- A very well streamlined new road layout which will allow for expansion of the town, and be of great benefit to the A96 route.
- Balanced housing commercial and recreational development.
- Best option for the long term, starting at Gollanfield and keeping south of railway line.
- Bypass does not have to cross railway line
- By-pass further away from Nairn
- By-pass is a by-pass with adequate entry to retail park
- Commercial/Retail Development reasonably thought out
- Containment of housing close to existing town centre
- Creates 4000 jobs
- No building between the A96 and the foreshore
- Housing and Commercial development is contained within one general area
- Keeps 'green' open space aspect of Nairn, but still has additional scope to East without crossing Bypass. Minimal bridge building required.
- Lack of housing development to east of River Nairn.
- More realistic but concentrates housing too much to the existing town - there is no shortage of land, so lets integrate with green areas and recreation (of every form) areas.
- Probably the best for trunk road traffic but leaves more residual traffic in Nairn.
- Scope for large retail development near bypass roundabout
- Somewhat more consolidated growth, but would want to see unmarked area preserved as green space (to west of Nairn)
- This option provides more jobs.
- The balance between providing a significant increase in housing/population and jobs while maintaining open spaces/environmental areas and having the infrastructure and services to support an increase
- The route of by-pass, close linkage with central Nairn opportunities for future well planned recreation and parkland beside River Nairn (East).
- The green belt between River and Road is maintaining a fair balance of People, Homes and Jobs.
- Town becomes more rounded. Preserves beach & golf course as unspoilt areas for tourist attractions. Long by-pass ensures development will not spread to far side. More appropriate number of houses. Good house/job ratio.
- You do not indicate is this is to be a single or double carriageway - it should be double.

### **Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION B?**

- Avoid development on Lochdhu Environmental Wetland area. It is an important natural sponge preventing flooding of tradespark area allows a slow release of water down Alton burn.
- Business/retail and industrial development reduces green space at Moss-side
- Bypass should not go so far north before joining A96

- Bypass starts quite far out, might put people off continuing along old A96 into town, by the time they reach junction on bypass will have already made their mind up to keep going.
- Development too concentrated
- Grantown Road not included in new road plan
- Houses far too close together. Househill Farm would be lovely area to live on, being near nice river views etc.
- Industrial development west of carse of Delnies.
- Loss of good agricultural land
- No access to Whiteness community
- No safe guard of green space at Delnies (Sandown not mentioned or indicated) Existing roads unable to take increased traffic (Station Bridge) Waverley Road and Cawdor Road. Number of houses still too high.
- Not enough capacity people/housing. Going too far inland, loss of good farmland.
- Not enough green areas.
- This route would cut through our farm, directly in front of our house causing great upheaval in our lives, and could greatly devalue our whole property. The land beyond our farm is also very wet and marshy.
- Out of town retail
- Residential area crammed along River for higher prices. Natural beauty jeopardized - cutting very close to SSSI & dissecting lots of farmland
- The business/retail and industrial areas are remote from existing areas and will thus compete rather than augment.
- The fact that there is no safeguard of the green space at the Delnies and Sandown lands at the north-west of the town. There is also a weakness in that the existing road linking the proposed housing to the town centre is currently substandard.
- The large area zoned for industrial/commercial development on greenfield sides around Meikle Kildrummy - away from Town Centre
- There was a possibility of extending community pitches at Nairn Academy across railway line - Balblair will be built on in this plan. Cawdor Road under railway bridge is narrow and dangerous for pedestrians - would require a widening or re-routing for pedestrians

### **The best feature of OPTION C is**

- All development lies to the south of railway.
- Best linkage of new housing with Nairn and all facilities/services e.g. Schools (with increased provision), new hospital & doctors clinics etc.
- Bypass begins nearer town
- Central containment of housing, lower increase in population and housing
- Every new dwelling should have a job created
- Good retention of green space.
- Business park location is ideal.
- Good mix of rural and houses
- Green space preserved at Moss-side
- It is smallest in terms of people and houses. More designated green space.
- Keeps Nairn compact, no straggling development
- Looks a shorter route and meets all necessary criteria
- Neat line, also good separation of housing/industry.
- Strong Green framework with clear retention of green space to the south of the A96
- That it, like A, maintains a good proportion of open space/environmental areas
- The absence of competing retail areas will help town centre development
- The bypass route provides access to Whiteness
- The location of the industrial/business development to the south-east of the river.
- The number of homes, woodland and greenspace

### **Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION C?**

- The bypass lies too close to Nairn. Building would occur on the other side of the bypass, which would create a road through the town again.
- Every proposed development is south of town centre with access only provided by B class roads with limited capacity plus low railway bridge.
- As with option B, there is substantial pressure on the road link to the town centre from the proposed housing development.
- Area zoned for business/industrial development on greenfield sites adjacent to Auldearn and Foysenfield
- By-pass close to Moss-side
- Bypass too tight in, better start from Gollanfield as per B and D.
- Spoils new community woodland at north of Nairn.
- Development putting pressure on all services, especially medical & education.
- Location of R Nairn crossing. The route crossed R Nairn at a separate crossing point from Howford Bridge. The R Nairn is a lovely Valley and should not be severed at a second crossing point
- Not enough zoning of land
- Placement of industrial development is disjointed from any existing industrial area - more logical to expand closer to existing industry at Granny Barbour's road and screen from housing.
- Poor road alignment

- Residential area cramped along River for higher prices. The natural beauty of the area is jeopardised, with the road cutting very close to SSSI & dissecting lots of farmland
- Retail/business parks are unwanted.
- That the proposed new housing business and industrial for development are all in isolated pocket, and that it provides the lowest increase in population.
- Too restrictive, too tight, does not allow for 30 years of growth.
- The new road will be bordering our house at Kildrummie Smithy, Wood-side.

### **The best feature of OPTION D is**

- A good road alignment
- The Golf course & housing.
- Community land, housing & room for future growth
- Good access on new by-pass route
- Good bypass route with new Golf Course.
- Good road alignment as Option B
- Green space preserved at Moss-side
- Homes spread along new road area
- It appears to offer options for various developments. Also would hope that it would be built as dual carriageway thus improving a further section of the A96
- It is a relaxed plan, environmentally responsible, with a good mix of green and development - a good spread of the most realistic when seen in a 30 year + context.
- Keeps 'green' open space aspect of Nairn, but still has additional scope to East without crossing Bypass. Minimal Bridge building required.
- No district centre south of the railway
- Proposed line of bypass
- The access route is more direct and avoids crossing railway line. This option also provides more jobs.
- The community woodland
- Two junctions on the by-pass on S side of Nairn

### **Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION D?**

- All new development is spread out throughout the whole area - very expensive in terms of infrastructure
- Bypass starts quite far out, might put people off continuing along old A96 into town, by the time they reach junction on bypass will have already made their mind up to keep going.
- Creates too many homes and not enough jobs
- Development between A96 and Foreshore.
- Two large roundabouts which slows traffic down.
- Too much development along bypass.
- Development North of A96 in Delnies area.
- It is key to keep Nairn and Whiteness & Ardersier from merging into one.
- Development north of Railway line
- Development seems overly dense
- Dysfunctional planning and location/separation of housing, business, retail and mixed development unrelated to central Nairn, and will kill off investment in/on the high street and associated areas of Nairn.
- Far too many people - encourages conurbation between Inverness and Nairn - will ruin the attractive and accessible coastline.
- Going too far inland, loss of good farmland
- It suggests that a sub-town will emerge, with local infrastructure duplicity to that in Nairn, shops, schools etc. Any new community will develop it's own sense of 'place', transportation will be key to this options success

- Makes the town overly spread out and will make Nairn have no heart. There will be no passing trade whatsoever, too far out.
- This route would cut through our farm, directly in front of our house causing great upheaval in our lives.
- Over-development east of river
- Retail development will further detract from the town centre.
- Route of bypass using huge area of agricultural land - does Nairn want to be this big.
- Prestige Golf Course development doesn't address local housing needs
- The establishment of industrial development on the south side will kill off the town centre
- Far too far from town centre. Spoils western approach to Nairn. Spoils isolation of beach and golf course. Too many people and too few jobs.
- Where is the water supply coming from? Where is the sewerage supply coming from?

### **The best feature of OPTION E is**

- A more compact and integrated development which adheres best to the planning criteria laid down.
- All development south of railway line
- Accessibility is good on this option
- Develops a new additional community within Nairn
- It is a compact design that causes the least amount of disruption to agricultural land and to the general countryside. Construction costs would be lower than for the other designs
- Nice rounded outline - easy access by foot to all parts of town
- No development north of A96 in Delnies area.
- Sensible location of industrial area adjacent to existing industry.
- Spread of houses across two centres
- The new development integrates the new housing, retail and industry which should enable an appropriate infrastructure to support it.
- Would probably cost the least

### **Anything that you particularly dislike about OPTION E?**

- A ring road is unlikely to discourage through traffic
- All it appears to produce is homes and a by-pass, a lost opportunity.
- By-pass cutting off community woodland and Moss-side settlement. Far too many people for size of town.
- Bypass route would slow A96 traffic to much
- Will still create noise and emission pollution.
- Will still be a pain for Inverness-Aberdeen commuters
- Cuts off Moss-side from Nairn
- Development too remote from Town.
- The visual impact on approach to town from the east would be disastrous.
- Far too much building in too small a space and not one idea geared towards holiday makers
- Huge sprawling development with poor links in and out of Nairn.
- Is the homes/people ratio correct?
- Loss of natural absorption of flood waters
- More homes than jobs. Should be looking to provide jobs for people living in Nairn, creating a community.
- Not a flowing line of the bypass
- Proposed development seems overly dense near river.
- Proposed location of industrial development around and east of Foysenfield on greenfield sites. Proposal for local services away from existing town centre.
- Rail network could cause major safety headache to those trying to run a service along these routes (Carse of Inverness, classic example)
- Roundabout on west side too close to Nairn
- Starting point of Bypass. Too many homes in too small a space
- Still has to cross railway line. It would go through Sandown Land - which would have an adverse effect on future development.

- The development to the south-east of the river - this is too remote from the town and has a negative visual impact on the towns southern approach. There is no safeguard of the Delnies/Sandown lands to the west, and the bypass route appears inefficient
- Virtually goes through our house and neighbours far too close to town and too tight for a by-pass.
- Worst of bypass options. Could be just as quick to go through central Nairn

## 6. OPTION PREFERENCES

The Feedback forms went on to ask people to rate their preferences overall in relation to the best layout and package of long term development, the best solution for housing development, the best solution for District Centres/Services development, the best solution for business and college campus development, the best option for open space, parks and recreation and the best option for the A96 relief road/transport. The table below shows the preferences which were expressed in absolute terms, and clearly show that in Inverness east, people felt that different parts of each of the options were preferable. In respect of Nairn South, the general preference was for Option B.

Option	Inverness East						Nairn South					
	Best Layout	Housing	District Centres	Business and College Campus	Open Spaces	Relief Road/Transport	Best Layout	Housing	District Centres	Business and College Campus	Open Spaces	Relief Road/Transport
A	4	5	3	1	2	2	4	2	2	1	4	4
B			1	1	2		23	14	20	20	15	23
C	5	5	2	3	5	3	7	15	9	6	13	6
D	3	3	4	3	4	3	7	7	4	8	8	9
E	3		3	4	1	4	5	8	7	9	6	5
NONE	2	4	4	5	3	5	8	8	12	10	8	7
Total	17	17	17	17	17	17	54	54	54	54	54	54

## 7. RESPONSES ON THE GREEN FRAMEWORK

### Any views about the draft Green Framework?

- Please keep the green margins to Barn Church Road all way through A96 to A96.
- The location of a major town E.N.E. of the Norbord Mill is an unwise selection (Tornagrain). Building of a major settlement downwind of the mill will inevitably create friction and the possibility of mill closure.
- Very important to maintain a rural aspect and prevent urban sprawl. Must protect open green spaces.
- We will never recover from the damage done by dense housing without preservation of green spaces - a change must be made to preserve what remains.
- A good idea if it is kept to. Green spaces should be a must and not an after thought just pushed in.
- Careful thought should be given to reducing car journeys, encouraging walking/cycling, boosting development of central Nairn with parks and environmental areas.
- Could not understand them
- Did not have time to study the proposals but I thought the coastal route was a lovely idea.
- I didn't get sufficient chance to digest it in its detail. Please publish it on internet and give us longer to comment.
- Must avoid a gradual infill of Nairn to Inverness
- Nairn by-pass needed, but consider rest of plans disastrous for the beauty and relative peace of the area.
- New developments must be prevented from merging/creeping into existing developments, leads to a Nairn/Inverness Supertown or continuous ribbon development.
- There should not be a path across Nairn Golf Course
- Token effort when huge loss of agricultural/country land is forfeited - to be replaced with pockets of "green" proposals
- Too preliminary to pass comment on.
- Very important to enhance and not spoil the area. Must keep open space and landscape.
- Do not want a sprawling city - Inverness - Nairn.
- Should have walkways & cycle routes - Nairn - Inverness.

## APPENDIX 1

### A96 CORRIDOR – CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	DATE	FROM	
1	12/09/06	Angus McNicol, Cawdor Estates	Letter received 14/09/06
2		Mr J and Miss A Marsden, Balloch	Comments sheet
3		E Forbes, Nairn	“
4		MacFarlane Grieve, Nairn	“
5		R Giles, Nairn	“
6		Mrs V Scrimshaw, Balloch	“
7		Mrs M A Lamont, Balloch	“
8		M & D Waters, Balloch	“
9		M & E Swanson, Balloch	“
10		D Lamont, Balloch	“
11	11/09/06	Miss M Rawlins, 76 Braeside Park, Balloch	Letter received 14/09/06
12		Rena Ellen, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 18/09/06
13		A J Ellen, Nairn	“
14		Mick Smerdon, Nairn	“
15		George Asher, Nairn	“
16		A Asher, Nairn	“
17		Mr & Mrs R Bones, Balloch	“
18		C J & J D Pinkney, Balloch	“
19		Joan Noble, Nairn	“
20		M Mackintosh, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 19/09/06
21		R Mackintosh, Nairn	“
22	18/09/06	W B Nield, Balnaspirach, by Nairn	Letter recd 20/09/06 and Comments sheet
23	19/09/06	Alex F Mackenzie, Allanfearn, Inverness	Letter recd 20/09/06 and Comments sheet
24		John Mackie, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 20/09/06
25		C C Hayward, Nairn	Comments sheet - undated
26		Dr Hilary Hayward, Nairn	“
27		Stacey, Nairn	“
28		Roy Cottle, Nairn	“
29		G Ritson, Nairn	“
30		W Forrest, Nairn	“
31		Mrs E Williams, Culloden	Comments sheet – recd 21/09/06
32	20/09/06	Brian J Innes, Nairn	Letter recd 21/09/06 and Comments sheet
33		Mrs D Fitzpatrick, Culloden	Comments sheet – recd 21/09/06
34		Grahame MacBeath, Inverness	“
35	11/09/06	Mary Rawlins, Balloch	Letter recd 21/09/06
36	17/09/06	Rev & Mrs A Stirling, Culloden	“
37		Iain MacDonald, Gollanfield	Comments sheet – recd 21/09/06

38		D Williams, Culloden	“
39	18/09/06	W B Nield, Balnaspirach, by Nairn	Letter recd 21/09/06 and Comments Sheet
40	20/09/06	T & J Jamieson, Balloch	Letter recd 21/09/06
41	20/09/06	D Liddell, Sportscotland, Edinburgh	“
42		R W Youngson, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 22/09/06
43		C Grantham, Nairn	“
44		McMillan, Nairn	“
45		Mr G C Grant, Balloch	“
46	Undated	I & M Foster, Balloch	Letter recd 22/09/06
47	19/09/06	D & S Robertson, Balloch	“
48	Undated	D Mitchell, Balloch	“
49	08/09/06	A & L Walls, Balloch	Email to Balloch CC recd in post 22/09/06
50	08/09/06	Dunbar Family, Balloch	“
51	09/09/06	B & I Glover, Balloch	“
52	05/09/06	M MacLeod, Balloch	“
53	18/09/06	J & I Brown, Balloch	Letter recd 22/09/06
54	11/09/06	JDA & E Michael, Balloch	Letter recd 22/09/06
55	11/09/06	A L Utton, Balloch	“
56	12/09/06	Mr & Mrs G Stevenson, Balloch	“
57	07/09/06	Mr J Horsfall, Balloch	“
58	05/09/06	W Beaton, Balloch	“
59	Undated	Mrs B MacMillan, Balloch	“
60	Undated	M & B Campbell, Balloch	“
61	18/09/06	Mr & Mrs W Primrose, Balloch	“
62	14/09/06	T & S Crombie, Balloch	“
63	12/09/06	Mr & Mrs Munro, Balloch	Email to itecs-inverness recd in post 22/09/06
64	19/09/06	G & B Jarvie, Balloch	Letter recd 22/09/06
65	22/09/06	I Williams, Balloch CC/L Green, Balloch Village Trust	“
66		I Williams, Balloch	Comments sheet - recd 22/09/06
67		P Mason, Nairn	“
68		Mrs J Mason, Nairn	“
69	18/09/06	C Fraser, Inshes Wood	Letter recd 20/09/06
70	25/09/06	R J Ardern, Inverness	Letter recd 25/09/06
71		J K MacLennan, Gollanfield, Inverness	Comments sheet – recd 25/09/06
72		Donald C Ross, Nairn	“
73		G Ross, Nairn	“
74	22/09/06	J Hogg, Jones Lang Lasalle, Edinburgh on behalf of Balloch Farm Limited	Letter recd 25/09/06
75	22/09/06	J A N Graham, Nairn	“
76	22/09/06	J & K MacKenzie, Balloch	“
77	22/09/06	H Johnston, Balloch	“
78	21/09/06	J Rose-Miller, Cawdor	“ and Comment Sheet
79		J Bryce, Nairn	Comments Sheet – recd 25/09/06
80	22/09/06	Keppie Planning, Glasgow	Letter recd 25/09/09 (prev. emailed)

		on behalf of DTG Grampian Ltd	
81	22/09/06	Drivers Jonas, Glasgow	Letter – recd 25/09/06
82	22/09/06	S Vass, Communities Scotland, Inverness	“
83		G Spalding & W MacLeod, Balloch	Comments Sheet – recd 25/09/06
84		J A Conran, Nairn	“
85		H Conran, Nairn	“
86		Mr J G Harrison, Nairn	“
87		Jane Smith, Nairn	“
88		J Dolan, Nairn	“
89	22/09/06	J D Carnegie-Arbuthnott, Buccleuch Town & Country Ltd, Edinburgh for C Allenby, Balblair	Letter recd 25/09/06
90	20/90/06	R Paterson, Nairn	“
91		Baird, Nairn	Comment sheet – recd 25/09/06
92		A MacCulloch, Balloch	Letter recd 25/09/06
93	22/09/06	W & E Malcolm, Inverness	“
94		M & S Crawshaw, Balloch	Comment Sheet – recd 25/09/06
95	19/09/06	R & P Gordon, Nairn	Letter recd 25/09/06
96	20/09/06	D Eccles, Nairn	“
97		Mrs J Porter, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 25/09/06
98		M & P Hemsneath, Nairn	“
99	20/09/06	Mr & Mrs McCormack, Balloch	Letter recd 25/09/06
100	20/09/06	GH & EN Walker, Balloch	“
101	22/09/06	P & H Jenkins, Meikle Kildrummie, by Nairn	“
102		M E Taylor, Nairn	Comments sheet – Nairn Library Comment box
103		A Eilgery, Nairn	“
104		Claire Bell, Nairn	“
105		D M Shillabegr, Nairn	“
106		Mrs A Stewart, Nairn	“
107		Shaun MacDonald, Nairn	“
108		Dr T L Coombs, Nairn	“
109		D MacLeod, Nairn	“
110		Ailie MacLeod, Nairn	“
111		Graham Marsden, Nairn	“
112		Mr A Elgey, Nairn	“
113		A Simpson, Nairn	“
114	24/09/06	Christine Spreiter, Nairn	“ (and letter)
115		D Youngson, Nairn Woodlands & Wetlands Association, Nairn	“
116		Fiona Rowland, Nairn	“
117	06/09/06	Norman Campbell – no address given	Email to Balloch CC posted in – 22/09/06
118		NO NAME	Comment sheet – recd 25/09/06
119		NO NAME	Comments sheet – Nairn Library Comment box
120		NO NAME	“

121		NO NAME	“
122	25/09/06	Sandra Heberton, Network Rail, Glasgow	Emailed- letter recd 26/09/06
123	25/09/06	J Brennan, Inverness	Letter recd 26/09/06
124	22/09/06	G H Johnston on behalf of Mr & Mrs Nicolson, Nairn	Letter recd 26/09/06
125	22/09/06	Jean Pumford, Inverness South CC	Letter recd 26/09/06
126	24/09/06	Shona Urquhart, Balloch	Letter recd 26/09/06
127		Doreen H Smith, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 26/09/06
128		Mr K MacRae & Ms G McNab, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 26/09/06
129		David Walker, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 27/09/06
130		Mr & Mrs P Taylor, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 27/09/06
131	26/09/06	Ben Leyshon, SNH, Dingwall	Letter emailed 26/09/06 – hard copy recd 27/09
132	27/09/06	Mrs A Worrall, 41 Moss-side Road, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 27/09/06
133	27/09/06	G Worrall, 41 Moss-side Road, Nairn	Comments sheet – recd 27/09/06
134	27/09/06	C MacLean, 4 Househill Gate, Nairn, IV12 5RY	Comments sheet – recd 27/09/06
135	27/09/06	A MacLean, 4 Househill Gate, Nairn, IV12 5RY	Comments sheet – recd 27/09/06
136	28/09/06	Houston Urquhart, Brenthela, Culcharry, Nairn, IV12 5QY	Comments sheet – recd 28/09/06
137	28/09/06	A R Farningham, White Young Green Planning, Edinburgh	Emails/hard copy of letters dated 13/09/06 and 25/09/06
138	19/09/06	Debbie Maguire, Greeninverness	Email sent to Scott Davidson 05/09/06
139	19/09/06	Turnberry Consulting on behalf of <b>Moray Estates</b>	Email sent to Scott Davidson 14/09/06
140	19/09/06	Brian Muir, Muir Smith Evans on behalf of <b>Inverness Estates</b>	Email sent to Scott Davidson 15/09/06
141	19/09/06	Turnberry Consulting on behalf of <b>HIE-IEH</b>	Email sent to Scott Davidson 13/09/06
142	28/09/06	Mrs P Kennedy, Culloden, Inverness	Letter dated 24/09/06
143	28/09/06	Peter Mason, Nairn	Letter dated 27/09/06
144	28/09/06	Stuart Benn, RSPB, Inverness	Letter dated 26/09/06
145	04/10/06	P & I Logie, Resaurie, Inverness	Letter dated 02/10/06
146	27/09/06	John R C Logie, SAPT (no postal address)	Email sent to <a href="mailto:A96corridor@halcrow.com">A96corridor@halcrow.com</a> on 23/09/06 then posted to TECs, HQ
147	05/10/06	William Kidd, Historic Scotland, Edinburgh	Emailed letter dated 03/10/06 – original in post
148	09/10/06	Miles J Fuller, Inverness College	Letter dated 05/10/06

149	10/10/06	Charles G Hardie, Inverness	Letter dated 06/10/06
150	16/10/06	Mrs D MacGillivray, Balloch, Inverness	Letter dated 13/10/06
151	03/10/06	Nairn Suburban Community Council	Letter dated 29 <sup>th</sup> September sent direct to Halcrow.