

BRIEF SUMMARY OF WEST PLAN MIR COMMENTS

PLAN TOPIC / SETTLEMENT	NO. OF SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS	WHO COMMENTED	BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLAN CHANGES SOUGHT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF REASONS
PLAN AS A WHOLE – VISION & SPATIAL STRATEGY				
GENERAL	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sportscotland 2. Scot Govt 3. SNH 4. 1 individual 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assurance that no net detriment to sports facilities 2. More detail in PP on guiding principles for SG especially developer contributions and all SPP topics covered 3. Site reductions and/or developer requirements for all sites that affect heritage interests and better explanation of green networks / spaces 4. More intuitive consultation software 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern that Plan proposals may lead to net loss of sports facilities 2. Need for compliance with national planning policy 3. Protection of heritage interests especially Natura sites 4. Confusion in making comments
OUTCOMES	11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scottish Water 2. RSPB 3. SNH 4. SSE 5. Scottish Salmon Producers 6. Inverloch Castle Estate 7. SEPA 8. Shildaig CC 9. MCS 10. 2 individuals 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. More emphasis in outcomes towards environmental protection 3. Overarching natural heritage protection objective 4. Support for onshore renewables 5. Positive reference to salmon industry 6. None 7. Increased emphasis on protection of environment 8. More emphasis on improving public transport 9. Overarching natural heritage protection objective 10. Emphasis on how a lack of land availability and affordable housing can constrain economic growth – fairer consultation software 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Plan as written 2. Tilting the balance of Plan aims towards environmental protection 3. Tilting the balance of Plan aims towards environmental protection 4. Offshore renewables vital to Highland economy 5. Salmon industry a major economic sector in West Highland 6. Supports home working and tourism development 7. Tilting the balance of Plan aims towards environmental protection 8. Recent cutbacks in rural public transport have had a negative impact 9. Tilting the balance of Plan aims towards environmental protection 10. Economic growth needs the right supportive conditions to allow that growth – online consultation not easy and accessible to all
SPATIAL STRATEGY	12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scottish Water 2. Sunart Community Company 3. Applecross Community Company 4. SSE 5. HIE 6. Glencoe & Glen Etive CC 7. Shildaig CC 8. SNH 9. Nether Lochaber CC 10. Uig CC 11. Uig Community Trust 12. 1 individual 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. Need for improved broadband notation should cover entire Plan area 3. Reference to Applecross Community Plan 4. Clarification of legal status of community plans and fragile areas 5. Improved, mapped information on broadband rollout 6. Improved, mapped information on broadband rollout 7. Improved, mapped information on broadband rollout and waste management sites 8. Map notations to reflect heritage issues 9. Whole of Nether Lochaber classified as a growing settlement but with growth restricted to Inchree 10. Uig upgraded to a main settlement with multiple development allocations 11. Uig upgraded to a main settlement with multiple development allocations 12. Removal of Kishorn as EDA 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Plan as written 2. Hatching inaccurate, only areas close to some exchanges being improved 3. There is an existing community plan and it is being updated 4. Need for clarity 5. Greater clarity 6. Greater clarity 7. Greater accuracy 8. Tilting the balance of Plan strategy towards environmental protection 9. More Plan detail for Nether Lochaber 10. Uig's constraints have been over-estimated 11. Uig's constraints have been over-estimated 12. Kishorn is too remote and will promote inappropriate commuting
SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY	16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HES 2. Scottish Water 3. RSPB 4. Caravan Club 5. Chiscot Ltd 6. Sunart Community Company 7. Applecross Community Company 8. SSE 9. Glencoe & Glen Etive CC 10. SNH 11. Uig CC 12. MCS 13. Uig Community Trust 14. 2 individuals 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guidance on community plan preparation should highlight the possible need for HRA/SEA 2. None 3. RSPB Involvement where community plan may have significant bird impacts – e.g. Canna 4. Recognition that sites at Morvich and Kinlochewe can diversify into pods and lodges 5. None 6. None 7. Applecross classified as a community plan settlement 8. Clarification of legal, planning policy status of community plans 9. Possible community plan for Glencoe & Etive 10. Hierarchy amended to downgrade main settlements with environmental capacity problems and upgrade those without 11. Uig upgraded to a main settlement with multiple development allocations 12. Whole Plan area should be classified as a special landscape area 13. Uig upgraded to a main settlement with multiple development allocations 14. Greater Plan emphasis and content for Glenfinnan – no hierarchy all settlements equal 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Possible legal requirement 2. Supports Plan as written 3. Potential significant impact on bird populations 4. To allow expansion of existing tourism facilities 5. Supports Plan as written 6. Supports Plan as written 7. Draft Plan already written and being updated, potential for growth increasing 8. Greater clarity 9. No reasons stated 10. Choice of growth locations should be driven by environmental capacity 11. Uig is bigger than Staffin which is main settlement and is a very important ferry port 12. All the Plan's landscape is special and merits protection 13. Uig is bigger than Staffin which is main settlement and is a very important ferry port 14. Glenfinnan is a tourism hub but has congestion issues – no reasons stated
HOUSING REQUIREMENTS	13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scottish Water 2. RSPB 3. Scot. Govt. 4. SSE 5. Glencoe & Glen Etive CC 6. Chiscot Ltd 7. Uig CC 8. Uig Community Trust 9. Applecross Community Company 10. 4 individuals 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. Reduction in growth targets 3. More detailed breakdown of housing requirements including specialist provision like gypsy travellers 4. Recognition that a lack of affordable housing hampers economic growth 5. Deletion of reference to a concentrated pattern of ownership being a barrier to development 6. None 7. Recognition that Uig is a high growth area 8. Recognition that Uig is a high growth area 9. Recognition that growth should only be promoted hand in hand with other improvements 10. Tighter restrictions on speculative development on croft land – tighter control on second/holiday homes – housing need figures inaccurate in terms of locational preference – reduction in housing and other growth requirements 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports Plan as written 2. Level of growth planned for beyond environmental capacities 3. Compliance with national planning policy and guidance 4. Difficult to fill jobs if insufficient affordable housing in local area 5. Lack of suitable sites and second/holiday home demand far more important barriers to growth 6. Supports Plan as written 7. Uig's housing stock has doubled in last 15 years 8. Uig's housing stock has doubled in last 15 years 9. Growth also requires co-ordinated infrastructure improvements and land availability 10. Crofters growing houses not crops and this fuels demand from incomers – control on second home market would resolve affordability issue for locals – people register for where there is existing affordable stock not where they want to live – no real demand, growth should be jobs led not aspirational
TRANSPORT	28	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kilmallie CC 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abandon Caol Link Road (CLR) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CLR has excessive cost and environmental impacts

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. RSPB 3. Sunart CC 4. Sunart Community Company 5. Applecross Community Company 6. SSE 7. Caol CC 8. Glencoe & Glen Etive CC 9. Uig CC 10. Uig Community Trust 11. SNH 12. 17 individuals / landowners 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Opposes renewable energy projects being incorporated into transport projects 3. A full and detailed appraisal of the Corran Narrows project 4. A full and detailed appraisal of the Corran Narrows project 5. Strome ferry bypass the number 1 transport priority 6. Recognition that SSE has providing funding assistance for many transport projects across Highland 7. Commitment to more consultation and information via formal STAG, resurrection of all options meantime 8. Addition of road upgrade to Glencoe Ski Station 9. Uig pier upgrade 10. Uig pier upgrade 11. SEA of all transport options before commitment to them and a committed list of active travel schemes 12. Deletion of CLR safeguard & inclusion of alternatives to CLR especially A82 bypass and active travel bridge at Caol Spit plus need for STAG – deletion of Strome ferry Bypass option that runs through Lochcarron village – better connection at Corran Narrows – preference for Lochcarron bypass and Glen Udalain routes – Ashaig airstrip zoned as transport and enterprise hub – one respondent seeks deletion of all bypasses and link roads – addition of national cycle route to Skye 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Environmental disbenefits of most renewable energy schemes 3. No reasons stated 4. No reasons stated 5. Lifeline route vital to public safety across a wide area 6. Adequate recognition of SSE's role 7. Constituents' majority views, insufficient information on which to make an informed decision on many alternatives especially to decide what is practicable and financially feasible 8. Rival Aonach Mor station has a lot of public funding for its access road and parity should be achieved 9. Scot. Govt. have committed money to a new ferry vessel that requires an upgraded pier and that upgraded pier can stimulate economic growth 10. Scot. Govt. have committed money to a new ferry vessel that requires an upgraded pier and that upgraded pier can stimulate economic growth 11. Legal requirement to assess all proposals for their environmental effects 12. Unreasonable restriction on development potential, adverse environmental effects of CLR, CLR impracticable, need for more information to make an informed decision – adverse traffic, amenity, and environmental effects of taking traffic through Lochcarron village – Corran crossing a lifeline route and vital to tourism – Skye airport will be a key economic driver - Lochcarron bypass will enhance the economic potential of Kishorn – bypasses just divert much needed trade from village and town centres – a national cycle route to Skye has been agreed by all relevant agencies
SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS	6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SSE 2. Glencoe & Glen Etive CC 3. Uig CC 4. Uig Community Trust 5. SNH 6. 1 individual 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification of reasons for SLA change 2. Mapping of SSSIs and SPAs and Loch Leven shoreline as development constraints 3. Tighter planning policy within all SLAs especially in relation to wind farms 4. Tighter planning policy within all SLAs especially in relation to wind farms 5. Additional of HwLDP policy that goes with SLAs 6. Extension of NW Skye SLA to cover Waternish and embargo on multiple wind turbine developments within that area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greater clarity 2. SLAs and NSAs are only 2 of many constraints to development 3. Greater protection is required for Highland landscapes 4. Greater protection is required for Highland landscapes 5. Greater clarity 6. Greater protection of the Waternish landscape and because the characteristics of this area (seaviews and tourism importance) are the same as those listed within the SLA citation
FORT WILLIAM HINTERLAND BOUNDARY	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SSE 2. SNH 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification that the Hinterland should not apply to renewables 2. None 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No restriction should apply to renewables within the Hinterland boundary 2. Supports Plan as written
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AREAS	15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applecross Community Company 2. Scottish Water (x2) 3. RSPB 4. SEPA (x3) 5. Inverloch Castle Estate Ltd 6. Scot. Govt. 7. SSE 8. Glencoe & Glen Etive CC 9. Uig CC 10. Uig Community Trust 11. SNH 12. 1 individual 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. Developer requirements to have early discussions about major water/sewerage users at Ashaig and Nevis Forest 3. Need for HRA assessment and mitigation re Ashaig proposal 4. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 5. Additional of live/work units to mix of supported uses 6. Additional references to Tourism Development Framework, homeworking, brownfield sites, integration of waste and energy developments, transport hub allocations 7. Reference to SSE's support for Ashaig junction improvement 8. Addition of Glencoe Ski Station as EDA 9. Addition of Uig pier area and its derelict buildings as an EDA with public subsidy priority 10. Addition of Uig pier area and its derelict buildings as an EDA with public subsidy priority 11. Increased developer requirement mitigation for all 4 sites to safeguard natural heritage interests 12. Deletion of Kishorn as EDA 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kishorn will attract and retain young people, diversify economy away from over-reliance on tourism & provide well paid enough jobs to compete in local housing market 2. Major/first time supply water and sewerage require advance capital programming and careful justification 3. Potential adverse effects on integrity of Natura and other heritage sites 4. Water environment protection 5. Hotel and Estate is a key economic driver for Lochaber economy and live/work units will assist the growth of the Estate 6. Compliance with national planning policy and advice 7. Recognition of SSE's role in assisting economic growth 8. Equal recognition of Glencoe Ski Station as a tourist facility with capacity for expansion 9. Environmental enhancement that could occur in bringing a brownfield site back into beneficial use 10. Environmental enhancement that could occur in bringing a brownfield site back into beneficial use 11. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests 12. No need for offshore renewables, Kishorn too remote and will therefore encourage long distance commuting and supply chains, adverse effect on environment and therefore on tourism
SETTLEMENTS: WESTER ROSS & LOCHALSH				
ULLAPOOL	44	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ullapool Harbour Trust (x6) 2. SEPA (x12) 3. Ullapool Coastal Rowing Club 4. SNH (x2) 5. Sportscotland 6. Scottish Water 7. RSPB 8. 20 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal and/or swapping of less feasible housing sites for more feasible ones - retention/expansion of employment sites 2. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 3. Enhancement of harbour facilities for craft launched by trailer 4. Additional cherished greenspace NW of West Terrace 5. Safeguard to ensure continued playability of existing golf course 6. Reference to need for early Scottish Water/developer dialogue 7. Additional priority to safeguard MPA 8. Majority opposition to most housing and employment sites especially harbour expansion allocation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing sites need to be developable in terms of gradient, service connections, adjoining use compatibility, landscape impact and availability – economic growth of village depends upon successful and growing local businesses 2. Water environment protection 3. Local skiff racing club requires dedicated storage and club house 4. Gap in green network / spaces and of similar public value as areas identified 5. New housing encroaching too close to the existing course will harm its amenity and playability 6. Major/first time supply water and sewerage require advance capital programming and careful justification 7. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests 8. Adverse visual and therefore tourism impact of harbour expansion however minority support for sensitive expansion of harbour – neighbour opposition to other allocations because of overlooking, landscape impact and use compatibility issues
POOLEWE	10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x3) 2. SNH (x2) 3. Wester Loch Ewe CC 4. Scottish Water 5. RSPB (x2) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Additional references to need for careful siting and design to protect NSA 3. Supports confirmation of presently non-preferred riverside site 4. Developer requirement for soils contamination assessment and any necessary water main 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests 3. Site central to village, flood risk setback feasible, close to facilities, green network along riverbank can be maintained, good siting and design possible 4. Contamination may corrode water mains

		6. 1 individual / landowner / developer	<p>protection mitigation</p> <p>5. Priority to reference and protect SAC and MPA, deletion of riverside site, SDA drawn in on SW edge</p> <p>6. Supports confirmation of presently non-preferred riverside site</p>	<p>5. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>6. Site central to village, flood risk setback feasible, close to facilities, green network along riverbank can be maintained, housing adjacent and precedent of housing along riverside, good siting and design possible</p>
GAIRLOCH	21	<p>1. SEPA (x5)</p> <p>2. SNH (x5)</p> <p>3. Crofting Commission</p> <p>4. Scottish Water (x2)</p> <p>5. RSPB (x3)</p> <p>6. 5 individuals / landowners / developers</p>	<p>1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential</p> <p>2. Deletion/reduction of sites at harbour, Achtercairn West and Land Between Gairloch and Charlestown</p> <p>3. Stronger priority to protect in bye croftland</p> <p>4. Developer requirement for soils contamination assessment and any necessary water main protection mitigation at Achtercairn - reference to need for early Scottish Water/developer dialogue</p> <p>5. Deletion of non preferred sites and stronger priority on environmental effects consideration</p> <p>6. Deletion/reduction/stronger developer requirements for sites at Achtercairn and harbour</p>	<p>1. Water environment protection</p> <p>2. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>3. Potential adverse effects on crofting interests</p> <p>4. Contamination may corrode water mains</p> <p>5. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>6. Neighbour concerns about adverse visual and other heritage impacts</p>
LOCHCARRON	52	<p>1. SEPA (x7)</p> <p>2. SNH</p> <p>3. HES (x2)</p> <p>4. Lochcarron Leisure Centre Company (x8)</p> <p>5. Lochcarron Community Development Company (x7)</p> <p>6. HSCHT</p> <p>7. RSPB (x3)</p> <p>8. 23 individuals / landowners / developers</p>	<p>1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential</p> <p>2. Any bypass lines included should be SEA'd for environmental effects</p> <p>3. Developer requirement to protect setting of SAM</p> <p>4. Retention of sites LCH1-3, LCM1-2 & LCLT1</p> <p>5. Retention of sites LCH1-3, LCM1-2 & LCLT1</p> <p>6. Retention of LCM1 with a housing component closest to existing village</p> <p>7. Reduction in LCM2 & LCLT1 away from shoreline and deletion of LCH4</p> <p>8. Landowners/developers seek retention of sites LCH1-3, LCM1-2 & LCLT1 – neighbours and other individuals seek deletion of LCH1 – some individuals seek extension of SDA to north and west of village</p>	<p>1. Water environment protection</p> <p>2. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>3. Potential adverse effects on built heritage interests</p> <p>4. Sites viable, available, supported by most in the community, mixed use, extant permissions, will help regenerate a fragile village, environmental effects can be mitigated</p> <p>5. Sites viable, available, supported by most in the community, mixed use, extant permissions, will help regenerate a fragile village, environmental effects can be mitigated</p> <p>6. Meeting local housing need, community ownership, viable, adjoins settlement</p> <p>7. Coastal flood risk and loss of croft land with agricultural and biodiversity value</p> <p>8. Sites viable, available, supported by most in the community, mixed use, extant permissions, will help regenerate a fragile village, environmental effects can be mitigated – objectors cite issues with woodland loss, landslide risk, mitigation measures so onerous as to make site unviable, poor ground conditions, surface water flooding problems, traffic safety/congestion, adverse visual impact, adverse protected species impacts – SDA expansion requests to allow more croft based development and community/tourism facilities</p>
KYLE OF LOCHALSH	17	<p>1. SEPA (x8)</p> <p>2. SNH (x4)</p> <p>3. RSPB (x4)</p> <p>4. 1 individual / landowner / developer</p>	<p>1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential</p> <p>2. Additional developer requirements to safeguard and protect MPA and SAC – site reductions if proven adverse impact on site integrity</p> <p>3. Additional developer requirements to safeguard and protect MPA and SAC – site reductions if proven adverse impact on site integrity – especially from reclamation</p> <p>4. Site opposite Clan Garage ineffective (implication it should be deleted)</p>	<p>1. Water environment protection</p> <p>2. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>3. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>4. Contamination, poor ground conditions, adverse impact on residential amenity</p>
GROWING & COMMUNITY PLAN SETTLEMENTS (WR&L)	22	<p>1. SNH (x8)</p> <p>2. RSPB (x4)</p> <p>3. Scottish Water (x3)</p> <p>4. Torridon & Kinlochewe CC</p> <p>5. Crofting Commission (x3)</p> <p>6. HES (x2)</p> <p>7. 1 individual / landowner</p>	<p>1. Augmented placemaking priorities to reference and protect designated sites</p> <p>2. Augmented placemaking priorities to reference and protect designated sites and croft land for its biodiversity and agricultural value</p> <p>3. Reference to and explanation of limited sewerage capacity</p> <p>4. Support for small scale development ideally to be occupied by year round residents east and west of current SDA and between roads and shore</p> <p>5. Placemaking priority changes to prevent restrictions of access to balance of crofts, to support development that is genuinely connected with the working of the croft and to look at development potential on the common grazings</p> <p>6. Additional reference to SAM (Bernera Barracks at Glenelg) and reference to HES in community plans guidance</p> <p>7. More pro development priority for Auchtertyre</p>	<p>1. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>2. Potential adverse effects on natural heritage interests</p> <p>3. Existing sewerage capacity is limited and improvement may not be economically justifiable or feasible</p> <p>4. Disagree with views over open water policy because precedent for seaward side of the road development already set</p> <p>5. To protect crofting interests</p> <p>6. To safeguard built heritage interests</p> <p>7. Adopted local plan allocations, land available, affordable housing developer interest</p>
SETTLEMENTS: SKYE				
STAFFIN	31	<p>1. SEPA (x7)</p> <p>2. SNH (x7)</p> <p>3. RSPB</p> <p>4. Staffin CC / Simon Gilkes (x4)</p> <p>5. Crofting Commission (x3)</p> <p>6. Staffin Community Trust (x4)</p> <p>7. 5 individuals / landowners / developers</p>	<p>1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential</p> <p>2. Deletion of sites SFH1, SFM1, SFM2 – reduction in size and capacity of sites SFH2, SFH3, SFM3 – additional and more restrictive priorities and developer requirements for all sites retained</p> <p>3. Reference to biodiversity and agricultural value of croft land</p> <p>4. Deletion of sites SFH3, SFM1 and SFM2</p> <p>5. Deletion of site SFH2</p> <p>6. Retention of SFM1, SFH3, SFM2, SFM3</p> <p>7. Deletion of sites SFH1, SFH3, SFM2</p>	<p>1. Water environment protection</p> <p>2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests (mainly landscape)</p> <p>3. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests</p> <p>4. Crofting Commission or SNH object to these sites for crofting or landscape adverse impact reasons</p> <p>5. Loss of good in bye croft land, better common grazings alternatives</p> <p>6. Vital to meeting local housing and economic development needs, adverse impacts can be mitigated, logical site selection process followed and community support, wider crofting community will benefit</p> <p>7. Loss of croft land, loss of privacy/amenity, other better site alternatives, adverse environmental impact, inadequate road capacity</p>
DUNVEGAN	25	<p>1. SEPA (x11)</p> <p>2. SNH (x4)</p> <p>3. RSPB</p> <p>4. Scottish Water</p>	<p>1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential</p> <p>2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations</p> <p>3. Reference to biodiversity and agricultural value of croft land</p>	<p>1. Water environment protection</p> <p>2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests</p> <p>3. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests</p> <p>4. Existing water and sewerage capacity is limited and improvement may not be economically</p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. HES 6. Crofting Commission (x4) 7. 3 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Reference to need for early developer dialogue about increasing water and sewerage capacity 5. Developer requirement to protect and reference SAM at St Mary's Church 6. Deletion of all allocations that result in the loss of in bye croft land (implied) 7. DVH1 site deleted – differing views on retention of potential community uses site at Lonemore 	<p>justifiable or feasible</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To safeguard built heritage interests 6. Loss of good quality croft land 7. DVH1 no longer available since purchase by active crofter, exposure of Lonemore site but its availability and effectiveness for a community sports pitch
PORTREE	50	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x30) 2. SNH (x4) 3. RSPB 4. Scottish Water 5. Crofting Commission (x2) 6. HES (x2) 7. 10 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations – deletion of priority that supports road around the Lump 3. Retention of green networks 4. Developer requirement for PTM11 (harbour) to safeguard/relocate Scottish Water plant 5. Deletion/reduction of sites PTH4 and PTLT1 6. Developer requirement to protect and reference SAM at Achachork 7. Neighbours seeking deletion / reduction / control of development on sites at Kiltaraglen and Wool Mill 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Potential positive effects on heritage interests 4. Potential adverse impact on existing Scottish Water plant 5. Loss of good quality croft land 6. To safeguard built heritage interests 7. Loss of residential amenity, inadequate ownership, adverse heritage effects, traffic congestion and safety risks, loss of greenspace
KYLEAKIN	16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x7) 2. SNH (x3) 3. RSPB (x3) 4. Scottish Water 5. 2 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations – additional greenspace notation on Links 3. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 4. Developer requirement for quarry site developer to have early discussions with Scottish Water re processing of waste products 5. Extension of SDA and allocation at Obbe 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Potential adverse & positive effects on heritage interests 4. Potentially inadequate water and sewerage capacity 5. Creation of development sites
BROADFORD	23	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x13) 2. SNH (x3) 3. RSPB (x2) 4. Scottish Water 5. Crofting Commission 6. 3 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. Site reduction north of industrial estate, additional priorities to reference biodiversity and agricultural value of croft land and bird interests at Broadford Bay shoreline, removal of eastern SDA (east of and including Harrapool) 4. Reference to need for early discussions with developers regarding water capacity 5. None 6. None 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 4. Potential lack of water supply capacity and need to programme improvements 5. Supports Plan as written 6. One landowners supports the reallocation of its sites because they are effective and being progressed and another clarifies that the non-preferred site east of Caberfeidh is intended for small scale croft house development only
SLEAT	44	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x5) 2. SNH (x2) 3. RSPB 4. Crofting Commission 5. Sleat General Grazings Committee (x2) 6. Sleat Community Trust 7. 32 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. None 4. Preference for retained allocations on sites not in crofting tenure 5. Deletion of housing sites at Teangue (Manse Field) 6. Inclusion of 3 new development areas at Armadale Filling Station, Tormore and Aird of Sleat 7. Neighbours seek deletion of all allocations other than those with planning permission – landowners / developers seek their retention / expansion 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Supports Plan as written 4. Protection of in bye and other agriculturally productive croft land 5. Loss of productive agricultural land, viability of unit affected, adverse visual impact, better alternative at Kilbeg, loss of habitat, agricultural operation disturbance 6. Community ownership, control, support and cross subsidising of other community benefits 7. Neighbours concerns re. loss of rural character, light pollution and consequent loss of tourism, excessive scale of development, inadequate demand, better alternative sites elsewhere, adverse visual impact, loss of greenspace, loss of habitat, adverse impact on protected species, loss of woodland, precedent, noise pollution, loss of crofting identity – landowners argue their sites are effective and progressing with masterplans / applications, adverse effects can be mitigated
GROWING & COMMUNITY PLAN SETTLEMENTS (SKYE)	20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA 2. SNH (x3) 3. RSPB (x2) 4. Scottish Water (x3) 5. HES (x4) 6. Crofting Commission (x3) 7. Uig CC 8. Uig Community Trust 9. Edinbane Community Company 10. Diageo 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. None 4. Reference to need for early discussions with developers regarding water and sewerage capacity 5. Developer requirements to protect and reference built heritagesites and settings 6. Strengthening of priority references to crofting interests 7. Uig upgraded to main village with allocations and priorities 8. Uig upgraded to main village with allocations and priorities 9. Additional priorities to reference/support new core paths, affordable housing, tourist facilities, retained and expanded school 10. Additional priority to reference importance of Talisker Distilleryto local economy and to safeguard its potential expansion by not supporting new housing close to its existing boundaries 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Supports Plan as written 4. Potential lack of water and sewerage capacity and need to programme improvements 5. Potential adverse effects on built heritage interests 6. Potential adverse effects on crofting interests 7. Trunk road, flood risk and land availability constraints exaggerated or can be mitigated plus economic upturn in terms of fish farms, sea salt production company & new larger ferry ship 8. Trunk road, flood risk and land availability constraints exaggerated or can be mitigated plus economic upturn in terms of fish farms, sea salt production company & new larger ferry ship 9. More sustainable to keep and expand facilities in each village – will reduce need for travel – new nursery provision planned 10. New housing too close to distillery may prejudice its expansion either physically or in terms of an increased number of sensitive receptors close to an industrial operation
SETTLEMENTS: LOCHABER				
MALLAIG	29	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x11) 2. SNH (x2) 3. RSPB 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations – clarification 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Supports Plan as written

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. HSCHT (x2) 5. Mallaig & District Swimming Pool Association 6. Mallaig Harbour Authority 7. 12 individuals / landowners / developers 	<p>that any land reclamation proposals are likely to adversely affect the integrity of Natura sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. None 4. Reduction of MAH1 but also enlargement to incorporate part of MAH4, addition of other infill sites. 5. Existing swimming pool site earmarked for business use 6. Retained but amended harbour expansion boundary, additional placemaking priorities to better reference importance of harbour to local economy and need for additional parking across village, masterplan to be referenced as future supplementary guidance 7. Consensus that part of MAH1 undevelopable and site boundary requires amendment - landowner seeks extension to MAH3 but neighbour seeks deletion - landowner seeks swap of preferences to prefer MAH6 and not MAH2 - landowner seeks reintroduction of MAH5 - landowner request for infill site 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Amended site boundary would better reflect contours and developability of land – smaller infill sites may be more feasible than larger allocations 5. To support community's aspirations to expand and refurbish the facility 6. To reflect recent feasibility work and community consensus building 7. Site boundary should better reflect gradient and developable land – previous planning permission versus surface water drainage, flood risk, overhead lines, slope stability concerns - road access to MAH2 needs to go through MAH6 – MAH5 has previous permission and allocation and adverse effects can be mitigated – infill sites more economic because services available closeby
SPEAN & ROY BRIDGE	17	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x5) 2. SNH (x4) 3. 8 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. Landowner seeks extension to SBH1 - other landowners seek confirmation of sites some of which non preferred or outwith SDAs, landowners of Roy Bridge site seek housing only not mixed use allocation - one neighbour of SBM1 seeks developer requirements to achieve lower density, height restriction and privacy set-back 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Natural extension to village and infill plots – adopted plan allocations and/or planning permissions granted, or forest croft development, adverse effects can be mitigated – loss of privacy, amenity and viability of tourist letting unit
FORT WILLIAM	77	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x26) 2. SNH 3. RSPB 4. HES (x4) 5. Crofting Commission (x2) 6. Sportscotland (x2) 7. Kilmallie CC (x6) 8. Lochside Residents Association 9. HIE (x2) 10. 32 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Placemaking priorities separated, transport safeguard corridors mapped and SEA'd 3. None 4. None 5. Additional references to crofting interests at Lochside and Blar Mor 6. Developer requirement to ensure no net loss of quality and quantity of sports pitch provision at Lochside Primary School and North of Lochaber High School Site 7. Supports most of Plan but seeks reduction in northern extent of Corpach allocations and additional cherished green spaces 8. Additional developer requirements to ensure suitable redevelopment of Lochside Primary School site 9. Reintroduction of non preferred site at Annat West – SDA extension close to smelter 10. Neighbours seeking deletion / reduction / more benign uses / additional requirements for several sites but especially Corpach Locks, Lochside and Upper Achintore Primary School sites & Lundavra Road site – landowner seeks short term phasing of Upper Achintore expansion site – landowner seeks extension of Annat FW1 site – extra greenspace suggestions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Supports Plan as written 4. Supports Plan as written 5. Supports building on common grazings at Lochside and reports crofting interests at Blar Mor 6. To ensure no net loss of quality and quantity of sports pitch provision 7. Protection of greenspaces and landscape, reports mixed local views on Corpach Marina proposal 8. Adverse impact on neighbours from anti social behaviour, inadequate water and sewerage capacity – buffer area vital 9. No reasons stated 10. To offset (real or perceived) adverse impacts of development including loss of greenspace, play space, sports pitches, habitats / species, residential amenity, public views plus inadequate infrastructure – site more feasible than short term allocated alternatives, will deliver affordable housing and reflects considerable public investment to date – no reasons stated – protection of amenity
STRONTIAN	27	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x6) 2. SNH 3. RSPB 4. Sunart Community Company (x7) 5. Sunart CC (x7) 6. 5 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 4. All settlement allocations amended to reflect latest community's Strontian masterplan 5. All settlement allocations amended to reflect latest community's Strontian masterplan 6. Campsite owner requests flexibility to include housing in mixed use site – consensus that Land East of Otterburn site should be changed to a business (tourism allocation) with suitable developer requirements 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests and factual update 3. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 4. Community masterplan reflects community consensus, undertaken by professionals and relevant stakeholders involved 5. Community masterplan reflects community consensus, undertaken by professionals and relevant stakeholders involved 6. To have a fall back option if the campsite is rendered unviable by adjoining housing development – to ensure mainstream housing is not possible and that landscape sensitivities and infrastructure capacities are respected
KINLOCHLEVEN	16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x6) 2. SNH (x9) 3. 1 individual 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. Deletion of long term site at Wades Road 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. Loss of habitat and species, proximity to electricity plant and overhead lines
NORTH BALLACHULISH & GLENACHULISH	30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x5) 2. SNH (x7) 3. HES 4. Ballachulish CC (x3) 5. Ballachulish Community Company (x2) 6. 13 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations, site reductions and/or very onerous landscape protection developer requirements for mixed use sites at Glenachulish 3. None 4. Removal of hotel or fast food outlet option on any site – retention and expansion of housing site at Bluebell Wood 5. Removal of hotel or fast food outlet option on any site – retention and expansion of housing site at Bluebell Wood 6. Neighbour and other objections to all sites seeking their deletion / non-retention – one request to reduce North Ballachulish SDA and one to expand Glenachulish SDA – landowners seek retention and/or expansion of Glenachulish sites 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests particularly adverse visual / landscape impact on NSA 3. Supports Plan as written 4. An additional commercial operation would undermine existing, already marginal, existing businesses – land at Bluebell Wood in community ownership and adverse impacts can be mitigated 5. An additional commercial operation would undermine existing, already marginal, existing businesses – land at Bluebell Wood in community ownership and adverse impacts can be mitigated 6. Objectors concerned about adverse heritage impacts (especially landscape), inadequate infrastructure / facility capacity, loss of tourism, loss of croft / agricultural land, loss of rural character, flood risk and other drainage problems, trunk road and pedestrian safety, previous DPEA decision to reject Glenachulish sites, closure of existing commercial businesses – landowners reasons: developable land available and not visually prominent, sites more serviceable than alternatives, have a unique and competitive advantage of trunk road visibility, are not in crofting tenure, adverse effects can be mitigated

<p>GLENCOE & SOUTH BALLACHULISH</p>	<p>46</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA (x5) 2. SNH (x13) 3. HES (x2) 4. Crofting Commission (x3) 5. Ballachulish CC (x4) 6. Ballachulish Community Company (x3) 7. Isles of Glencoe Hotel 8. Glencoe & Glen Etive CC 9. 14 individuals / landowners / developers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. None 4. Deletion of North of Glencoe Primary School site, recognition of crofting interest in sites GCH2 and GCLT1 5. Deletion of BHH3, new site for housing and new school campus between MacColl Terrace and Primary School, extension of SDA to include hydro scheme and housing plots development potential in Brecklet Forest, North of A82 and elsewhere built development should be limited to refurbishment / redevelopment e.g. of boatsheds and quarries 6. Deletion of BHH3, new site for housing and new school campus between MacColl Terrace and Primary School, extension of SDA to include hydro scheme and housing plots development potential in Brecklet Forest, North of A82 and elsewhere built development should be limited to refurbishment / redevelopment e.g. of boatsheds and quarries plus south of filling station site at Glencoe 7. BHB3 should be broadened to mix use 8. Priority to only support development on crofts that will be used by crofters, Glencoe SDA extended along Clachaig Inn Road to allow single house plot developments, GCH1 changed to mixed use to support new village hall and a very small affordable housing development 9. Objections seeking the removal and/or reduction of sites and/or additional developer requirements to offset adverse effects – landowners support allocations and some seek extensions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests particularly adverse visual / landscape impact on NSA 3. Supports Plan as written 4. Loss of most if not all of croft unit which comprises good in bye land, need for consideration of crofting interests 5. BHH3 “too cramped”, loss of greenspace and flood risk – alternative development areas have community support and/or community ownership 6. BHH3 “too cramped”, loss of greenspace and flood risk – alternative development areas have community support and/or community ownership 7. To allow housing use (reasons not stated but inferred) 8. To protect remaining in bye land, to allow single plot developments on poorer but available land, to allow limited affordable housing provision in the village and construction of a new and better village hall 9. Concerns about adverse heritage impacts (especially landscape), inadequate infrastructure / facility capacity, loss of tourism, lack of local employment, loss of croft / agricultural land, loss of rural character and residential amenity / privacy, flood risk and other drainage problems, trunk road and pedestrian safety, closure of existing commercial businesses – landowners reasons: developable land available and not visually prominent, sites more serviceable than alternatives, feasibility work undertaken, some sites have a unique and competitive advantage of trunk road visibility, are not in crofting tenure, adverse effects can be mitigated, (e.g. community park offer at West Laroch)
<p>GROWING & COMMUNITY PLAN SETTLEMENTS (LOCHABER)</p>	<p>18</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEPA 2. SNH (x4) 3. Scottish Water (x2) 4. HES (x4) 5. Crofting Commission (x5) 6. Arisaig & District CC 7. 1 landowner / developer 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer requirements to avoid/mitigate flood risk, peat loss, wetland habitat loss and/or local heat network potential 2. Developer requirements to reference and protect adjoining heritage designations 3. Clarification that first time sewerage provision would need to be required by SEPA and/or proposals would need to meet the 5 Ministerial criteria for investment 4. None 5. Additional priorities text regarding crofting interests in Acharacle and Clovullin 6. Additional priorities in Arisaig for loch front parking and cemetery expansion space 7. Nevis Estates want more positive, pro-development references within Morar section 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water environment protection 2. Potential adverse effects on heritage interests 3. To make clear that currently unprogrammed water and sewerage improvements may not be economic / feasible 4. Supports Plan as written – offers HES input to community plans 5. To better reference crofting interests 6. To better meet local needs and priorities 7. The village is well placed to accept further growth with its range of community and commercial facilities and good transport network connections
<p>TOTAL</p>	<p>742</p>			