

Contents

Issue 22: Helmsdale

1. Schedule 4

2. Representations

Crofting Commission (955042)

John Murray (906905)

Kathy Mitchinson (931273)

SEPA (906306)

Shona Blance (951829)

3. Relevant Council's Supporting Documents

CD14: Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997

CD16: Sutherland Local Plan, Jun 2010 (as continued in force, 2012)

Issue 22	HELMSDALE	
Development plan reference:	Helmsdale pages 93 - 96	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
<p>Crofting Commission (955042) John Murray (906905) Kathy Mitchinson (931273) SEPA (906306) Shona Blance (951829)</p>		
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Helmsdale site allocations	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>HD02 North of Rockview Place <u>John Murray (906905)</u> Site should be expanded to include land between the eastern portion of site and A9, as land now not large enough for viable croft. Portion of HD02 built out or with extant planning permission.</p> <p>HD03 Simpson Crescent <u>Kathy Mitchinson (931273)</u> Objects to inclusion in the plan due to recreational amenity, hazardous access, visibility from tourist route, distance to village centre, and a lack of safe active travel links to the primary school. Suggests land west and adjacent to primary school should be explored and that brownfield sites within the village should be used for future housing. Recommends allocating site as Greenspace.</p> <p><u>Crofting Commission (955042)</u> Site may include some croft land.</p> <p>HD04 Shore Street <u>SEPA (906306)</u> Recognises that site is partially located in a harbour. Recommends text be amended to allow for harbour related uses in the floodplain area.</p> <p>HD05 East of Industrial Estate <u>Kathy Mitchinson (931273)</u> Objects to inclusion in plan unless requirements to screen off entire industrial estate due to visibility from tourist route.</p> <p><u>Shona Blance (951829)</u> Owner and tenant of field that is eastern part of the site. Objects to inclusion in plan due to</p>		

concerns about safety of access through housing sites. Would prefer eastern part of site be allocated for business or housing use.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

HD02 North of Rockview Place

John Murray (906905)

Extend allocation north to A9 adjacent to HD05.

HD03 Simpson Crescent

Kathy Mitchinson (931273)

Remove the site allocation from the Plan.

HD04 Shore Street

SEPA (Ms Susan Haslam) (906306)

Include text to clarify that harbour related uses could be compatible in areas shown to be at risk of flooding.

HD05 East of Industrial Estate

Kathy Mitchinson (931273)

Remove the site allocation from the Plan or screen off entire industrial estate from A9 tourist route.

Shona Blance (951829)

Allocate eastern part of site for business or housing use.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

HD02 North of Rockview Place

The Council do not support the suggestion to extend the site north. Whilst it is noted that the site has built and consented development on it, there remains sufficient housing land for the settlement on allocated sites (HD01, HD02 and HD03). Moreover extending the site in this direction could add additional constraint to development of the industrial allocation at HD05. It is important to ensure that the industrial allocation is not stymied by neighbouring development by becoming surrounded with housing, particularly in light of there being limited industrial land available. No modification is proposed by the Council.

HD03 Simpson Crescent

Concerns about landscape and visual impacts and limited safe active travel links to the Primary School are noted. However, the Developer Requirements set out specific considerations for layout and landscaping treatments that are sensitive to the setting and residential amenity. Developer Requirements also set out expectations for enhanced connectivity of the site including a new footpath along roadside boundaries. No modification is proposed by the Council.

Crofting Commission comments that part of site may contain croft land are noted. However, part of the site is already allocated for housing in the current adopted Sutherland Local Plan. Therefore the Council feels the site allocation should remain unchanged. No modification is proposed by the Council.

HD04 Shore Street

If the Reporter is so minded, the Council is agreeable to modification of the Developer Requirements as follows (additional text italicised): “Flood Risk Assessment (*only harbour-related uses permissible* in areas shown to be at risk of flooding)”.

HD05 East of Industrial Estate

This site is currently allocated in the adopted Sutherland Local Plan, June 2010 (CD16) for industrial use. It should continue to be allocated for this purpose to ensure an effective supply in the settlement. Efforts to identify other suitable sites for industrial land were made but a range of constraining factors (e.g. flood risk, incompatible neighbouring land uses, access constraints) meant HD05 remained the favoured site.

The site relates well to the existing neighbouring industrial land uses. It is considered that allocating the eastern portion of the site for housing would not be compatible with the industrial allocation. The southern boundary of the site is already adjacent to a housing allocation and to add further housing along the eastern boundary could add additional constraint to future development. It is important to ensure that the industrial allocation is not stymied by neighbouring development by surrounding the industrial allocation with housing, particularly given the limited amount of industrial land available. Within the site’s use as ‘Industry’, Class 4 Business uses (including office uses), could be permitted under The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997 (CD14).

Developer Requirements for the site set out that landscaping, and sensitive siting and design should ensure residential neighbours and the trunk road (tourist route) are given due regard. No modification is proposed by the Council.

Reporter’s conclusions:

--

Reporter’s recommendations:

--