

Issue (heading):	Access to the Outdoors
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	A Healthier Highland
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
The Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2), Duncan MacDonald (17), Juliet Robinson (34), J Mayhew (50), Nairn River Community Council (51), The Highland Council (70), Kurt Larson (95), Amy MacDonald (102), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Westhill Community Council (147), Glenurquhart Community Council (174) Maria de la Torre (196), Anne Thomas (197), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Ken Nicol (215), Kinraig & Vicinity Community Council (225), Ardrross Community Council (236), Helen Campbell (301), Diane Hawksey (317), Brenda Steele (319), SportScotland (320)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	<p>Replace Structure Plan SR5, SR6, SR7</p> <p>Drop Structure Plan SR7</p>
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should reflect the important of access on and off paths. Issues with safeguarding access rights • Increase long and short distance cycle paths • Need to Develop long distance routes North of Inverness • Developers must take account of access to the outdoors not just be encouraged. • Local consultation on routes of paths is key. • Could reasonable charges be considered for use of areas such as forestry commission land. • Need for sufficient access for people to come into contact with natural, built and cultural heritage. • Making wild land legally inaccessible would be detrimental to recreation and tourism. • Management of access during and after construction of onshore wind turbines is important. • Suggest the use of the word ensure rather than encourage. • Do not infringe on landowners rights to privacy. Encourage development of more bike routes. • Education on the use of the countryside and peoples interaction with it is needed. • Need to protect all paths not just the ones in the core path network. • Any paths which go through people’s gardens should not be core paths • Improvement of paths using developer contributions. • Access strategy as S.G. encourage developers take account of access when developments are coming forward. • Creation of more “safer routes to school” • Responsible access is important to promote but should consider the needs of users of the land such as farmers. 	

- Access to the outdoors must be a requirement for all new developments.
- Provision of new cycle tracks linked to suitable routes.
- Education on use of wider access is necessary.
- Ensure access opportunities are not limited by renewable energy developments
- Lack of funding may limit opportunity to retain and develop the core path network.
- Core Path Plans should not be static, need to develop with communities needs.
- An off road path network for rural areas linking key meeting places should be in place.
- Need to protect areas from too much development and ensure access to larger settlements is available.
- Need to clarify if landowners need liability insurance if people accessing their land.
- Maintenance of paths should be addressed.
- Need to support local community initiatives.
- Support position of SPP refuse if negative impact on access.
- Clarity needed on approach and strong policy on access rights.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Creation of new cycle ways and footpaths throughout Highland.
- Strong policy on protection of access rights.
- Developer Contributions – access to outdoors covered in this section
- Maintenance of Paths
- Protection of landowners rights
- Encouragement of active travel between places.
- Standard condition for safeguarding of access rights as alluded to in the Land Reform (Scotland) Act.
- Recognition that all types of access are equal.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Creation of new cycleways and footpaths throughout Highland

The Core Path Plans produced by the Council detail the existing paths in the area and together. The Core Path Plans will be adopted as supplementary guidance to the Highland wide Local Development Plan. Through community consultation on these the Council have identified aspirational routes. Aspirational paths need to be deliverable, therefore a mechanism for delivery will be developed and included in the Highland wide Local Development Plan.

Strong Policy on the Protection of Access Rights

The Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 afforded responsible access rights to all and also protects these rights. In the spirit of the Modernised Planning System we do not believe it is necessary to repeat this legislation in the Local Development Plan. However, the Local Development Plan will support the provisions of the Highland Access Strategy 2008-2011 and the Core Path Plans through adoption as supplementary guidance both documents were brought forward under the provisions of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003. Reference to the benefits of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 will be referenced in the supporting text of any policy on access.

Maintenance of Paths

The Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 does not place any statutory duty on the Council to maintain paths which have been identified as Core Paths. However, where

appropriate and where resources are available the Council will carry out maintenance to paths in its control.

Protection of landowners rights

Under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 the Council has a duty to uphold access rights and protect right of ways. Through consultation on the Core Path Plans across Highland, landowner rights have been taken into consideration and where new paths are likely to be formed consultation will be held and discussed with landowners. The Act does not give people the right to walk over garden ground within the curtilage of a house, and therefore the Act recognises landowner rights to privacy and because of this The Council do not believe a specific policy is needed on protection of landowners rights as it is adequately covered by the Act.

Encouragement of Active Travel Between Places

Through our approach to accessibility and transport we will be actively encouraging developers to consider active travel between places through linkages to the core path network and through the creation of more accessible places for active travel.

Standard condition for safeguarding of access rights as alluded to in the Land Reform (Scotland) Act

The Council are currently working toward a new set of Standard Conditions. A standard condition(s) for access will be included in this. These will be published as a separate document on the Highland Council's website and not included in the Plan.

Recognition that all types of access are equal

The Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 sets the context for access to the outdoors and recognises that all forms of access are equal. The Council believe that this adequately covers this point and therefore do not intend to include this in the Plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Green Networks
Policy - Open Space
Policy - Playing Fields and Sports Pitches
Policy - Public Access
Policy - Long Distance Routes
Policy - Travel

Links to Related Supplementary Guidance

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Affordable Housing
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Affordable Housing
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Marie Cruickshank (14), Irene Brandt (18), Graham & Sibbald - Derek Mackenzie (35), Mrs J Mayhew (50), Brian Lynch (54), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), Halliday Fraser and Munro Planning - Tulloch Homes (North) Ltd (57), Halliday Fraser and Munro Planning - Deveron Highland (62), Joan Noble (67), Halliday Fraser and Munro Planning - Fairways Leisure Group Ltd (69), Paul & Helen Jenkins (74), I Wade (85), John Mackie (86), Paul Maden (88), Mrs L Mackintosh (90), Kingussie Community Council (93), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Kirkton Farms (106), Inverness South Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Brora Community Council (121), Mr A Manson (143), Elizabeth Budge (148), Julian Walford (155), Highlands and Islands Green Party (168), Annie Stewart (172), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Peter Roberts (194), Bryden Associates - Strathdearn Community Council (205), John Martin (223), Kincaig & Vicinity Community Council (225), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (229), Graham & Sibbald - Mr & Mrs Grant (231), Ardross Community Council (236), The Highland Council (241), Robertson Homes (246), Patricia Roberts (247), John Waring (250), Eveline Waring (253), Ian Wilson (255), Roger Piercy (257), Colliers CRE - Whiteness Property Company (260), Mr and Mrs Stafford (272), Mr J Bingham (283), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Pete Campbell (290), Scottish Property Federation (291), Homes For Scotland (293), Mr JG Walford (300), Helen Campbell (301), Reynolds Architecture Ltd - Miss Joyce Hendry (302), Scotia Homes Limited (314), Diane Hawksey (317), Inverlochy and Torlundy Comm Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), WYG Planning & Design - The Cawdor Maintenance Trust (325), Ward 11 - Caol v Mallaig (THC) (332), EMAC Planning - Barratt Homes and Robertson Homes (333), EMAC Planning - Hill of Fearn West, Scotia Homes (334), EMAC Planning - Castletown North East, Scotia Homes (335)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace / amend – Structure Plan Policy H4 Affordable Housing & Policy H5 Affordable Housing
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Council and Registered Social Landlords need to find ways to fund affordable stock, retain and not sell ▪ Hope that the Scottish Government pursues removal of Right to Buy for new tenants and to keep all as rentals ▪ There is a need to more than consider innovative delivery methods but to actually implement them ▪ The requirements for the identification of housing needs must be transparent ▪ No contribution should be sought where there is no shortfall, although would support delivery in certain identified areas ▪ All affordable houses should be built together, don’t agree with mix of housing tenures ▪ Need flexible approach to provision so economics of providing affordable housing do not hinder wider development of proposals ▪ Land release for higher density housing will assist in provision of affordable housing 	

- Registered Social Landlords should take the opportunity to buy the existing excess housing stock now available on the market
- Need for greater emphasis on integrated mix of housing solutions to allow private sector to develop affordable solutions
- Consideration of abnormal costs should be given to allow development to proceed
- Housing should be high quality and efficient to reduce costs of heating and maintenance
- Preference of affordable housing to be provided for young local people and local families
- Space standards for affordable housing needs review to allow better design and space standards
- Local Authority should supply affordable housing, and not from cross-subsidy. The Council should become a developer and re-invest profits
- Affordable housing “space standards” should be updated to provide more innovative design
- Contribution should be sought even where no evidence of need exists
- Affordable housing should only be allowed in areas with public transport and facilities.
- Need definition of affordable houses, should just be called Council or Housing Association,
- Affordable tend to be high density and not appropriate for village character
- Lowering threshold may reduce numbers coming forward making small scale development less attractive
- There is a need for flexibility to take account of abnormally high land preparation costs
- Have concerns about mathematical accuracy of projected need for affordable housing; if significant proportion of population can't afford to buy, why is majority of new housing to be open market?
- Developer contributions should be dropped with the Council providing all infrastructure, house prices would then drop as a consequence

Threshold

- Small scale developments may become unviable with a reduction in the threshold level.this should only be in clearly defined areas
- Need clear justification for reduction in threshold to 4, broadly favour 4 house threshold at 25%
- Threshold needs to be 1 in 3 in Lochaber to reflect pressure
- In rural areas drop threshold to 1 with requirement to provide affordable plot for every new build
- Desirable to have consistent approach across Highland, burden of 1 in 4 elevates the average open market price
- Do not agree with reducing threshold, would want developer-led process emerging

Contribution

- Do not feel that the percentage contribution should increase the status quo should be maintained.
- A definitive upper threshold for the percentage of affordable housing contribution should be set.
- Feel concerned over any potential increase in demands for affordable housing provision especially when viewed along with other contributions being required

- No case for increasing 25% contribution
- Do not feel that there is a case to increase the proportion of affordable, this is appropriate only in exceptional circumstances
- Maintain status quo as increase will make development of sites uneconomic
- The use of commuted sums should be clearly explained and defined for developers to avoid lengthy negotiation process
- SCDI concerned that the Council is proposing to reduce flexibility on demands for affordable housing when house building sector is struggling

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- The requirement for any threshold and percentage contribution should be transparent.
- Modify policy approach so affordable provision is delivered separately from private not as part of a mix.
- Remove all Right to Buy and retain stock for rental only
- Provide detailed guidance on levels of commuted sum levels where utilised
- Retention of existing threshold
- Retention of existing 25% contribution

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

General

Clarification has been sought on defining what affordable housing is and that they just be referred to as Council or Housing Association. Also that affordability depends on income. The delivery of affordable housing covers a wide range of delivery mechanisms ranging through rental accommodation, assisted self-build (RHOG), shared equity and private affordable provision so the terms suggested are too narrow. A wider definition of affordable housing is available in the supplementary guidance on affordable housing. The provision of affordable housing can take many different forms, rental accommodation, shared equity provision of affordable plots. The delivery of a specific type of housing relates directly to the identified demand for any development.

The question of innovative methods of affordable housing delivery was raised. The Council will continue to examine ways of bringing more affordable housing to development, but has already brought forward the Highland Housing Alliance.

Scottish Government funding and the work of the Council's Housing and Property Service enabled the Highland Housing Alliance to be set up. The Alliance is a not for profit development company that has been set up to help build more new affordable and private houses for people in the Highlands. The Alliance works with Housing Associations, Landowners and Private Developers to ensure as many housing sites as possible are used for new homes.

Comments indicate that affordable housing should be located near public transport links, Affordable tend to be high density and not appropriate for village character. It is agreed that the development of affordable housing should utilise the existing transport links and other infrastructure and services. There is a need to seek to provide affordable housing in rural locations where there is an identified need. In terms of higher densities many highland settlements comprise of higher density housing at their core.

The development of affordable housing alongside private sector housing was raised with comment that these different sectors of housing be developed separately. There is scope for the development of small scale affordable proposals that are not associated with private developments. One of the aims of the affordable housing

policy is to develop mixed sustainable communities with a choice of tenure, type and size of housing being available.

It is suggested that the Local Authority should supply affordable housing and that this should not come from cross-subsidy and that affordable housing development should not hinder the progression of private development. Also the potential for Registered Social Landlords existed to buy excess housing stock on market. Planning policy and advice does indicate that planning has a role to play in the provision of affordable housing where a shortfall in supply is evidenced. The delivery of private sector housing does not necessarily meet all the housing needs of an area, in particular the need for low cost home ownership and rental opportunities. Funding streams from the Scottish Government are targeted towards the provision of affordable housing through grant to housing societies/associations. However, the overall sums available are insufficient to meet the existing and growing need for affordable housing units.

There is a need, therefore, for elements of cross-subsidy to assist in the delivery of affordable housing. The private sector are increasingly investigating ways of delivering low cost housing to the market to assist in the accommodating this sector of the housing market. Also the affordable housing policy does provide flexibility in the form of provision of an affordable contribution and as such lack of available public funding would not hinder wider development proposals.

In respect of the availability of existing private sector properties for acquisition by social landlords, the Scottish Government for run a scheme whereby those families that meet the requirement for affordable housing can purchase into the private market with benefit of an equity share to be retained by the affordable sector

In addition the Scottish Government has made available funds to the Council that will see the delivery of 52 new build Council rental houses, the first in over 20 years within the area.

The need for affordable housing to be of a high quality and well insulated to assist in reducing costs was raised in regard to affordable housing standards. In terms of compliance with the Building Standards, affordable housing units are built in excess of this standard in terms of the thermal efficiency of these standards. Standards of space and design were also subject of comment and the need to improve and increase these. The funding available to Registered Social Landlords relates to the type of dwelling that is to be built and also the size of family that can be accommodated so to a degree is determined by central government.

The removal of Right to Buy on affordable properties was called for and consequent retention of stock for rental. The Council has had "Pressured Areas Status" since 2005; this means that tenants who started their current tenancies on or after 30 September 2002 in the designated "Pressured Areas" have their Right to Buy (RTB) suspended for five years until November 2010. The Council has recently applied for this to be extended for a further five year period and the suspension of Right to Buy applied to all Areas within Highland, excluding Caithness. In Caithness, Pressured Area Status has been applied for in Thurso. The charitable status of the majority of Housing Associations gives exemption from the Right to Buy legislation.

Submissions highlighted the need to take account of abnormally high land preparation costs. National guidance indicates that planning authorities should take account of abnormal costs in their application of the policy, this will form part of the negotiations on the level of contribution being sought by the Council.

It was indicated in some comments that there should be no contribution sought where there was no demand, conversely other comments indicated that contribution should be sought regardless of need. The Council's Housing Need and Demand Assessment and other survey work has been undertaken to inform both the Highland Housing Strategy and The Highland wide Local Development Plan has identified areas where housing pressures are less and this has informed the areas in which an affordable housing contribution will not be sought at this time. Contributions will, however, be sought in locations where there is a clear shortfall in the supply of affordable housing but where this need can be met more efficiently elsewhere within the local housing market.

Concerns were raised about the mathematical accuracy of projected need for affordable housing; also that if significant proportion of population can't afford to buy, why is majority of new housing to be open market? The need for affordable housing is defined within the Councils Housing Need and Demand Assessment has been verified by the Government Centre for Housing Market Analysis as being "robust and credible". The Council is required to provide for the delivery of an effective housing supply for the projected growth in population and also household growth. The Council's affordable housing policy is aimed at assisting in the delivery of housing that is accessible to those unable to access the private housing market.

Threshold

Concern has been voiced regarding the move to lower thresholds making small scale development less attractive and the impact this may have on a potential reduction of numbers coming forward. The lower threshold has operated at the identified lower threshold in West Ross since 2006 where delivery of development generally has higher overheads. Additionally both the Sutherland Local Plan and the soon to be adopted West Highland and Islands Local currently contain policy for the application of the affordable housing contribution at the lower level. It is however a consideration and the impact on number of smaller scale developments will be monitored. The use of a lower threshold will not provide a large increase in the number of affordable houses delivered through the policy but it will have a significant effect on the geographic spread and number of settlements where affordable contributions will be sought, assisting in the delivery of affordable housing more widely through Highland. It is therefore the Council's intention to reduce the threshold for application of the requirement for affordable housing contribution. In line with the Wester Ross, Sutherland and West Highland and Islands Local Plans.

Contribution

The potential increase in percentage of affordable contribution has been question in relation to the justification for this and the potential implications for the development industry. National planning guidance indicates a benchmark figure of 25% contribution as appropriate. It also indicates that where a different percentage is required, this should be justified through the housing need and demand assessment and identified in the local housing strategy and development plan. Where there is a case for seeking an increase in the benchmark 25% the Council will refer to the annual review of housing information that is annexed to the Highland Housing Strategy. Evidence from work carried out in conjunction with the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment has indicated areas where there are significant housing pressures in respect of all sectors of the housing market. The intention is to retain the 25% contribution as the benchmark but highlight the potential for negotiating a higher level of contribution in the more pressured areas. The retention of the existing benchmark contribution will give continuity and certainty to the private sector planning.

Clarification was asked for on the potential for seeking a commuted sum and also on the ultimate use of these sums. The approach and use of commuted sums is dealt with in greater detail within the existing Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing. A sequential approach is taken in respect of the use of commuted sums; practical difficulties of managing the delivery of single or small scale affordable units have been highlighted by both the private and public sector. The use of commuted sums is most likely to be utilised in these scenarios.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Affordable Housing

Links to related Supplementary Guidance and Housing Need and Demand Assessment

See Committee Draft papers for wording

Issue (heading):	Ageing Population
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Ageing Population
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Mrs J Macdonald (11), Joan More (45), Mrs J Mayhew (50), Nairn River Community Council (51), Lochardil & District Community Council (56), Joan Noble (67), Paul & Helen Jenkins (74), Alastair Noble (76), Laid Grazings Committee (83), John Mackie (86), Paul Maden (88), Mrs L Mackintosh (90), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Inverness South Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Mr A Manson (143), Elizabeth Budge (148), Philips Aitchison Limited (162), Highlands & Islands Green Party (168), Valerie Springett (179), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Bryden Associates - Strathdearn Community Council (205), Hugh Robertson (214), Ken Nicol (215), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (229), Ardross Community Council (236), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Jeff Baker (284), J G Walford (300), Helen Campbell (301), Reynolds Architecture Ltd - Miss Joyce Hendry (302), Diane Hawksey (317), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), Scottish Government (324)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	There are no relevant adopted plan policies
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planning policy for housing for Elderly should be tied to lettings policy so only elderly can qualify for occupancy ▪ Build more houses for the Elderly ▪ Support for sites in centrally located sites with the use of brownfield land where possible ▪ Market forces should be allowed to prevail in providing appropriate accommodation ▪ Support specialist building firms providing housing for Elderly, more housing with Wardens ▪ Growth in elderly population brings with it additional costs in their care ▪ Don’t believe the capacity exists to meet future elderly needs which will be exacerbated by the population growth projections proposed. ▪ Would like this policy to be expanded and given greater emphasis in the plan ▪ Wish to see mix of elderly / general housing, not all elderly together ▪ Need policy so housing suitable for elderly is available ▪ The requirement for housing provision for an ageing population will depend on the Housing Need and Demand Assessment some areas may need up to 50% of new housing to be for this purpose. ▪ More infrastructure needed to support this ▪ Need to increase in-migration to rural areas where ageing population is an issue ▪ Population is static, In migration favours elderly retired ▪ Need for specific facilities to deal with elderly needs, Run by non-profit organisations ▪ Feel there is a need for the provision of more care homes for the elderly ▪ Housing should provide more bungalow accommodation that is suitable for the older market ▪ Policy shouldn’t presume what is suitable, there are a range of needs 	

<p>including purpose built semi-sheltered accommodation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure needs to be in place to support elderly population attracted ▪ Appropriately designed housing will assist in reducing the burden on the Council ▪ Housing provided should be able to be occupied by younger people ▪ Suggest areas of search for appropriate sites located close to facilities ▪ All housing should have a mix, Elderly people do not quality for affordable and have to move, Allotment space should be provided with all developments ▪ Housing for the elderly should be integrated into the community and not segregated ▪ Insufficient reference has been made to providing care in the home ▪ Developers should take account of the fact that many elderly can afford moderately spacious accommodation and not assume that small properties are appropriate ▪ No new build as will only aggravate current imbalance between age groups, The Council can barely cope with existing elderly – how will they manage with increased numbers? Most immigrants are of retirement age ▪ Should provide detail and timescale for implementation of policy proposals on housing for ageing population ▪ What about provision of housing for older people with no special needs? ▪ There is a need to quantify the size and impact of ageing population ▪ Would support plans that encourage developments that provide something in between, eg assisted living in apartments/housing that can be rented, part owned or wholly owned.
<p>Policy sought by those submitting representations:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add planning policy to constrain the occupation of housing for the elderly to those qualifying. • Further investment will be needed in addition to assist in delivering adequate provision for the elderly • Need for plan to have a greater emphasis on the importance of this topic for the future of Highlands • Expand the overall strategy of growth on sustainable principles to inform the what, where and when of growth
<p>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</p>
<p>Comments indicated that it was felt there was Insufficient reference to care in the home. The Council's policy position regarding care in the home is expressed in the Council's Social Work Service Plan. The intention of including policy within the Highland wide Local Development Plan is to assist in the delivery of housing suitable for older people in locations close to services and facilities.</p> <p>Concern was intimated regarding the Council's ability to cope with the existing elderly population and how will they manage with increased numbers and the additional costs in their care. The Council's Social Work strategy seeks to address the needs of an ageing population with the focus on how to meet the care needs of individuals at home. Population projections indicate that the existing resident population will make up the vast majority of the ageing population.</p> <p>Issues were raised regarding the provision of housing for older people with no special needs and that developers should take account of the fact that many elderly can afford spacious accommodation and not assume small properties are appropriate. The Building Standards now require that all new houses are now built to a standard that can accommodate the needs of the elderly in terms of accessibility and ability to</p>

be readily adapted to accommodate specialised needs. Whilst this allows for the adaptation of new build housing to accommodate the needs of an ageing population there is a clear need for the provision of purpose built accommodation that can directly serve this sector of the population. Planning policy will seek to provide a wide range of accommodation that is appropriate for projected household types including the ageing population and look to the provision of a mix of properties including single storey appropriately sited within developments to provide ready access to available services, facilities and transport links.

Support was given to plans that encourage developments that provide alternatives to care in the home or care homes e.g. assisted living in apartments/housing that can be rented, part owned or wholly owned. Planning policy considers proposals of this nature would be assessed in the context of the suitability of a development to the surrounding area. The preparation of supplementary guidance on this issue will provide a basis for consideration.

It was indicated that policy should be put in place to restrict the occupancy of housing to the elderly. While specialist housing may carry such restrictions in terms of titles to houses and also tenancy conditions the approach favoured by the Council would be for a widespread consideration of the development of housing types that can fulfil wider housing needs while being adaptable enough to cater for living requirements in later years.

It was also indicated that there was a need to quantify the size and impact of ageing population. Further information on the projected changes in population and households can be accessed from the Council's Housing Need and Demand Assessment. Household projections indicate that between 2011 and 2021 an anticipated 12,623 new households will be created. Of that increase the element expected for households headed by a retirement age person (ie 65+) is 10,168 representing a percentage increase of 35% in that age group over the 10 year period. This will increase the percentage of households headed by 65+ year olds from 29% to 34% of total households. This represents a significant increase in the demand for housing suitable for the changing needs of the community.

Support was given for the development of centrally located sites for appropriate housing was given with the use of brownfield land where possible. The policy option seeks to identify and allocate appropriately sited development opportunities for the development of housing and where appropriate indicate the suitability for these to accommodate housing for the elderly. In many settlements these opportunities will lie on infill sites that have been previously developed. The Highland wide LDP will also include a policy encouraging the reuse of previously used land.

It was also stated in comment that housing for the elderly should be integrated into the community and not segregated. The Housing Need and Demands Assessment indicate the level and type of housing need for the area. This information along with waiting list and needs survey information will assist in forming the type of housing need within settlements. The preparation of further guidance will examine the potential for the delivery of housing for the elderly to be integrated within larger development proposals.

In the context of the provision of an adequate supply of housing land this is a main element of the development plan. The Council has a requirement to assist in the delivery of housing that meet the varying needs of the wider community. The growing proportion of the older population should be catered for with housing that responds to the housing priorities we have in later life. The Building Standards in Scotland set

out a solid framework for the delivery of housing that is readily adaptable to the changing needs of the older population. However to meet some of these requirements adaptations are required to properties and also changes to the use of living spaces. Older groups and disabled are important groups and although needs are not identical, disability tends to increase with age and the housing needs of both groups could in principle meet the shared needs of both groups. There is an existing and growing market for the delivery of housing that can accommodate changing needs of the population without the need to especially adapt housing significantly.

The housing supply is largely focussed on the needs of those wishing to enter the housing market or to move within the market to a larger property. The provision of more modest accommodation is aimed primarily at starter homes rather than those wishing to downsize to properties better suited to their changing needs. Housing demand in this sector is likely to be primarily for 2 bedroom properties delivered in higher density single storey/courtyard homes in appropriate sustainable locations that will meet an increasing demand for this type of low-rise housing. There is likely a shortfall in choice in the housing market for this type of move with an assumption that as we get older we will wish to stay put in a family home. There is an opportunity within the housing market to cater for this sector to accommodate what is an increasing proportion of the population. Developing a true mix of housing types will assist in the ability of the older population to live longer in their community. Housing development tuned to the priorities of the older population can draw “empty nesters” and those who are thinking forward to downsize and take advantage of homes that can more readily accommodate future needs. The development of mixed sustainable communities is a main tenet for future development in Highland’s communities. The development of this approach will assist in the ability for older people to maintain their role in the community.

Where a higher level of assistance is sought by individuals the solutions may involve the development of supported communities with facilities aimed at providing a sliding scale of care as and when needed. These communities should seek to integrate with the wider community where possible through the development of pedestrian and footpath linkages and through social interaction with certain facilities being available to the wider older community.

There will continue to be a role for dedicated care homes for people with the need for a greater level of assistance that can no longer be catered for within the home environment. Proposals that seek to address these needs will have to be assessed in the context of the Joint Community Care Plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Accommodation for an Ageing Population

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Air Quality
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Sustainable Development and Climate Change
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Elizabeth Budge (148), Julian Walford (155) Pilips Aitchison Limited (162), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Robert Goodwin (234), John Edmondson Ardross Community Council (236), John Waring (250), Eveline Waring (253), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Brenda Steele (319), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Structure Plan W12
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not only new development should have to adhere with this policy. • Air quality is not an issue. • Ban incinerators to tackle air quality issues. • More data needs to be collected on air quality to be able to use the policy. • If there is any detrimental impact on air quality a planning application should be rejected. Local communities should be protected from air borne emissions from waste management. • Need to be clear on what standard is for air quality. • A standard should be set and universally applied. • Soft engineering can improve air quality for local people. • Potentially a need to improve existing housing stock to improve/safeguard air quality. • Policy needs to be developed in the proposed plan. Need to demonstrate understanding of current issues, how existing problems can be addressed and stop and future problems arising. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy on air quality which can be retrofitted. • A political statement on the use of incinerators. • Clear air quality standards to be set out in a policy. • Demonstration of the current issues. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>A policy on air quality which can be retrofitted The Planning System does make provisions for or allow development of a policy framework which can be applied retrospectively. Planning Applications are assessed against the Development Plan which is in place at the time of determination and it would be unfair and indefensible to place a requirement on developments prior to their development. For clarity, the policy which is developed for use in the Highland wide Local Development Plan will not be retrofitted.</p> <p>A political statement on the use of incinerators. The Highland wide Local Development Plan will set out policy considerations for waste management facilities of which Energy from Waste (EfW) will be a part. There will be a need for any development for an EfW facility to be determined using any air quality policy which is developed.</p>	

Clear air quality standards to be set out in a policy

In order to ensure a flexible approach when considering applications it is not believed that having air quality standards set out in a policy to be beneficial. This is because air quality standards are subject to change which is outwith the control of The Highland Council. Instead of including the air quality standards in the policy the HwLDP will contain a link to the most recent national air quality standards set out in the National Air Quality Strategy and this is the standard which will be considered when determining an application which is likely to have an impact on local air quality.

Demonstration of the current issues

The Highland Council does not currently have any Local Air Quality Management Areas, however, there are areas which do have issues with air quality. These areas are not fixed and can change dependant on a number of factors. As the areas are so changeable we do not believe that it would be beneficial to describe them in the HwLDP as this would mean the plan may become out of date quickly.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Air Quality
Policy - Pollution

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Business & Industrial Land (all issues)
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Business & Industrial Land
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Staffin Community Council (13), I. Brandt (18), P. Mason (24), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), Highland Council Access Team (70), M. Harrison (73), P. Maden (88), L.M Mackintosh (90), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Inverness South Community Council (107), SNH (118), E. Budge (148), Cromarty Arts (150), R. Mardon (156), J. Walford (155), Philips Aitchison Ltd (162), British Waterways (177), Halcrow Group (Loch Ness Centre) (169), I. Cowan (185), Turnberry Consulting for IABP Ltd (191), Bryden Associates (Strathdearn Community Council) (205), A. Macleod (206), Nairn Residents Concern Group (209), Kincaig & Vicinity Community Council (225), M. Hutcheson & A. Lowe (226), Graham & Sibbald for Mr & Mrs Brian Grant (231), R. Goodwin (234), Dingwall Community Council (235), Ardrross Community Council (236), J. Waring (250), E. Waring (253), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Council (256), R. Piercy (257), Dunnet Head Educational Trust (259), Colliers CRE for Whiteness Property Company (260), D. Buchanan (265), Turley Associates for Sainsbury's Supermarkets (267), Mr & Mrs C Stafford (272), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285)	
Intended impact on approved development plan "general" policies	Replace SP Business policies B1, B2, B3 & B7
Council's summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant opportunities have been omitted; food and drink, life sciences, the digital economy, education and the wider energy industry as well as the role of retail development. • The reference to small scale local businesses/ micro businesses also needs to be developed. Proposed plan to make express reference to the IABP's allocation. • Consideration should be given to targets for the minimum amount of land available to businesses at all times in a range of places within Inverness City region and local centres. • Mixed response regarding mixed use developments; support for a reduction in travel but this should be limited to new developments only. A more ambitious approach could be considered which would require new development proposals for over 50 houses to include mixed use proposals for however it was also felt unnecessary to introduce a this requirement • Preferred option allows for a range of economic development sites, with a flexible and pro-active approach that is welcoming for business and reflects 'real-life' demand. • Point 3 of the preferred option seems to give development a green light regardless of what might be written in the Plan. Development should be more tightly controlled and therefore have a lesser impact on the environment. • More recognition required for home-based micro businesses, some of which will grow into larger operations and require small commercial premises within the locality • Tourism is the main industry and should be shielded from any negatives i.e. wind farm developments. North Highland Tourism is not visible enough. • The alternative option has a lesser impact on the environment and is more in 	

line with the desire for a more plan led approach to development, identifying sites more openly and inclusively. Identification of sites needs business input and opportunities for existing businesses to develop

- Alternative is to encourage many small clean sustainable industries.
- Economic growth is unlikely in the future whilst the growth in sustainable industry is essential. Inward investment projects are less likely to development sustainable industries and communities than locally invested and subsidised schemes
- Wish to see evidenced all info that was considered before advancing figure of 5000 new jobs/ any plans which HC or other body has put in place to attract such large scale employment to the A96 area (this relates to the figure specified in Nairn section of the MIR)
- Agree with preferred option, need policies supporting home working with associated facilities like improved broadband speed. Protection for sustainable tourism businesses which depend on a high quality landscape.
- Protection is important for services like local pub which provides for residents and visitors – supporting other tourism businesses like estates, accommodation providers etc.
- Need suitable allocation of simple small scale light industrial units to help support local businesses

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Reference to small local businesses needs to be further developed
- More emphasis on the importance of infrastructure and services in designation of business sites
- Strategy to take account of the contribution that retail development has to sustainable economic development
- Specific sites must be allocated including simple small scale light industry allocations
- Recognition of the role of home-based micro businesses which may grow and require their own small commercial premises within the locality
- Reduction in threshold for mixed use developments from over 100 houses to over 50
- Inclusion of a specific policy for the economic potential of Dalcross Airport
- No threshold should be specified at all
- More provision for community consultation
- Access/Open Space key to designation of sites
- Policies to provide more protection for the tourism industry
- More protection for the environment
- More emphasis on the importance of tourism
- Modification of the stated alternative to allow building of new housing as part of business developments but not new large scale businesses within existing residential or agricultural land uses
- More definition/clarity regarding the 'right' place (p.58)
- The inclusion of targets for a minimum amount of land available to businesses at all times in the Inverness City Region and local centres
- Inclusion of policies to control development to prevent any damaging impact on the environment.
- Proposed Plan should identify opportunities for existing businesses to develop
- Recognition of opportunities for development in leisure sector
- Inclusion of reference to the established identification and allocation at Inverness Airport Business Park which should be promoted as the 1st phase

<p>of development in the A96 Corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The right of the developer to apply for the change of use to residential should be curtailed
<p>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</p>
<p>Comments regarding open space, tourism and area-specific locations are dealt with in those specific schedule 4s.</p> <p><u>Mixed use developments</u> - National planning policy states that development plans should identify opportunities for low impact industrial, business and services uses which can co-exist with housing and other sensitive uses. Integrating new employment generation with supporting infrastructure and housing development is an important means of achieving sustainable communities and reducing the need to travel.</p> <p><u>Pro-active approach</u> - The development of business is of the greatest importance to the economic health and well-being of the Highland region and is also essential to ensure growth occurs in a sustainable manner, particularly given the housing and population projections outlined in the Council's Housing Need and Demand Assessment.</p> <p><u>Business and Industrial Land</u> - The Council agrees that land should be safeguarded and promoted for employment uses especially where the private sector will not provide it. Greater detail on specific enterprises and allocations will be given within area local development plans.</p>
<p>Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content</p>
<p>Policy - Business and Industrial Land Policies - Tourism Policy - Retailing</p> <p>Proposals Map to identify settlements requiring Class 5 industrial sites and other strategic employment sites</p> <p>See Committee Draft papers for wording.</p>

Issue (heading):	Caithness and Sutherland
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Caithness and North Sutherland
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Brenda Herrick (5), A Moore (23), DSRL (26), Hitrans (33), Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (42), Brian Lynch (54), Ms Janetta Christie (81), Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Mrs M Moore (96), Mr John D Moore (97), Inverness South Community Council (107), SNH (118), Mrs E Holland (153), Philip Aitchison Ltd (162), Annie Stewart (172), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), HIE (190), Caithness Partnership (224), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Railfuture Scotland (227), Ardross Community Council (236), Amy Walker (239), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Golspie Community Council (266), Mr & Mrs C Stafford (272), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274), RMT (276), Mr J Bingham (283), Pete Campbell (290), Mr Alistair Christie (295), William Mowat (297) EMAC Planning (298), JG Walford (300), Helen Campbell (301), Scottish Government (324), Ward 12 Caol & Mallaig (332), SEPA (326), EMAC Planning-Scotia Homes (335)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Caithness and Sutherland element of Structure Plan Spatial Strategy. The proposed vision and spatial strategy is complementary to the more detailed vision and strategy within the Sutherland and Caithness Local Plans.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of representations agreed with the preferred option set out in the Main Issues Report. • Improved broadband coverage is necessary for regeneration. • Need to identify development opportunities outwith the Inner Moray Firth. • Require improved road and rail infrastructure and improved ferry links to Orkney. Bypass corridors for the A9 should be shown. More freight should be carried by rail. Harbour facilities should be developed. • Dornoch Rail Link should be supported and shown on a map. • Dounreay should be redeveloped as a nuclear power producing site. There is support to produce an updated Dounreay Planning Framework. A Pressurised Water Reactor fed power station should be built at Dounreay; it would create jobs and provide power generation. Jobs to replace those at Dounreay should be a priority. • Thurso and Wick should be identified as a joint sub-regional centre. • The Main Issues Report gives little consideration to Sutherland in the Caithness and North Sutherland section. • Land should be allocated in Golspie for relocation of companies that have outgrown their current premises and have been denied access to the Business Park. • Enterprise and innovation opportunities, connected communities, transport opportunities, IT connectivity and skills opportunities should all be encouraged. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	

- Improved broadband
- Improved road and rail infrastructure including Dornoch Rail Link
- Improved ferry links
- Thurso and Wick identified as a joint sub-regional centre
- More consideration of Sutherland in this section
- Local employment

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

The Vision for Caithness and Sutherland in the Proposed Plan will give more emphasis to Sutherland and the challenges it faces. It will acknowledge that broadband coverage is important in keeping the area competitive and connected to the global economy. The Spatial Strategy for Sutherland has been agreed in the recently adopted Sutherland Local Plan.

The Proposed Plan will contain spatial strategies for Highland which will identify strategic development opportunities. The Highland wide Local Development Plan will be identifying large strategic allocations for development and will not be identifying specific allocations in settlements; the appropriate vehicle for this is the area local development plans which will have allocations for settlements.

The spatial strategy for Caithness and Sutherland will identify improved road, rail and ferry connections and harbours where there is potential for offshore renewables bases to be accommodated. There will also be suite of policies for transport issues and there will be a link to the Local transport Strategy. The spatial strategy will identify the rail link north but it will not show any potential Dornoch Rail Link as this would need support from the Scottish Government in order for a possible route to be safeguarded; The Rail Link does not currently feature in the Scottish Governments list of projects. The map will have a key which will distinguish between road and rail links. A9 bypass routes cannot be safeguarded as projects are not committed to by Transport Scotland. Safeguarding potential routes could cause significant planning blight for properties along the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided by not safeguarding such routes.

The settlement hierarchy in the Proposed Plan will show Thurso and Wick as a joint sub-regional centre.

Dounreay will be shown on the spatial strategy map for Caithness and Sutherland and an updated Dounreay Planning Framework will be produced. The Scottish Government oppose the development of new nuclear power stations. Dounreay will continue to be an important source of local employment well past the lifetime of this plan.

The vision for Caithness and Sutherland will encourage many of the key opportunities identified in the Caithness and North Sutherland Regeneration Partnership: Vision for Caithness and North Sutherland and it will highlight the links between it and the Proposed Plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

- Caithness and Sutherland Vision and Spatial Strategy
- Proposals Map shows settlement hierarchy
- Caithness settlement specific development areas and Policy that invites masterplanned proposals
- See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Caithness and Sutherland General
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Caithness and North Sutherland
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Brenda Herrick (5), Brian Thorogood (6), Mr Paul Maden (88), Ms Janetta Christie (81), SNH (118), Dunnet Head Educational Trust (259), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274), Mr J Bingham (283), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Mr Alistair Christie (295)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Caithness and Sutherland element of Structure Plan Spatial Strategy. The proposed vision and spatial strategy is complementary to the more detailed vision and strategy within the Sutherland and Caithness Local Plans.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the NHS. • Do the Council have powers to take ownership of derelict listed buildings? • Tourism should be enhanced and developed along the north coast, not just at John O’Groats. It should be identified as an area of green tourism driven by renewable energy with an organisation created similar to the Moray Firth Partnership and better links with Orkney. • The strategy map should include international and national heritage designations. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy map to include heritage designations • Tourism opportunities to be enhanced and developed along the north coast. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>NHS service delivery is outwith the scope the Highland wide Local Development Plan which is a land use planning document.</p> <p>If the owner of a listed building fails to keep it in a reasonable state of repair, the Planning Authority or the Scottish Ministers may be entitled to acquire it by compulsory purchase if the owner fails to repair it in accordance with a previously served Repairs Notice. The Council’s preference is to work with owners and encourage them to undertaken any necessary repairs; compulsory purchase will only be used once all other alternatives have been exhausted.</p> <p>The importance of tourism to the economy of Caithness and Sutherland is recognised and as such the Proposed Plan will support a high quality tourist industry where tourists are attracted by high quality facilities. We will also encourage the regeneration and revitalisation of John O’Groats as a key tourist destination and to help support regeneration of the wider sub-region. The vision for Caithness and Sutherland will acknowledge that the high quality natural heritage is important in attracting tourists.</p> <p>The spatial strategy for Caithness and Sutherland will not identify international and</p>	

national heritage designations as these will be shown on the proposals map in the proposed plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Caithness and Sutherland Vision and Spatial Strategy

Proposals Map for heritage features

Policy - John O'Groats

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Caithness and Sutherland
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Caithness and North Sutherland
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Thurdistoft Farm (8), E.ON UK (31), Juliet Robinson (34), International Power Marine Developments Ltd (40), Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (42), Mrs M Moore (96), Mr John D Moore (97), The Crown Estate (100), SNH (118), Mrs E Holland (153), Highland and Islands Green Party (168), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Floris Greenlaw (222), Dunnet Head Educational Trust (259), Scottish Renewables (270), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), EMAC Planning (298), Inverlochty & Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), Scottish Government (324)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Caithness and Sutherland element of Structure Plan Spatial Strategy. The proposed vision and spatial strategy is complementary to the more detailed vision and strategy within the Sutherland and Caithness Local Plans.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine renewables should be supported; they should however be sensitive to wildlife and particularly sea life and the natural environment should be protected. The links to this industry and economic development should be highlighted. There is potential to create engineering opportunities and local employment. • Consistent and timely pre-application advice should be given for marine renewables developments to deal with the conflicts between economic development and environmental issues, so as not to deter investors. • The Highland wide Local Development Plan should identify all areas of coastline that may be suitable for offshore and marine renewables. • Electricity grid reinforcements of national importance to supporting the offshore renewables industry should be identified. Where appropriate the Council should work in partnership with Orkney Islands Council. • Wind power should also be encouraged on appropriate sites. • The potential for economic development from the West of Shetland Oil and Gas exploration should also be considered. • The Coastal Development Strategy should be consulted on at the same time as the Highland wide Local Development Plan. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine renewables should be supported but should respect the natural environment • Link marine renewables to local economic development and employment • All areas of potentially suitable coastline for marine renewables should be identified • Electricity grid reinforcements of national importance to supporting the offshore renewables industry should be identified 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	

The Proposed Plan will support marine renewables and the development of related facilities and industries. The Spatial Strategy for Caithness and Sutherland will identify offshore renewables bases at Scrabster, Gills Bay and Wick. The Pentland Firth will be identified as an area for renewable energy development. It is recognised that this industry has the potential to provide local employment and sustainable economic growth. The Proposed Plan will through the spatial strategies identify particular potential areas that may be suitable for off shore and marine renewables, although this will not be to the exclusion of proposals being considered in other areas.

Part of the vision for Caithness and Sutherland will be that the area will become an international centre of excellence for marine renewables, including marine engineering and environmental management.

The spatial strategy in the Proposed Plan will identify electricity grid reinforcements of national importance and the Plan will also contain a policy on electricity grid infrastructure (see Renewable Energy).

All marines renewables developments will be subject to scrutiny and part of this will look at potential impacts on the environment. There will be a policy for renewable energy. The vision for Caithness and Sutherland will highlight the importance of the natural environment. The Council operates a pre-application advice service which any potential marine renewables development would be encouraged to use. This enables all the appropriate people to meet at an early stage in the process.

Wind energy will be dealt with in the Proposed Plan via a renewable energy policy and Supplementary Guidance.

The Coastal Development Strategy has been adopted as non-statutory Supplementary Guidance in the interim, pending consultation on and progression of the Proposed Plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Caithness and Sutherland Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Renewable Energy Developments

Policy - Coastal development

Policy - Business and Industrial Land

Coastal Development Strategy as Supplementary Guidance

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Caithness and Sutherland
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Caithness and North Sutherland
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Brian Lynch (54), J Fitzgerald (75), Annie Stewart (172), William Mowat (297), EMAC Planning (298), Helen Campbell (301), EMAC Planning - Scotia Homes Ltd (335)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	<p>Replace Caithness and Sutherland element of Structure Plan Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed vision and spatial strategy is complementary to the more detailed vision and strategy within the Sutherland and Caithness Local Plans.</p> <p>Remove Caithness hinterlands</p>
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing in the countryside should be encouraged and the hinterland policy should be revised. • The boundary around Thurso should be extended further and the settlement of Dixonfield should become a PP1 area (Caithness Local Plan) as there is a sewer on site. • Restrictions on house building between Wick and Thrumster should be removed. • What ‘provisions’ need to be in place for housing development? This should be specified. If it is based on ‘commitments in principle’ then this should be stated. • New towns around Wick should be considered due to potential transport links including the airport. • Land at Castletown identified in a Masterplan should be allocated for development in the Proposed Plan. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hinterland policy should be revised and housing in the countryside should be encouraged • New towns around Wick • Land allocated in a Masterplan for Castletown should be allocated in the proposed plan 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>Settlement boundaries and potential areas for development can be examined during the review of the area Local Development Plans. The Highland wide Local Development Plan is looking at policies rather than settlement boundaries and site allocations.</p> <p>The hinterland around Wick and Thurso will be removed, however all applications for housing will still be considered against all other policies. This is in order to help with sustainable economic development and aide the regeneration of Caithness. There is Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance which gives direction on development of housing in the open countryside. There is also forthcoming Siting and Design Supplementary Guidance which will give information on appropriate siting and design. Further details on housing in the countryside will be available in the housing in the countryside policy in the Proposed Plan.</p>	

The Council will support the delivery of the Castletown Masterplan and it will be adopted as Supplementary Guidance to the Local Development Plan. This will be included in the vision for Caithness and Sutherland.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy for Caithness and Sutherland

Policy - Housing in the Countryside (Hinterland areas)

Specific section on Caithness development areas and a general policy on other masterplanned proposals

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Coastal Development
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Coastal Development
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Mrs J MacDonald (11), Juliet Robinson (34), Lochardil and Drummond Community Council (56), Joan Noble (67), Gordon Mooney (71), Mary Harrision (73), Kingairloch Estate (95), The Crown Estate (100), SNH (118) Skeabost and District Community Council (176), SCDI (180), Mr Cowan (185), HIE (190), Anne Thomas (197) Ken Nicol (215), Highland Council (241) Patricia Roberts (247) Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Council (256) Golspie Community Council (266) Whiteness property company (260) Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285) Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), Scottish Government (324), WYG Planning & Design (325), SEPA (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace SP FA5 Drop SP Policies FA1, FA2, FA3, FA4, FA6, FA7, FA8, FA9, FA10, FA11
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>On coastal erosion/flooding/sea level rises</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other plans will be fruitless if there is a threat of land instability • SNH - UKCP09 outlines a range of changes that are expected in the coming decade (see http://ukclimateprojections.defra.gov.uk). A scoping review of Coastal Flooding (see http://www.sniffer.org.uk/ code: FRM 10) identifies the Inner Moray Firth as being at higher risk from the combined effects of coastal flooding than the remainder of the Highland coastline. • Concern about development in view of rising sea levels. <p><u>On coastal/aquaculture policy for the Highland Wide Local Development Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where aquaculture policies are being developed, there is a need to align these with other authorities issuing planning permissions to marine fish farms (cooperation is a benefit to industry and overall environmental protection). • Concerned that Aquaculture Framework Plans do not provide anything approaching a comprehensive coverage of substantial marine resources. • Unsure how this ties with aquaculture framework plans and how spatial guidance, informed by environmental constraints would generally be available. • Feels there are too many poorly sited fish farms. • Close down/phase out all fish farming in tidal river estuary/ sea loch and move offshore as has been done elsewhere. The evidence of the effect of fish farm on wild migratory species is well founded. • Feels there are too many poorly sited fish farms in scenic areas and on migratory routes of wild fish. Atlantic salmon are a European protected species, and the Council as planning authority has obligations under the European Habitats Directive in that regard. • SEPA: Highland Council at the vanguard of preparing aquaculture framework plans over many years, these have been useful. The preferred options although vague are commendable. <p><u>On the coastal classification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embargo against development on the isolated coast and a presumption 	

against development on the undeveloped coast which makes the proposals for Delnies unacceptable.

- Coastal development has to be considered very carefully and in particular the area to the west of Nairn Golf Course covering Delnies. It is an isolated beautiful stretch of coast and the Scottish Plan for coastal development does not permit development of these areas they are to be left in their natural state (note: area lies within the undeveloped coast).
- Designations of coast should have regard to future opportunities rather than reflecting current land uses

Specific feedback on the Coastal Development Strategy (CDS)

- Ensure that recreational users are consulted, the region offers world class destination for water users (surfers, sea kayakers etc). Ensure the appropriate National Governing bodies are consulted.
- Scottish Council for Development and Industry: welcome the link between the local development plan and the CDS due to need for integrated streamlined approach to sustainable economic development in Highland's coastal areas.
- Important that the HwLDP and CDS are fully compatible and coastal issues. A96 corridor, Easter Ross, Nigg, Dounreay, Scrabster and Wick Harbours, marine renewables onshore infrastructure, and coastal flood management should be reflected and taken account of the coastal /marine issues in the Coastal Development Strategy.
- Welcome the links between the development plan and the Coastal Development Strategy,
- Ferries, marinas, fish farm infrastructure etc all depend heavily on working within a policy context which allows appropriate development.
- Wider tourism functions for the A96. The development of Whiteness and impact on the marine environment has been dealt with through the outline consent, and management plans that suggest that the Moray Firth and its habitat can co-exist and complement each other. CDS and proposed plan should reflect this.
- Support sustainable development and use of coastal zone whilst safeguarding its natural and cultural heritage assets because of the economic benefit from tourism.
- Strike a balance between coastal and inland development.
- Important that the CDS is consistent with the development plan, for example ensuring that appropriate development can take place to fully support the development of marine renewable energy projects.
- SEPA: Both plans need to be future proofed so they link with marine spatial planning under the Marine (Scotland) Bill and implementations requirements of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) as they develop.
- SEPA: Because of different requirements they do not anticipate that the potential locations of marine renewables will present a major conflict with fin fish aquaculture sites unless practices change considerably allowing aquaculture into more energetic waters.

General feedback on coastal issues

- Coastal areas provide considerable potential to deliver significant economic benefit in fragile areas. Cites role of Corpach/Mallaig and Kishorn and believes it is imperative their commercial and industrial activity are protected. Also great recreational potential in terms of pontoons, moorings and shore facilities for leisure yachts.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

On the coastal classification

- Scottish Council for Development and Industry: The best natural resources are often located around the most isolated coasts. Generally supportive of presumption against but it may be that essential onshore infrastructure is required for offshore developments and where no practical alternatives exist after weighing up the wider environmental benefits, there may be circumstances in which development is needed to meet statutory renewable energy and climate change targets.
- Concerned about the CDS generalisations of developed, undeveloped, and isolated. A more robust classification would be welcomed with more detail set out eg current pockets of development etc perhaps based on modelling used in Norway and Canada. A model of good practice suggested - Scottish Sustainable Marine Environment Initiative (SSMEI) Sound of Mull Project and it was felt more weight needed to be given to local management plans where these exist and or loch framework plans.
- Caution against a potential anti development designation. Need for clarification and further consultation on this.
- Any policy appropriate or not is hindered as this leaves decision to public bodies or individual planner to decide. All coastal areas must have same protection to ensure safeguarding of fragile environments.
- Need to reconcile any potential for conflict with the identified expansion areas for the A96 corridor which lie within undeveloped coast.

On coastal/aquaculture policy for the Highland Wide Local Development Plan

- In absence of comprehensive planning framework we need to augment with a process of developer-led planning based on pre application discussions with the planning authority.
- SNH: The alternative is closer to what is required by SPP22 and the draft consolidated SPP and on the face of it seems preferable in terms of providing clear and specific spatial guidance, informed by environmental constraints. They welcome the alternative as it accords with modern way of map based plans
- Prefer the alternative to the preferred option mapping sensitive areas as this is much more strategic than the preferred option.
- Consider, in line with SPP, the scope for providing locational guidance on the location of new fish farm development.
- Other criteria necessary in general policy, species and habitats, visual impact, land/seascape, coastal processes and access and recreation.

General feedback on coastal issues

- Whiteness property company: Coastal development via its new harbour should be identified in the proposed plan, the relationship between the site, aquatic environment, and tourism potential should also be referred to. They wish to see the site capacity of 4000 units (doubling), advantage of being decontaminated and fully remediated, benefiting from major utility connections and potential for future retail and identifiable town centre commensurate with this. Future opportunity for expansion of business and industry should also be recognised.
- Support proposal by RSPB and Scottish Wildlife trust to create a bird hide on loch fleet but find the current position on the north shore unacceptable because visitors would have to use an unmanned level crossing and dangerous exit onto the A9. They encourage the council to work to promote a site accessed from Ferry road instead.
- Development should not be promoted where it has an unacceptable impact

on statutory designations or natural heritage features.

- Agree with MIR but emphasise the urgency in identifying onshore facilities for marine energy facilities so that proximity of smaller ports and harbours to the Pentland Firth is recognised.
- Location of marine renewables should be part of the Marine Planning System to be introduced as part of the 2010 Act.
- SEPA: The structure and condition of the intertidal zone is a quality element in the Water Framework Directive and there is a need to protect the remaining areas of intertidal zone along some stretches of the developed coastlines these areas have become fragmented/degraded by the coalescence of development in the past.
- Account needs to be taken of onshore landing points for grid connections related to the Pentland Firth development.
- Emphasis on protecting the Inner Moray Firth from inappropriate development and industry.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Where comments relate to the Coastal Development Strategy (CDS) these issues have already been considered, with the consultation report and necessary amendments approved at May PED. However for avoidance of doubt where it involves linkage with the HwLDP the general approach is still reflected in our response here. However all the respondents on the CDS have an individual response to their comments, and the strategy is being finalised. Unlike the HwLDP there is no further opportunity for consultation and comments on the CDS.

Changes made to the CDS that influence or are closely linked to the HwLDP, or comments made to both documents.

To address the need to closer tie the HwLDP with the CDS, the CDS was amended to better reflect the major development proposals within the HwLDP including text amended in section 1.4 regarding the A96 corridor. The CDS was also amended to increase clarity as to purpose of the CDS and HwLDP.

There were further amendments to reflect the most up to date information available on sea level rise projections, and to address SNH concerns regarding wild fish populations.

Section 1.1 in the CDS also required amendment to mention the likely timescale for preparation of the national and regional marine plans and the need, in due course, for subsequent editions of the CDS and HwLDP to take these into account.

With regard to the bird hide Loch Fleet: they were advised to take their inquiry through the Local Planning Office and access officers.

On the role of the Coastal Development Strategy, Highland wide Local Development Plan and how they relate

The Council has pointed out that this is a broad-brush strategic exercise which is designed to complement the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. The HwLDP is the main statutory planning instrument so it is right and proper that it should deliver the main policy elements including general policies on development around the coast and the sustainability criteria which must be met, area-specific policies, or subject-specific policies. Section 4 of the CDS has been revised to make this clear. Whilst the largest strategic allocations are covered in the HwLDP, the future Area Local Development Plans have a role in delivering area-specific policies, and identifying appropriate sites for development.

Some correspondents felt that the draft strategy devoted insufficient attention to the issue of climate change and projected sea level rise and that the combined effects of coastal flooding had not been fully accounted for in SEPA flood mapping. Therefore further text has been added within the Coastal Development Strategy, and within the HwLDP Flood Risk policy the Council now requires a Flood risk assessment where a site borders the coast.

Some also commented that the linkage between the Coastal Development Strategy and other strategies, plans and development projects could be improved. Further text amendments have sought to address this.

On port's, and marine renewables

Detailed port development issues are considered in the HwLDP and will also be picked up in the future through the Area Local Development Plans. Reference should be made to the schedule 4 on Renewable Energy and Electricity Transmission Grids and their policies for further information on these topics.

The Main Issues Report for the Highland wide Local Development Plan suggested major bases/ ports which could in particular have potential roles to play in supporting marine renewables development, namely Nigg, Wick, Thurso/ Scrabster, Kishorn and Mallaig. Since then, and as a separate exercise, the National Renewables Infrastructure Plan (NRIP) has identified a range of sites which offer the potential to help Scotland become an established location for offshore wind turbine manufacturing and construction operations. Recognising their strategic importance the Spatial strategy of the Highland wide Local Development Plan identifies all these locations are now identified as either offshore renewable/natural resource bases or employment bases. Whilst the Council will also support the reuse of the site at Whiteness for renewables related development, should the housing element not come forward.

The Highland wide Local Development Plan seeks to provide for developments to support the growth of marine and other renewables, promoting the potential roles of ports, harbours and other bases. As more becomes known there may be potential for sites to be identified in more detail within the Area Local Development Plans with specific sites and developer requirements set out. We will also consider supplementing the Plan with Masterplans for those sites where there is a clear need, though in some cases the preparation of these may be developer-led.

On coastal erosion/flooding/sea level rises

The EuroSION project provided the European Commission with information management practices to address coastal erosion in Europe using knowledge gained from past experiences and the current status and trends of European coasts. From this EuroSION data into coastal change we can identify the areas that are subject to coastal erosion. Coastal erosion is a physical constraint and will be covered in the Supplementary Guidance to be produced on Physical Constraints. After consulting EuroSION data, SNH the relevant authority for coastal erosion can then be consulted for their expert advice. Where necessary proposals will need to be supported by computer modelling to identify the impacts, to understand how mitigation on one site may affect other areas.

Some correspondents felt that the combined effects of coastal flooding may not been fully accounted for in SEPA flood mapping of flood risk. Therefore further text has been added within the Coastal Development Strategy, and within the HwLDP the Flood Risk policy the Council now requires a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) where a

site borders the coast. A greater allowance for sea level and climate change in coastal flood risk assessment is appropriate and reflects emerging best practice.

On coastal classification and coastal policy for HwLDP

The Coastal Development Strategy as it was originally conceived has been affected by recent changes to national planning policy which removed the requirement for local authorities to classify their coasts and partially withdrew the national policies (as per NPPG 13) that went with it. The terminology favoured by the Scottish Government has changed insofar as the “Undeveloped” category (always a somewhat misleading label because it included inhabited areas) has been abandoned. However the Isolated Coast remains as a category where there is expected to be a presumption against development. Therefore the Highland wide Local Development Plan identifies Isolated Coast as a local and regionally important feature and offers policy protection within Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage policy.

The Delnies area west of Nairn lies within the undeveloped coastline and there is no associated policy suggested for this within SPP(2010). The council has followed the SPP(2010) in terms of offering policy protection to the isolated coast line. Previously in the now replaced NPPG13 the undeveloped coast line did suggest an approach to considering the appropriateness or otherwise of development, however it did not rule out development within these areas.

Our Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage policy will allow for developments where they can be shown not to compromise the amenity and heritage resource of the isolated coast. However this consideration must be balanced with any social or economic benefits, but will not be interpreted as support to all renewable energy projects regardless of their impact on the isolated coast. The planner’s assessment will need to consider issues such as whether there are: suitable alternative opportunities within less sensitive locations for this type of development; what the proposals relative contribution is towards renewable energy targets and any other social or economic benefits, and weigh these up with the proposals impact on the isolated coast. To do this the developer will need to submit any relevant assessments including Environmental Impact Assessment where appropriate, along with the specifics of the proposal including any mitigation and restoration arrangements proposed. From this type of assessment the planner will be able to judge whether the impact is outweighed by social or economic benefits.

It is considered that the coastal policy needs to account for the relative sensitivity of any part of the coast, rather than protecting all coastal areas in the same way. This is because there needs to be a proportionate and relevant type of protection afforded to the coastal area involved. Where the proposal relates to the isolated coast, the sensitivity is to evidence of human influence on the landscape. Whilst on an area of the coast that is part of a Special Landscape Area, its qualities and its sensitivities are identified within its accompanying citation. However all proposals relating to the coast need to refer to the coastal policy as there are general policy principles which should be applied to all our coastal areas.

The policies for our coastal areas in the Highland wide Local Development Plan do not solely relate to the current landuse. However in terms of the isolated coast which has wildness qualities, this lack of human influence on the landscape needs to be recognised and protected in line with Scottish Planning Policy. Development proposals in coastal locations need to be considered in line with all relevant general policies of the plan. Therefore impact on statutory protected species and any natural, built and cultural heritage features applies through application of these policies. The coastal policy suggested only deals with issues not already covered within other

general policies of the HwLDP.

On integration with the new marine planning system

National marine plans at UK and Scotland level are already in preparation and planning partnerships will be set up within the next few years to produce plans for marine regions. The Scottish Government has still to consult on boundaries for these regions but it expects there to be about 10 around the Scottish coast. The likelihood is that Highland's coastal waters will fall within 2 or 3 of these regions. Highland Council's preparation of a Coastal Development Strategy helps to lay the ground for these and clarify some of the main issues before the process of marine region planning starts in earnest. It can also act as a buffer or interface between the terrestrial and marine planning systems.

On Aquaculture policy approach

The scale of the Highland's coast line makes producing meaningful spatial guidance for the whole Highland area an immense task. The main areas of pressure are covered by the detailed and spatial analysis of the Aquaculture Framework Plans (Loch's: Sunart, Bracadale, Hourn, Inchard, Nevis) with a Coastal Plan produced for the Two Brooms Area. The Council has also produced a Coastal Development Strategy to provide an overarching vision for our coastal resource.

It should be noted that Argyll and Bute Council have had their Local Plan recently adopted and have successfully incorporated a criteria based policy to supplement their integrated coastal plans.

For spatial guidance some features would be difficult to map without a lot of background information and work necessary to refine areas such as navigational issues, settings of settlements (if not a simple buffer), natural anchorages, and recreational interests. Also other features such as carrying capacity, water quality and existing aquaculture sites would need to be updated regularly making the spatial plan date quickly.

Our preferred Aquaculture approach combines a spatial map based approach through the Aquaculture Framework Plans and coastal plans, with a criteria policy to guide the small amount of proposals that come forward outwith these areas. In order to keep the plan concise the Aquaculture policy only deals with any issues not already covered within other policies of the HwLDP. Therefore this policy needs to be read in conjunction with all other relevant policies of the plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Proposals Map identifies strategic employment sites

Policy - Coastal development

Policy - Aquaculture

Link to Coastal Development Strategy and Aquaculture Framework Plans as Supplementary Guidance

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Communications Infrastructure	
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Not included in the Main Issues Report	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
N/A		
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Structure Plan U4, U5 Drop Structure Plan U6, U7	
Council’s summary of the representation(s):		
No representations have been made regarding this issue.		
Policy sought by those submitting representations:		
No representations have been made regarding this issue.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
The development of communications infrastructure is important to the development of businesses across Highland, especially in the more rural areas. Scottish Planning Policy sets out a position on Communications Infrastructure Development and this will be reflected in the policy in the Highland wide Local Development Plan.		
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content		
Policy - Communications Infrastructure Policy - Siting and Design of Communications Infrastructure See Committee Draft papers for wording.		

Issue (heading):	Crofting and Agriculture
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Crofting and Agriculture
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Mr Bob Bull (12), Staffin Community Council (13), Lucille Shadforth (15), Irene Brandt (18), Juliet Robinson (34), Gairloch Community Council (36) 37 Craggan Crofters (37) W G Macleod (44) Mrs J Mayhew (50) Woodland Crofts Officer, Highlands and Islands Enterprise (63), Joan Noble (67), Milltown Grazing Committee (82) Mr Paul Madden (88) R Honer (89) Mrs LM MackIntosh (90) Mrs H Rask (92) Kingussie Community Council (93) Kingairloch Estate (95) Mrs Amy MacDonald (102) Avoch and Killen Community Council (103) N Williamson (104), Kirkton Farms (106), Inverness South Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Badrallach Grazings Committee (142), Conon braes Farm (146), Elizabeth Budge (148), Cromarty arts (150), Mrs E Holland (153), Julian Walford (155), Roland Mardon (156) Strathnairn Community Council (157), Phillips Aitchison Ltd (162), Annie Stewart (172), Glenurquhart Community Council (174), Skeabost and District Community Council (176), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180) Lynn MacDonald (188), Maria Del La Torre (198), Keppie Mr D MacDonald (199), Fortrose and Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Philip Hodges (210), Hugh Robertson (214), Joyce Wilkinson (216) Ian Parsons R (217), John Martin (223), Kinraig and vicinity Community Council (225), Michael Hutchison and Alison Lowe (226), Balnagowan Estates (229), 236 Ardross Community Council (236), Ward manager Lochaber (241) Patricia Roberts (247), Keppie (248), Roger Peircy (257), Diana Buchanan (265), Crofters Commission (271) Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Pete Campbell (290) Scottish Property Federation(291), Clynelish and Clyne hill common grazings (292), JG Walford (300), Bowlts Chartered Surveyors (309), Sally Melville (313), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), HIE (321)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	<p>Policies which we intend to replace / amend</p> <p>A1</p> <p>Dropped Policies</p> <p>A2,A3,A4,A5</p>
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Summary of issues raised on the protection to be given to agricultural/croft land</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real need to protect more agricultural land for various reasons. Reasons included, so we can produce maximum food locally - thus saving on imports, transportation, and the carbon footprint. There was also concern about global food shortages and the impact of climate change. • Given the need to protect agricultural land why is development/growth concentrated on good agricultural land in the A96 corridor • Prime land is very scarce and crofting is an important factor for the Highlands. • On crofts where food production is possible it needs to be safeguarded as locally important croft land. • The recent consultation on allotment policy has shown the community interest, with several communities actively pursuing community allotments; therefore protection of good land is essential. • The Crofters Commission support the preferred option which involves good local consultation with the grazing committees. They feel this process will 	

protect the more productive land from unnecessary development.

Summary of issues raised on subdivision of crofts (with new houses) and decrofting for single house sites and on establishment of new crofts with housing associated

- Concern that planning system has not been sophisticated enough to manage the piecemeal development and get an overall density that the crofting community would find acceptable.
- Concern that there is no joint working between the Crofters Commission, grazing clerks and assessors and that this leads to second homes and enriching developer pockets.
- Locally some crofts have been subdivided on the basis of new entrants. In some cases these have very little ground and appear to have only gained space to build millionaire style houses, using initially a crofting grant.
- Why perpetuate subsistence farming by creating smaller crofts (dependent on croft size)
- Crofters need a house for family members so 2 houses on a croft is fine.
- The Council should allow people to build houses so they can make an income out of their crofts.
- Crofters have a right to minimum interference from all bodies as they try and earn a living under difficult circumstances.
- HIE feel where the crofts are of a significant size then subdivision is a credible alternative to provision of new crofts. Regarding decrofting for house sites there will always be those who wish to circumvent the legislation but with this integrated working it should be possible to exclude such individuals from using public finance for personal advantage over crofting and community development.
- That decrofting does not have the power after planning consent is wrong and the new Crofting Bill promises to address this.
- The Crofters Commission point to the diagram in the HwLDP monitoring report of new relationship between planning and decrofting procedures as one of the good ideas generated at the Planning Masterclass that they would like to take forward.
- Sub division is something for others to regulate, needs to be regulated, and that the information should be provided prior to planning consent.
- There is also quite a lot of support for a blanket approach where we do not allow more than one additional house on a croft. Main reasons for choosing this option included the ease of application, reduced bureaucracy, and it has an allowance for another family house.
- SNH feel the reason for the assessment of subdivision (with associated housing) needs to be clarified is it agricultural and/or economic viability of the croft.
- Subject crofters to greater scrutiny to ensure they are crofting and encourage them to use the land.
- It would be good to have a policy which encouraged use of crofts beyond providing new house plots. It would be good to have new horticulture and forestry.
- There should be a right to a house on the croft. However for a woodland croft onsite residency is not considered necessary.

Specifically on creation of new crofts/new crofting townships

- Old crofting ground which was lost during the clearances could be resumed.
- Estate land could be used for future developments and there are grants in place at the moment to take this forward.

- The question of what is a croft should be left to those regulating crofting.
- Concern that it is too easy to get tired of crofting and sell on, there is a need to ensure any new crofts are safeguarded from get rich quick operatives.
- New Croft Townships would be outwith existing areas and would require the agreement of the landowners.
- Attention has been given to 'environmentally sound planning' but 'ensuring access to land' has not been a primary objective.
- Tight control is required because they are aware of an example in their area that got permission and has turned out to be neither croft nor woodland management.
- Not convinced of role for woodland crofts and would like to see national forestry estate land available for traditional crofts. A better model would be for Forestry Commission to lease land rather than a community body buying the land.
- The woodland croft concept is supported because it can link housing, rural livelihoods, and woodland management. This has potential to bring new business development to crofting and enable ideas behind rural development and land reform to be realised.
- HIE's woodland croft officer feels thought should be given to requirement for a woodland management plan – and who will assess this? Will it be a HC forestry officer? We should avoid extra workloads and use existing mechanisms where possible.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

Summary of issues raised on the protection to be given to agricultural/croft land

- Agricultural productivity of hinterland is important, brownfield sites should be the only development here.
- Would like us to re-evaluate our development strategy sites and avoid key prime land where possible.
- On agricultural land a case by case analysis required, flood risk and infrastructure costs means land close to settlements will sometimes be required for development.
- HIE consider that this is an evolving area as high importance may be attached to lower agricultural classifications in the future. They believe a blanket ban on inbye development might be too draconian and could be avoided or reduced by reference to the wider development needs of that community as suggested by the Highland Council process.
- HIE feel there should be a minimum class 5.1 land protected in crofting communities. However they feel the contra argument about effective land supply is valid.
- SNH suggest preference for common grazings needs to be balanced against other considerations such as settlement pattern and natural heritage.
- Council should more closely follow SPP on agricultural land with regards to renewables and minerals being acceptable where proposals will return land to its former status.

Summary of modification sought on subdivision of crofts, and establishment of new crofts (with housing associated), and decrofting for single house sites.

- Some felt the Council should take care to put a framework that does not lead to unbridled growth in the countryside.
- Greater strategic planning at a township parish level linking closely with landscape capacity studies.

- SNH feel that generally a strategic approach is required for each parish to ensure that ad hoc development is avoided which may create adverse landscape impacts and/or compromise future development capacity.
- SNH suggest there is a need to say how crofting is important to the identity, scenery, landscape character and biodiversity of the Highlands. They suggest that houses are often located where good quality land meets poorer to take advantage of access to both. Continuation of this pattern should be allowed. SNH would like to be part of a working group with the Council, HIE and the Crofters Commission which can develop the policies on crofting.
- Some felt we should not get involved and should let crofters build on their crofts.
- Others felt it was important to safeguard locally important croft land.
- There should be no additional house on a croft only replacement.
- There needs to be joint working between local representatives of the Crofting Community and planners, unrestrictive planning policies have already lost good productive ground.
- Assess agricultural and forestry applications primarily according to their contribution towards sustainable land management (rather than according to their income generation) so that planners could 'provide access to land through environmentally sound planning (reflecting principle 3 of the Rio declaration 1992).' It was felt that by limiting woodland crofts to Registered Crofts only, the demand will never be met with any significance. Best practice could allow low impact development tied by woodland management plan and a set of criteria which defines further conditions.
- SNH feel that crofting policies to support new crofts should regard existing housing in the countryside policies.
- HIE would hope that the new Housing in the countryside would be more permissible.
- HIE supports the suggestion of a more integrated approach at the planning stage.
- In line with the diagram in the monitoring report the Crofters Commission seek to align their processes along with the SGRIPD in a joint working arrangement.

Specifically on creation of new crofts/new crofting townships

- Broaden the scope to include small farm holdings as crofting is not applicable in parts of the Highlands.
- There should be more community consultation.
- Prevent a productive garden being used as justification for housing in the countryside.
- First step should be to consider whether there is an unmet demand.
- The Crofters Commission agree that working arrangements between the Council, and the Forestry Commission will be important. It is reasonable for the Council to check that proposed development is on a genuine croft which is registered through the Crofters Commission.
- Some considered that the new croft policies should be extended to allow for extensions to existing crofting townships, and where they are close to towns they should not be treated any differently.
- Planning restrictions upon any form of development in the countryside not associated with competitive agriculture hampers access to small scale farming.
- The building of homes in remote areas of croft land, for people to move to, where there is inadequate public transport and employment opportunities

should be discouraged. People living in these areas commuting long distances to work cannot be justified.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Appropriate protection of agricultural land/croft land through development strategy

The proposed policy approach for agricultural land should be consistent with Scottish Planning Policy. Here there is a recognised need to refrain from a total embargo on development on prime agricultural land. The SPP (2010) accepts loss of prime land where it is an essential component of the settlement strategy. In the process of producing the development strategy it will always need to be considered as one factor amongst many before we make any judgement.

There is understandable concern expressed about the loss of prime agricultural land. The preference for reuse of brownfield sites is something national planning policy supports, and the Council supports the reuse of brownfield land, and makes a significant land allocation at Whiteness. However the housing need and demand assessment illustrates that the need for development that exceeds what can be delivered solely on brownfield sites. A choice and flexibility of supply is also necessary to ensure the deliverability of the strategy. Please refer to the Population and Housing Schedule 4 for further information.

Whilst the starting position will always be to consider the suitability of land outwith the prime classifications first, there are occasions where prime land close to a settlement will be required for development. These locations offer other benefits that can serve to outweigh the agricultural impact. If it is in the wider public interest to prefer this land for development then it is necessary. Whilst any loss of prime land is regrettable this is the approach the SPP (2010) supports and it has resulted in the allocations proposed within the A96 corridor which are essential to the Council's wider Vision and Spatial Strategy. The Highland wide Local Development also includes a policy to provide appropriate protection to prime agricultural land in line with SPP (2010).

With regards to allocating croft land for development an equivalent approach applies because there is the same need for balancing of other interests. The MacAulay classification is however of limited use as it is a point in time assessment with the potential for under utilised croft land to be significantly improved through the crofter's efforts. Also the purpose of Macaulay mapping is not to try to assess what might be considered locally important croft land. Therefore the Council considers that when starting an Area Local Development Plan the best approach is to consult with the local grazing clerks for their input. Common Grazings will be the preference but if this is not suitable and does not address the wider needs of the community then inbye land will be considered. The grazing clerks input would inform site options selected within the Main Issues Report and we would then engage with the wider community on these sites.

On food security

The Council acknowledges the importance of having planning policies and approaches which seek to retain and expand potential for local food production. The approach taken balances this against the need to safeguard prime land and important croft land where possible whilst providing an appropriate land supply for the development strategy. We also support new croft/small farm development through our township policy.

On identifying Settlement Development Areas for every parish in the Area Local Development Plans

When we start to review the Area Local Development Plans if we were to identify all

the specific sites that are suitable in every parish this would be a very time consuming exercise. The wider countryside policy provides opportunity for development whilst assessing against the natural and cultural heritage features, considering settlement pattern, loss of locally important croft land, and any infrastructure constraints. Also the Housing in the Countryside Siting and Design guidance will give guidance on appropriate additions to settlement patterns. It is considered that this site by site analysis approach is the most suitable especially when you consider the traditionally relatively low build rate in these communities.

On effective use of croft land

It is the Crofters Commission's role rather than the Councils to ensure effective use of croft land and there is reform currently happening with a new Crofting Bill going through parliament. It the Crofters Commissions aim to regulate crofts, to promote occupancy of crofts, active land use and shared management by crofters, as a means of sustaining and enhancing rural communities. The Council's role is to ensure there is an appropriate safeguard for development on the best croft land, and this will be delivered through Policy 44 for Inbye and Apportioned croft land.

Outwith the hinterland - loss of inbye land through multiple new house decrofts

Although the responses are varied there is more concern expressed about the need to tighten our policies and procedures when considering housing proposals on crofts. This is countered by others who would like to see our policy relaxed or no restriction on development on crofts. However whilst this would benefit individual interest it is considered that this approach could be of real detriment to wider crofting interests. On the other hand the idea of having a blanket policy of only one additional house on a croft would be unduly restrictive in some circumstances.

The policy for inbye/apportioned croft land tries to find the right balance between individual crofters, crofting as a whole, and wider community interest. The commended new policy ensures that multiple decrofts are only accepted in limited circumstances, and ensures good siting within the croft.

Cumulatively single or small scale applications for housing can have a significant impact on the resource of locally important croft land. The need for a joined up approach with the Crofters Commission is therefore essential. The policy proposed comes out of our joint working with HIE and the Crofters Commission. It is hoped this can tighten up on our consideration of crofting impact outwith our hinterland: so that less inbye land is lost, and to ensure good siting and therefore less impact on crofting activities. Also the Housing in the Countryside siting and design guidance will establish the principles of adding sensitively to existing settlement patterns. Whilst it is felt that strict spacing policies between houses are inappropriate, guidance is required on how to respect the character of these areas.

In addition to the commended policy change it is recognised that there could be an improvement in the relationship between the Councils and the Crofters Commissions processes so we can better account for crofting issues at the planning application stage. In the 6 month trial for the Ross Skye and Lochaber area (excluding our Hinterlands), the Scottish Government Rural Payments and Investments Directorate will provide the agricultural assessment of the croft and the proposed house site to help inform the planning decision. A short form will be sent to those submitting applications on croft land to ask for further information and to advise on how to identify the preferred siting within a croft. Currently you may be aware that the decrofting process struggles to assert the influence it should because wider public interest is deemed to be established by the planning consent. This proposed change would give more information on the crofting impact of the proposal to the planner.

This should help improve our understanding and protection of locally important croft land. If successful this trial can be rolled out across the whole Council area.

Within the hinterland - New crofts

It is acknowledged that the balance of concern was that crofting could be used to support new development, and that there is and could be future abuse of this bias in favour of housing associated to crofts. For others who are concerned about access to new croft land and the desire to see more small scale agriculture units, the crofts/farm themselves can be created without the need for the house to be on the croft/farm. However if they need to be on the croft or farm itself for operational reasons then the policy allows for these proposals to be supported.

The Council recognises that there is a genuine need to promote and support crofting communities and activities. However, we must also ensure that crofting-related development does not conflict with the Council's other policies and objectives and in particular the Housing in the Countryside policy (especially those relating to the hinterland around towns) or result in unsympathetic development in our rural areas. A careful and considered balance must therefore be struck.

A change is therefore commended to our approach to houses proposed on new crofts within the hinterland. Some background to this is that the Crofters Commission cannot consider even basic viability (on part time income) when registering a new croft. For instance a new croft could be a large garden with a polytunnel. Therefore the current flexible approach for housing associated to crofting in the countryside within our Hinterland areas where development pressure is high would likely be exploited. We feel that proposals for houses on crofts within our hinterland areas other than new crofting townships should be considered on the same basis as any other agricultural unit.

Also we should remove the presumption that the croft house needs to be on the croft because the Crofting Bill presently going through parliament (currently) only recognises that you only need to be within 32 km, not on a croft itself. Crofting should therefore be removed from the Housing in the Countryside policy and houses on new crofts would require to be considered under agriculture or where the proposal meets other criteria specified within the policy or Supplementary Planning Guidance.

However it is considered that the Council should be supportive within the hinterland, where the wider public benefit of the proposal is apparent. There can be township proposals where this can be achieved. The normal planning considerations plus the economics of service delivery need to be part of the assessment and there is a policy to address these factors. This is equally applicable to significant extensions of existing crofting townships and to development of new townships of small farm holdings.

The way the National Land Forest scheme operates is not within the control of the Council so we cannot change that model to allow a community body to lease the land rather than buy it.

Within the Hinterland – sub division of crofts

It is considered that unless it can be justified on an agricultural basis through our Housing in the Countryside Guidance, then there is no basis for going against the general principle of restricting houses in the countryside within this area. The Crofting Bill currently supports regulation that insists you live within 32 km of the croft; there is no requirement to be on the croft itself.

New crofts outwith the hinterland

The Housing in the Countryside policy is flexible outwith the hinterland subject to normal planning considerations with no general presumption against. Individual houses proposed on crofts will be assessed against the general policies of the plan and new crofting township proposals do not need to demonstrate wider public benefit but still need to meet the other criteria of the township policy.

With regards to the concern expressed about the sustainability of new homes within crofting communities which are remote from employment opportunities, the Council will continue to support these communities and opportunities for their growth. Access to land for new housing is critical to support existing and future business in these areas, so restricting new housing development would impinge on this. There does need to be consideration of the impact on service delivery within these areas but if this is economic for the Council then we do not feel the opportunity for new housing should be unduly constrained.

Townships

It is recommended that the presumption against housing in the countryside is removed within the hinterland areas, but only where a wider public interest is clearly established alongside the crofting proposal. Community proposals (e.g. new crofting townships) could qualify because of the rigorous process they go through to buyout the land can effectively establish a wider public interest. Such proposals tend to result in a tenant setup which secures long term benefits as a community owned asset, have an element of affordable housing and bring wider benefits to that community (such as opening up/improving recreational access to woodland, diversifying tree species, creating a nature reserve etc). It is difficult to envisage how individual new crofts could offer similar wider public benefit and the Council therefore consider that it does not require an exception to the normal housing in the countryside policies.

We will identify the approach and broad criteria for assessing the appropriateness of new croft proposals in the HwLDP, but with the new townships generally identified through the Area Development Plans. This is the most appropriate way to consider these sites allowing for the most effective engagement at a local level. However, we recognise in some instances these proposals may come forward independent of the development plan process as planning applications.

Crofters Commissions Statement

The Crofters Commission supports policies that enable crofters to live on or near their crofts.

The Commission is seeking to improve the decrofting and planning permission process to aid the retention of better quality in-by-croft land balanced with the provision of rural housing. To this end the Commission is working with the Highland Council on a 6 month trial for the Ross, Skye and Lochaber areas with a view to improving the efficiency of the process and effectiveness of outcomes.

The Crofters Commission believes that public policies should be directed towards supporting communities that are more fragile in terms of their environment, population, services and economics. In assessing proposals for housing in the countryside the Crofters Commission acknowledges that the Council's policies reflect the different challenges presented between proposals in remote crofting areas and those in the more pressurised hinterland areas.

The creation of new crofts in the countryside can contribute to the fabric and

structure of any existing crofting community and the wider rural community. The Commission supports the creation of housing opportunities where these communities are more fragile in nature.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Safeguarding Inbye/AppORTioned Croftland

Policy - New/Extended Crofting Townships

Policy - Agricultural Land

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Developer Contributions
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Developer Contributions
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Glachbeg Croft (Bob Bull) (12), Duncan Macdonald (17), Irene Brandt (18), Norma Young (19), Network Rail (Andrew Roberts) (32), HITRANS (David Duthie) (33), Graham & Sibbald - Derek Mackenzie (Claire Peters) (35), George MacWilliam (39), Joan More (45), UBC Group Limited (Andrew Wilson) (46), Mrs J Mayhew (50), Brian Lynch (54), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (Michael Gimson) (56), Halliday Fraser and Munro Planning - Tulloch Homes (North) Ltd (Hazel Sears) (57), Halliday Fraser Munro Planning - Deveron Highland (Hazel Sears) (62), Joan Noble (67), Halliday Fraser and Munro Planning - Fairways Leisure Group Ltd (Hazel Sears) (69), Mary Harrison (73), Paul & Helen Jenkins (74), Rose-Miller Farms (John Rose-Miller) (80), John Mackie (86), John Mackie (86), David Matthews (91), Mrs H Rask (92), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Kurt Larson (95), Avoch & Killen Community Council (Claire Devine) (103), Kirkton Farms (Shaun Macdonald) (106), Inverness South Community Council (Mrs V Mitchell)(107), Scottish Natural Heritage (George Hogg) (118), Brora Community Council - Morag Gibson (121), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - Maclean Family, Muir of Ord (Alan Ogilvie) (136), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - County Properties (Northern) Limited (Alan Ogilvie) (137), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - Macdonald Hotels & Resorts Ltd. (Alan Ogilvie) (138), Brian Macgregor (145), Westhill Community Council (Mrs CM Johnston) (147), Mrs E Holland (153), Roland Mardon (156), Michael Meehan (158), Philips Aitchison Limited (162), WYG Planning & Design - Trustee's of Richard Tyser's Overseas Settlement (Joanne Plant) (166), Highlands and Islands Green Party (Myra Carus) (168), Valerie Springett (179), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (Gareth Williams)(180), West Coast Energy Ltd. (Neil Foxall) (184), Highlands and Islands Enterprise (Charlotte Wright) (190), Maria De La Torre (196), Anne Thomas (197), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (J Cornwell & G Phillips) (203), Bryden Associates - Strathdearn Community Council (Duncan Bryden) (205), Elspeth Fraser (207), Muir, Smith, Evans - Mr Allenby, in respect of Nairn South (Robert Evans) (220), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (John Wright) (229), Graham & Sibbald - Mr & Mrs Grant (Claire Peters) (231), Dingwall Community Council (Nigel Greenwood) (235), Ardross Community Council (John Edmonson) (236), William Main (238), Turnberry Consulting Limited - HIE (Jonathan Coulson) (240), The Highland Council (Dot Ferguson) (241), Robertson Homes (Bruce Walker) (246), Patricia Roberts (247), Keppie Planning & Development - William Gray Construction (Derek Hollywood) (248), Muir, Smith, Evans -Inverness Estates Ltd (Brian Muir) (249), John Waring (250), Juilan Paren (252), Eveline Waring (253), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (Richard Cross) (254), Roger Piercy (257), Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council (Margaret Ribertson) (258), Colliers CRE - Whiteness Property Company (Anthony Aitken) (260), Caithness Windfarm Information Forum (Brenda Herrick) (261), Cawdor Estates (Angus McNicol) (264), Diana Buchanan (265), Turley Associates - Sainsbury's supermarkets (Richard Phillips) (267), Jones Lang LaSalle - Scottish & Southern Energy PLC (Stuart Winter) (268), Crofters Commission (Uileam Smith) (271), European Forest Resources (Coralie Laurencin) (275), Scottish Water (Will Paton) (281), Graham & Sibbald - Trustee's of Smithton Church (Claire Peters) (282), Scottish Wildlife Trust (Maggie Keenan) (285), Pete Campbell (290), Scottish Property Federation (David Melhuillish) (291), Homes For Scotland (David Horsfall) (293), Mr JG Walford (300), Helen</p>	

Campbell (301), Reynolds Architecture Ltd - Miss Joyce Hendry (George Reynolds) (302), Bowlts Chartered Surveyors - Hector Munro (Ken Bowlt) (307), Bowlts Chartered Surveyors - Mr A Ross (Mr AD Newlands) (308), Bowlts Chartered Surveyors (Ken Bowlt) (309), Scotia Homes Limited (Dennis Watt) (314), Diane Hawksey (317), Inverlochy and Torlundy Comm Council (James Weir) (318), Brenda Steele (319), Donald Scobbie (329), Ward 11 - Caol v Mallaig (THC) (Alan Henderson) (332), EMAC Planning - Barratt Homes and Robertson Homes (Emelda Maclean) (333), EMAC Planning - Hill of Fearn West, Scotia Homes (Emelda Maclean) (334), EMAC Planning - Castletown North East, Scotia Homes (Emelda Maclean) (335)

Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Developer Contributions part of SP Policy G4
--	--

Council’s summary of the representation(s):

A96 Developer contributions

- Concern regarding the ability to enforce developer contribution protocols and resultant impact on A96 potential and wider
- Seeks early development of unconstrained land in A96 (Not requiring Developer Contributions – by implication)
- There should not overly be a reliance on the development industry to provide finance for A96 infrastructure improvements; THC and other public agencies should commit funds
- Existing LP allocations in A96 should not be subject to additional requirements than outlined in Inverness LP
- Can see benefit of flat rate contribution, but need to consider wider consequential effects
- A joined up approach required, Scottish Water have no preference as to how it is collected, but require these to provide infrastructure
- Developer contributions needed towards greener network
- Seek policy requiring developers to provide qualitative improvements to existing rail related improvements and level crossing
- Existing LP allocations in A96 should not be subject to additional requirements than outlined in Inverness LP
- Areas such as Cawdor will have no direct impact on much of the infrastructure
- Contributions should be set aside for funding Nairn by-pass
- Contributions for public transport improvements instead of improving arterial routes
- Need to consider implications of A96 development on wider area
- Given length of delivery, it is impossible to estimate cost of delivery of infrastructure
- Protocol needs to be more flexible to accommodate unplanned development (currently would it contribute?) or failed planned elements.

Developer contributions - General

- Contributions should be prepared on equitable basis, not biased to larger developers
- Need for developer contributions to be enforceable, clear and transparent, linkages to wider areas to contributions are hard to illustrate
- Prefer case-by-case consideration, single approach would need very thorough consideration

- Contributions should apply to all infrastructure, not just roads, sewerage
- Would wish there to be broad involvement in development of and any consultation on protocols
- Should seek policy requiring developers to provide qualitative improvements to existing rail related improvements and level crossing
- Level of contributions need to be scaled down in present climate to encourage development; Infrastructure requirements need to be prioritised so requirements are not overly widened, concern that contributions sought are not proportionate
- May lead to diminution in quality developments in order to afford contributions
- Support revised developer contribution protocol
- Surely present policy can do this already, developers must provide the infrastructure
- THC need to consider development viability when seeking contributions,
- Contributions should be sought in terms of reducing energy usage in existing development and infrastructure
- Phasing for delivery of infrastructure needs to be married to development
- Support as long as contributions on equitable basis
- Wish to see split between public / private investment to infrastructure
- View difficulties in linking elements of developments to infrastructure provision on wider basis, Needs to be clear and transparent links
- Danger that development becomes developer led
- The concept of phasing infrastructure is dangerous the appropriate scale of infrastructure needs to be put in place at outset
- Seek policy requiring developers to provide qualitative improvements to existing rail related improvements and level crossing
- Wish to be involved in development and any consultation of protocols
- Support proportionate contribution based on clear calculation to assist developer costings
- Contributions should fund facilities in existing villages (HiC)
- Developer contributions have been developed in more buoyant economic times, need to consider the impact of seeking contributions at this time and introduce flexibility in reduction in contributions
- The need to provide developer contributions will slow down development rates and give time to reflect the merits of growth
- New developments should contribute to cycle ways and public transport
- The high cost of providing housing is inconsistent with the provision of affordable housing
- Feel site specific contributions should be deducted from requirement for wider improvements
- Welcome proposal to collect levy from even single developments, all bring pressure to existing facilities
- Contributions essential to improving transport infrastructure
- Proportion of developer contributions should be made at an early stage of development
- Wish to see increased contributions from developments such as supermarkets
- Consider there should be one protocol to cover Highland, which would cover external impacts
- Infrastructure needs to be in place prior to development
- Needs to be a definition between developer contributions and community benefit
- Feel that developer obligations fall unequally on the house building sector and Government should contribute
- Feel that levels of developer contribution are asking for too much
- Employment uses should attract lower level of developer contributions, feel there

is a need to recognise different infrastructure requirements

- Contribution levels should comply with circular 12/1996(01/2010)
- New developments should contribute to cycle ways and public transport
- Developers should fund entire infrastructure, if not no permission

Community Benefit

- Developer contributions for windfarms can vary through various factors – capacity, wind speed etc (Community benefit)
- Developer contributions should be clearly defined in relation to the impact of development (i.e. for windfarms)
- Do not wish to see the delivery of “Community Benefit”, it can be seen as a bribe
- Needs to be a definition between developer contributions and community benefit
- Should be made clear that this will not be applied to developments that voluntarily make contributions to local communities
- Support the idea of a shared pot to pay for sport and leisure facility

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Policy approach should be extended to provide qualitative improvements to rail and level crossings, given impact.
- Facilities should be in place before development progresses
- This policy approach may not be feasible given current economic situation, do not implement at this time.
- Financial implications of developer contributions should be stated for developers to consider

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

A96 Developer Contributions and Wider Considerations

Concern was voiced regarding the ability to enforce developer contributions, especially once planning permission had been granted. The delivery of developer contributions will be controlled through a s75 agreement where a mutually agreed statement of the level of contribution is enforceable through law.

Comment indicated that there is land available in the A96 corridor that can progress and is free from constraints. The Highland wide Local Development Plan is seeking to identify land within the A96 that can progress at an early stage to complement the existing housing land supply in Inverness, Nairn and across the corridor. There will still be a need for the delivery of a level of infrastructure and potentially contribution that is commensurate with the scale of development. Equally existing land allocations will need to meet certain requirements.

The potential for developer contributions to cover the delivery of a green network in addition to more obvious infrastructure requirements was highlighted. The Highland wide Local Development Plan has set out a strategy for the development of the A96 Corridor which includes a policy and supplementary guidance on the issue of Green Networks including developer contributions and requirements.

The need for the delivery of infrastructure prior to development taking place was highlighted. The development plan seeks the identification and allocation of development land to utilise existing infrastructure to best effect and also to allow the potential increase in capacity of these to take place. The provision of infrastructure

will be generally be delivered in parallel with development, however, some infrastructure will need to be provided in advance of development commencing.

Comments indicated that a consistent approach to developer contributions will remove the need for lengthy negotiations and that certain development proposals should not attract the need to provide contributions. The Council will prepare Supplementary Guidance on the process of determining the requirement for developer contribution. Developments in different locations will be subject to varying levels of contribution dependent on the impact of individual proposals on services and infrastructure. The Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions will also set out criteria for the application of the policy. The approach to determining the level of contribution will be consistent across the Highland area. In relation to the ability to determine the costs of infrastructure well in advance of delivery, the costs determined at a point in time will be indexed to changing construction costs.

The view was expressed that contributions should focus on public transport infrastructure improvements and not road improvements. The Council's policy will set out a range of requirements related to impact and that could include both public transport and road improvement requirements.

Views were expressed that developers should fund the whole cost of infrastructure and if not then no planning permission should be given. Where development is the sole driver for the provision of a specific infrastructure or service requirement then the developer will be responsible for that provision. However, it is likely that large scale development would involve several different developers and there would still be the need for a developer contribution protocol to ensure that contributions were relative to the impact of each portion of development. Where development will add to an existing deficiency in infrastructure provision or service provision, new development will be required to contribute to a level proportionate to the impact of the new development on that deficiency, as defined within Planning Circular 1/2010: Planning Agreements.

The issue of contributions for the Nairn by-pass was raised. The construction of the A96 By-pass is a long term solution to divert through traffic away from the centre of Nairn and, subject to further discussions with Transport Scotland, developer contributions will be required to contribute to its provision.

Developer Contributions - General

The benefits of a flat rate contribution across Highland were supported in some comments. Developer contributions and planning agreements should only be sought where they will serve a planning purpose; relate to the proposed development either as a direct consequence or as part of the cumulative impact of development in the area and are fair and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development.

The potential for the requirement for developer contributions to be used in the delivery of higher levels of energy efficiency in existing and proposed development was highlighted. The Proposed Plan sets out a requirement for all development to be designed in the context of *sustainable development*. Supplementary Guidance on Sustainable Design is to be prepared, and also national planning advice as contained in PAN 84 Reducing Carbon Emissions in New Development forms the basis for the consideration of how development can contribute towards lower emissions and energy usage.

Comments expressed the view that contributions should be placed in a shared pot to pay for sport and leisure facilities. Developer contributions will only be expected where they will create a requirement for a new, or improvement to an existing facility or service, this is in line with national guidance on implementation of policy contained in Circular 1/2010. Contributions acquired and accrued in a shared pot will be directly attributable to new/improved provision that will serve the development and not for a pot to be more widely distributed.

On the issue that some affordable housing providers felt that they should be exempt from contributions. Affordable housing requires the same access to the same services as other forms of housing and as such there is a need for contribution to assist in the delivery of these. The Council has removed the requirement for affordable housing developers to contribute towards education provision. However, while the provision of affordable housing remains a priority for the Council there is a need to ensure that these developments receive the same access to services and infrastructure as other housing sectors.

It was felt that employment uses should attract lower level of developer contributions. The development of employment uses is likely to attract a smaller range of improvements to which contributions would be required; they would not have to contribute towards educational provision or open space. However, where infrastructure and service improvements are required to allow the grant of planning permission the use of planning agreements and contributions will be appropriate.

The viability of development will be a consideration in seeking developer contributions. There is a need also to consider whether development can progress without the benefit of these contributions.

Scottish Government Circular 1/2010 acknowledges the need to be aware of the economic implication that developer contributions may have on development proposals; *“It is essential that planning authorities understand the implications of a planning agreement on the viability of a development. Entering into an agreement is likely to have financial consequences. Cash flow can also be affected where substantial sums of money have to be paid before a development proceeds or at an early stage in construction. Where a planning agreement requires financial contributions, staged payments in line with the construction programme can help avoid prejudicing the overall viability of a project.”*

In relation to concerns that development will become developer led, the development plan will continue to form the basis on which development proposals are assessed and sets out the framework for the appropriate development of land.

Community Benefit

The Council will expect developments to benefit the local community and contribute to the wellbeing of the Highlands, whilst recognising wider national interests.

The Council will seek to enter into agreements with developers as appropriate on behalf of local communities for environmental and socio-economic purposes, generally in response to large scale projects such as renewable energy projects

‘Community benefit’ arrangements do not form part of the consideration of the Planning Application decision process.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Developer Contributions

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Settlement Hierarchy
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Juliet Robinson (34), The Coal Authority (38), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), RoseMiller Farms (80), Kingussie Community Council (93), Kurt Larson (95), Inverness South Community Council (107), Brora Community Council (121), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd-Mr S Kelly (133), Elizabeth Budge (148), Philips Aitchison Limited (162), Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Tain (175) Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Martin Mackay Solicitors-Dingwall Auction Mart Limited (181), Ian Cowan (185), The Theatres Trust (187), Peter Roberts (194), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Stop Highland Windfarms Campaign (213), Ken Nicol (215), Joyce Wilkinson (216), Strutt & Parker LLP (229), Graham & Sibbald-Mr & Mrs Brian Grant (231), Ardross Community Council (236), Amy Walker (239), Knight Frank LLP-Mr Morrison land at Muir of Ord (244), Shildaig Community Council (245), Patricia Roberts (247), John Waring (250), Eveline Waring (253), Roger Piercy (257), Golspie Community Council (266), C Stafford (272), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274), Dorothy Clark (279), Inverlochty and Torlundy Community Council (318), Transition Black Isle (330)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Structure Plan Spatial Strategy (part)
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to change emphasis to community facilities such as post office/shops/village halls. • Settlement hierarchy should recognise the coal mining legacy in and around Brora. • Potential to designate a regional centre around Lairg to serve the population in the west and south. • Nairn should be designated as a regional centre. • Should consider greater infrastructure in Kingussie (CNPA area) • Need to ensure that adequate infrastructure is in place. • Areas identified are key to tourism and facilities should be in place to support this. • Clarification is needed on the term settlement hierarchy. • Need to consider settlements in the wider countryside and their needs. • Visual impact on the landscape must be considered. • Role of district/local/neighbourhood centres should be recognised as supporting urban and rural communities. • Need for more emphasis recreation but less emphasis on shopping. • Sutherland must be considered in its entirety and not separate Dornoch, Brora and Golspie. • Tain should be a sub-regional centre due to area its services serve. • Development of UHI, ICT and renewable energy is important there is no reason why key centres should not attract and retain international students and globally ambitious businesses. • Consideration should be give to the infrastructure constraints in or adjacent to local centres to take into consideration short term delivery of sites. 	

- Centres provide focus for shopping, leisure and employment with diversity of uses making a contribution to their vitality and viability. New housing in town centres should be supported by new or enhanced community facilities.
- Settlement hierarchy should illustrate cultural infrastructure on offer and provide new opportunities for development where shortfalls are evident.
- Hierarchy should identify the role all towns and villages have in the future sustainment of Highland and to its development.
- Many areas are not suitable for development or should not be developed to maintain character. Local settlements should maintain their own plans and aspirations, and not be part of the overall strategic development process.
- Settlement hierarchy means little, the idea is too late.
- Important to recognise the value of areas between towns and villages
- Some of the Council corporate services could locate in sub-regional centres to aid regeneration.
- Economic generation and regeneration should be actively sought out and encouraged. Sustainability and viability of Highland is in danger if growth is only encouraged and actively sought for Highlands as a whole.
- Local housing need needs to be met in these areas if the demand does not match with the settlement hierarchy than a flexible approach should be taken to ensure needs can be met.
- Settlement hierarchy should confirm the role of Inverness and reflected in development allocations with the hierarchy providing for a suitable range of sites.
- Development needs to be flexible and not purely rely on tourism, infrastructure improvements are required. Small local ventures should be encouraged.
- Wick and Thurso should be grouped together as a sub-regional centre.
- Development of Inverness should not be to the detriment of other parts of Highland.
- Vital for the LDP to identify sufficient land outwith major settlements.
- Growth of housing on Black Isle should not be considered. Concentrate on its role for providing agricultural need and tourism.
- Should give greater consideration to Golspie.
- Developing local centres should be considered in particular Contin.
- Provision should only be made for requirements that are present or can be confidently predicted in the life of the plan.
- Provision should not be made for unrealistic developments.
- Fort William should have greater importance than local centres closer to Inverness.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- A range of respondents looking for a change in the status of a settlement in the hierarchy.
- Definition of each level of the hierarchy to aid understanding of the hierarchy.
- Flexible approach is required to use of the hierarchy.
- Role of district/local/neighbourhood centres should be recognised as supporting urban and rural communities.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Change in the Status of a Settlement in the Hierarchy

We have considered each of the settlements which have been mentioned and revisions will be made to the settlement hierarchy following suggestions. For example Thurso and Wick due to their proximity to each other and the wider area they serve will be designated as a joint sub-regional centre.

Definition of each level of the Hierarchy

This will be included in the proposed plan. A definition of the settlement hierarchy as a whole will be included in the glossary. Some respondents also sought an explanation of why each settlement has been allocated in the Hierarchy. The HwLDP will set the context for the hierarchy and the area Local Development Plans will explain the role of each of the centres identified in the hierarchy.

Flexible approach is required to use of the Hierarchy

The hierarchy is designed to focus development towards areas which have appropriate facilities to support growth and help to create sustainable Highland communities, in the first instance. In applying the concept of a settlement hierarchy the Council will consider whether new development is in scale with the facilities available in the area. The area Local Development Plans will ensure that appropriate land is allocated in each of the identified centres to facilitate sustainable Highland Communities.

Role of district/local/neighbourhood centres should be recognised as supporting urban and rural communities.

District, local and neighbourhood centres play an important role in providing facilities to the communities in Highland. This is especially apparent in many of the larger settlements in Highland. While important we believe that it is more appropriate to identify the smaller localised centres within settlements in the area Local Development Plans.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Settlement Hierarchy defined on Proposals Map

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	East Inverness
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Scottish Prison Service (10), I. Brandt (18), HITRANS (33), J. Robinson (34), G. MacWilliam (39), UBC Group Limited (46), J. Mayhew (50), B. Lynch (54), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), J. Denholm (61), P & H Jenkins (74), D. Matthews (90), H. Rask (91), James Barr Ltd - Rep Macdonald Estates PLC (92), Avoch Community Council (98), Inverness South Community Council (103), Nairn River Community Council (107), Highland Council – TECS (109), Scottish Natural Heritage (114), G.H Johnston-Mr F Hutcheson (118), G.H Johnston-Macdonald Hotels and Resorts (127), Westhill Community Council (138), Cromarty Arts (147), M. Meehan (150), Highlands & Islands Green Party (158), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (168), Highlands and Islands Enterprise (180), CB Richard Ellis Limited - Rep Grosvenor Eastgate Centre(190), P. Roberts (193), M. De La Torre (194), Bryden Associates-Strathdearn Community Council (205), E. Fraser (196), D & J Piggot (207), M. Hutcheson & A. Lowe (208), Turnberry Consulting-Highlands & Islands Enterprise (226), P. Roberts (240), Muir Smith Evans - Rep Inverness Estates Ltd (247), D. Buchanan (249), Mr & Mrs Stafford (265), Scottish Water (272), Graham and Sibbald-Trustee's of Smithton Church (281), J. Baker (282), Scottish Wildlife Trust (284), JG Walford (285), H. Campbell (300), Bowlt's Chartered Surveyors-Hector Munro (301), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (307), Scottish Government (324), SEPA (326)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Policies which we intend to replace / amend – Elements of Spatial Strategy from HSP
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prison potential in East Inverness. • Support for early phasing in of development in 2011-2016 • Prefer alternative approach, but agree with the provision of a park and ride. • Development in this area is should be subject to prior implementation of public transport improvement to reduce peak time congestion. • Should justify why the East Inverness framework plan is a departure from the adopted Local Plan. • Seeking land allocation for site in East Inverness area. • Assumptions made may not occur in terms of college not locating on the campus site and growth may not happen. • Incremental approach to development can be resisted. Need for development in this area should be based on more sound assumptions and evidence. • Support for a potential land allocation at Balloch Farm • Need to explain why development to the east of Inverness is favoured – infrastructure, environmental • Clarity is needed over why certain sites have been designated high, medium or low density • Need to look at other areas around Inverness • Campus could provide employment opportunities and young people to the area. • Cautions against development too soon. • Support for the preferred option in principle but should further consider the 	

constraints in the framework area.

- Should set priorities for development between 2016 and 2021, looking at alternative sites to those presented in the current framework.
- Development in this area should not go ahead until the delivery of the trunk link road. Development in this area should not be of further detriment of roundabout at Inshes
- Should be reference to rail in this area
- Need to consider designated sites near by and protected species present in the area.
- Support for the continued role of the Pre-Application Advice Service.
- Support for preferred option to which land owed by respondent could play a part.
- Seeking land use change of Stratton Lodge from hotel to residential, support for preferred option if this is the case.
- Active travel should be at the centre of masterplanning for the expansion of Inverness.
- Development in this area should go ahead if infrastructure is delivered at the same time.
- Oppose the preferred option and alternative but favour the establishment of a rail station at Beechwood.
- Road traffic in the area would increase as more people would come to the area.
- Support for development in East Inverness but recognitions of some infrastructure issues which could be over come by the active promotion of sustainable and active travel opportunities in the area.
- East Inverness Framework should incorporate Class 5 industrial land and additional class 4 industrial land
- Support the preferred option but would like retail developments in the area to be carefully examined as to not have a detrimental impact on Inverness City Centre.
- Option covers a wide range of community needs.
- Important to consider the quality of buildings
- Should consider the impact proposals will have on the wider area.
- Clarity is needed on the terms high, medium and low density.
- Agree with the preferred option so long as regeneration of the town centre comes first.
- The site identified for the campus could be used to augment housing land supply when needed if college does not relocate.
- No proven need for the campus in this area.
- Beechwood is prime agricultural land and should not be wholly built on.
- Need to consider the options for true sustainable development.
- Support for development of the area but should recognise that not just Inverness College will locate on the proposed Campus site, and that the plan should fully reflect the aspirations as set out in the campus masterplan.
- East Inverness should be used as a testing ground for the principles of development in the A96 corridor.
- Broadly in support of preferred option to support coherent planning and to provide market confidence.
- Need to set limits on urban creep.
- Difficulty understanding the need for campus site at East Inverness.
- There is a lack of greenspace in the area
- Scottish Water is currently engaged with developers in the area to enable their individual projects in parallel to other developments in the area.

- Support for a clear policy statement for East Inverness is supported.
- Developer contributions should be proportionate to the specific development proposals.
- Provision of a park and ride and public transport interchange would allow the area to be highly accessible.
- Infrastructure delivery should provide infrastructure to sustainable development.
- Support the preferred option but would like to see sufficient area safeguarded for provision of major infrastructure.
- Early gain should be sought on infrastructure provision
- Priorities for development in the area should be set out.
- Infrastructure agreements need to be in place prior to development
- Government is committed to provision of the A9-A96 trunk link road and delivery in this area should be informed by the ongoing traffic modelling work.
- Sites in this area may be subject to flooding

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Infrastructure led development – including firm commitments to delivery not commitments in principle
- Provision of sustainable transport solutions in the area should be required.
- Delivery of active travel opportunities.
- Justification of the need for campus relocation.
- Increase supply of industrial land.
- Consideration of the wider impact of the development.
- Seeking a number of additional or modified land allocations.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Infrastructure led development – including firm commitments to delivery not commitments in principle

There has been continued dialogue with Transport Scotland in order to identify the key pieces of infrastructure for requirement in this area. To ensure development of the area can progress there will be transport interventions in the short to medium term which will enable a level of development however there will be a need to restrict development to the sites until the infrastructure as a whole can be developed i.e. dualling of the A96, provision of the A9-A96 Trunk Link Road etc. The Council will continue discussions with Transport Scotland regarding details of funding and delivery on the ground.

Provision of sustainable transport solutions in the area should be required

All sites will be required to design in sustainable transport solutions from the outset and where appropriate make contribution toward improved public transport infrastructure, public access and active travel.

Delivery of active travel opportunities

Developers will be required to contribute to the provision of a green network which will include improvement of existing and provision of new opportunities for active travel. This is to be detailed in Green Networks: Supplementary Guidance which will be out for public consultation at the same time as the Highland wide Local Development Plan.

Justification of the need for campus relocation.

The Council believes that this site offers the most suitable opportunity for a sustainable campus for the University of the Highlands and Islands. We understand

that there are a number of users who will co-locate on the site offering an opportunity for world class research and development on this site.

Increase supply of industrial land

We recognise that there is an undersupply of this type of land in the East Inverness Framework area. A number of the sites will be mixed use offering opportunities for Class 4 development, however there is a need to identify Class 5 land and this will come through the area Local Development Plans.

Consideration of the wider impact of the development

The Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment of the Highland wide Local Development Plan has allowed us to consider the development of the area as a whole and the impact that it may have. Also other assessments have been undertaken (such as transport modelling) which allows us to consider the issues related to infrastructure limitations.

Seeking a number of additional or modified land allocations

A number of allocations have been put forward within this area and a justification for the decision of allocating/not allocating has been attached to this document.

Detailed Responses to specific sites:**Ashton Farm (No representation made to the HwLDP)****Decision**

Site to be considered for longer term development post 2031.

Justification

The site at Ashton Farm is currently constrained and therefore unavailable for development in the medium to long term. This means that this site if allocated in the Highland wide Local Development Plan would be ineffective. An element of land take may be required within these lands in order to facilitate the A96-A9 Trunk Link Road and a suitable road linking potential future developments to the rear of Inverness Retail and Business Park and development at Stratton Farm. Once sites within the City of Inverness are completed and the initial expansion sites to the east of the city are underway there will be scope for mixed use development in this area.

Conclusion

As the lands comprising this site are currently constrained and therefore unavailable for development this would be seen as being an ineffective land supply and would not be able to facilitate the development industry in meeting the housing need and demands in the area.

Phasing

Post 2031

Developer Requirements

To be determined in review of the Local Development Plan. Initial developer requirements to be extracted through SEA process.

Balloch Farm (HWLDP-MIR-098)**Decision**

Site **not** to be included in the Highland wide Local Development Plan

Justification

The allocation of sites to contribute toward the strategy for the development of the City of Inverness and its expansion in the Highland wide Local Development Plan needs to:

- Consider the current housing supply;
- Allow for the consolidation of the city; and
- Plan for sustainable growth of the city.

While the proposal at Balloch Farm, Inverness contributes in part to each of the above, we would see it as being long term, beyond the 20 year period towards which this Local Development Plan looks. Our reasoning for this is below:

Housing Land Supply

The current unconstrained housing land supply in Inverness is expected to last until 2020. This is based upon a supply of 6036 which within the next ten years would be able to meet the housing need which is identified in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment. In addition to this is a constrained supply of 1160 to which the restriction could be lifted in the life of this plan. We recognise the need to offer alternatives to these constrained sites, in case the necessary infrastructure can not be delivered in the life of this plan and therefore have chosen to allocate sites which would help to consolidate the city.

Consolidate the City

In seeking to consolidate the City of Inverness we will be looking to allocate sites which will help to achieve this. Given the above mentioned housing land supply in Inverness we will first be directing growth to sites which are already adopted as part of the Inverness Local Plan and then to the A96 expansion areas. We do not believe the development proposed at Balloch Farm would aid in this consolidation at this stage. In addition, it is likely that in time this development would significantly impact on the green wedge which currently separates the two settlements of Culloden and Balloch, merging these two settlements which we believe should be kept separate for reasons of character and identity.

Planning for sustainable growth of the City

In planning for the sustainable growth of the city we have chosen to allocate development sites to the east of the City which can meet the need established in development in the period. The sites which we have chose to allocate in the proposed plan are close to the city centre and existing services, have the potential to deliver wider benefits in terms of active and sustainable travel opportunities, significant contribution to the green framework and delivery of the long term infrastructure needed in the area.

Conclusion

We believe that the site at Balloch Farm, in the long term (i.e. post 2031), may be suitable for a level of development at the scale proposed. However, given:

- existing unconstrained land supply in Inverness
- the need for focus development to consolidate the city;
- the potential to impact on the green wedge between Culloden and Balloch;
- the location of the site in relation to others; and

- the infrastructure upgrades associated with this site

we believe that other sites in the area should be brought forward to deliver the sustainable growth of Inverness to the East prior to this development area.

Phasing

Not Applicable

Developer Requirements

Not Applicable

Beechwood Campus (HwLDP-MIR-240)

Decision

Site to be allocated in the Highland wide Local Development plan with detail of the first phase.

Justification

The establishment of a University of the Highlands and Islands would have significant benefits in the City of Inverness and right across the Highland through its partner colleges. The main benefit of the establishment of this would be to enable sustainable economic growth, however there would also be a number of other benefits including social.

In considering the allocation of this site for campus uses it is necessary to consider the two key questions:

- Is this the most appropriate site for campus uses?
- How will the site 'fit' with surrounding uses?

Site Location

The site location, once fully built out will have good connections by private and public transport and will help to promote sustainable transport solutions in the area.

The site at Beechwood gives the opportunity for the location of a wide range of campus users including educational, recreation, research and institutional residential opportunities. The site is a considerable size offers potential for expansion of facilities, while remaining predominantly a green site.

Fit with surrounding uses

Due to the location of this site it offers the opportunity to link the existing city to the expansion of the city to the east. The key to fitting with the surrounding uses will be the connections between this site and the surrounding sites to both the east and west. A green bridge is proposed linking this development into the Raigmore area of the city, pedestrian access to the east of the development could potentially use the existing railway crossing. It would be beneficial if this site could link into the existing road network, if only for public transport uses, around Inverness Retail and Business Park, to ensure that there are meaningful connections right across the eastern edge of the city.

Conclusion

We believe that the site at Beechwood, can deliver a fit for purpose campus solution

for the Highlands and Islands. We would like to ensure that the campus is well connected and able to deliver sustainable economic growth therefore we will set out a number of developer requirements.

Phasing

The development of the first phase of this site should be phased from 2011-2016. The second phase should be allocated from 2016 onwards.

The first phase of development should include no more than the following to ensure there is not an adverse on the infrastructure in the area.

- Non- Residential Institutions 34,000m²
- Business 3,000m²
- Residential Institutions 10,000m²
- Assembly and Leisure 8,000m²

Development at this scale should also be accompanied by appropriate landscaping, open space, parking, servicing and means of access.

Reason: To ensure core infrastructure can be delivered to facilitate the development of the campus as a whole and allow for the relocation of other campus based services in Inverness.

Developer Requirements

Any development of this site would require to meet the following criteria:

- Deliver bridge link towards Inverness City Centre;
- Deliver bridge links towards Inverness Retail and Business Park;
- Take two accesses one from Culloden Road and one from Caulfield Road North;
- Deliver recreational access infrastructure;
- Reserve land for the potential route of the A96-A9 Trunk Link Road;
- Ensure development of the first phase does not preclude development of later phases;
- Safeguard Sets of Badgers and habitats of other protected species;
- Develop a workable landscape framework for the site as a whole; and
- Carry out and submit a Transport Assessment to the satisfaction of the Council and Transport Scotland.

In addition to the above the Council are likely to seek Developer Contributions towards infrastructure provision in the area. Further requirements are likely to be identified through the SEA process.

Inverness Retail and Business Park

Decision

Site to be allocated in the Highland wide Local Development plan.

Justification

In assessing this proposal it is appropriate to consider the following points:

- Need for development of this use and location of this use; and
- Connectivity to the wider area.

Need for development of this use

In the City of Inverness there are a number of retail parks including those at Inverness Retail and Business Park, Telford Street and in the Carsegate area. It is Scottish Government Policy to direct retail development to the existing retail centres. As Inverness Retail and Business Park is already a retail centre expansion of this site could be seen as inline with Government policy. It is appropriate to assess this development following the sequential approach and in order to determine an application on this site a Retail Impact Assessment will be required which clearly demonstrates the use of the sequential approach.

Conclusion

This site is currently subject to an outline planning application for non-food retail. In determining this application it will be appropriate to consider the impact this may have on the other retail centres in the City of Inverness and the impact development at this scale may have on these centres.

Phasing

2011-2016

Developer Requirements

Aid in the provision of railway crossing
Retail impact assessment
Path connections
Green infrastructure

Milton of Culloden Small Holdings (HwLDP-MIR-138)

Decision

Site to be included in the Highland wide Local Development Plan within early phases. Site to be allocated as short-medium term expansion (housing land) **2011-2016**. The wider site should be brought forward once local road infrastructure improvements have been made in the area. The wider site should be phased from 2021-2031.

Justification

The proposal in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework identified this for a mixture of medium and low density housing.

The allocation of sites to contribute toward the strategy for the development of the City of Inverness and its expansion in the Highland wide Local Development Plan needs to:

- Consider the current housing supply;
- Allow for the consolidation of the city; and
- Plan for sustainable growth of the city.

While the proposal at Milton of Culloden Small Holdings, contributes in part to each of the above, we would see it as being long term, beyond the first 10 year period in which we are allocating sites for the growth of the City of Inverness. Our reasoning for this is below:

Housing Land Supply

The current unconstrained housing land supply in Inverness is expected to last until 2020. This is based upon a supply of 6036 which within the next ten years would be able to meet the housing need which is identified in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment. In addition to this is a constrained supply of 1160 to which the

restriction could be lifted in the life of this plan. We recognise the need to offer alternatives to these constrained sites, in case the necessary infrastructure can not be delivered in the life of this plan and therefore have chosen to allocate sites which would help to consolidate the city.

Consolidate the City

In seeking to consolidate the City of Inverness we will be looking to allocate sites which will help to achieve this. Given the above mentioned housing land supply in Inverness we will first be directing growth to sites which are already adopted as part of the Inverness Local Plan and then to the A96 expansion areas. We believe that a residential development at Milton of Culloden Small Holdings, in the medium to short term, at this time would not aid in the consolidation of the city in the short to medium term but in the medium to long term (post-2016) there is potential for it to do so.

Planning for sustainable growth of the City

In planning for the sustainable growth of the city we have chosen to allocate development sites to the east of the City which can meet the need established in development in the period 2011-2021 and then take a view as to where the growth could be in the City post 2021. The sites which we have chose to allocate in the proposed plan are close to the city centre and existing services, have the potential to deliver wider benefits in terms of active and sustainable travel opportunities, significant contribution to the green framework and delivery of the long term infrastructure needed in the area. Those of which we have taken a view as being long term sites have been chosen in order to identify land for the long term consolidation and sustainable growth of the city.

Conclusion

We believe that the site at Milton of Culloden Small Holdings, in the short-medium term (2011-2016), may be suitable for a level of development which would facilitate a transition between the agricultural landscape to the east and the urbanised landscape to the west.

Phasing

2011-2016 (wider site – 2021-2031)

Developer Requirements

Developer requirements will be identified through the SEA process.

Stratton Farm (HwLDP-MIR-249)

Decision

Part of site to be allocated in the Highland wide Local Development plan.

Justification

The allocation of sites to contribute toward the strategy for the development of the City of Inverness and its expansion in the Highland wide Local Development Plan needs to:

- Consider the current housing supply;
- Allow for the consolidation of the city; and
- Plan for sustainable growth of the city.

We believe that, in part, the development of elements of the development proposed at Stratton Farm would aid in the delivery of the sustainable expansion of Inverness to the East.

Current Housing Land Supply

The current unconstrained housing land supply in Inverness is expected to last until 2020. This is based upon a supply of 6036 which within the next ten years would be able to meet the housing need which is identified in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment. In addition to this is a constrained supply of 1160 to which the restriction could be lifted in the life of this plan. We recognise the need to offer alternatives to these constrained sites, in case the necessary infrastructure can not be delivered in the life of this plan and therefore have chosen to allocate sites which would help to consolidate the city.

We believe that the development proposal at Stratton Farm should be one of these alternative sites. However, given the scale of the proposal we believe that at this time only a first phase of the proposal should be allocated in the Local Development Plan. The reason for this is that the proposal as a whole would require significant infrastructure, including the upgrade of the A96 trunk road, which is not likely to be delivered pre-2017. The uncertainty of the design of the upgrading of the A96 trunk road is one of the reasons why the proposed business units (including car showrooms and a garden centre) are would not included in the first phase of development). By delivering a first phase of development, infrastructure improvements can be secured prior to them being overloaded by this and other surrounding developments.

Consolidation of the City

In seeking to consolidate the City of Inverness we will be looking to allocate sites which will help to achieve this. Given the above mentioned housing land supply in Inverness we will first be directing growth to sites which are already adopted as part of the Inverness Local Plan and then to the A96 expansion areas.

We believe that in part the Stratton Farm development would help to consolidate the East of the city. While the delivery of the proposed development as a whole would aid in the expansion and consolidation to the east, we believe, for the reasons mentioned above, that only a first phase should be allocated at this time. This first phase will enable the consolidation of the city to the east and also with Culloden.

Plan for sustainable growth of the City

In planning for the sustainable growth of the city we have chosen to allocate development sites to the east of the City which can meet the need established in development in the period. We believe that a development at Stratton Farm could meet part of this need. This and other sites which we have chose to allocate in the proposed plan are close to the city centre and existing services, have the potential to deliver wider benefits in terms of active and sustainable travel opportunities, significant contribution to the green framework and delivery of the long term infrastructure needed in the area.

Conclusion

We believe that a first phase of development in this area could deliver benefits to the wider City of Inverness, aid in the consolidation in the city and help to deliver some of the longer term infrastructure required to enable future development of the City.

Phasing

As stated above in the Highland wide Local Development Plan we are seeking to allocate the entire site but only give detail on a first phase of development at Stratton Farm. We believe in doing so we can balance the pressure places on the existing infrastructure while also enabling the provision of new infrastructure. In order to do this we will also set out a number of developer requirements in the Highland wide Local Development Plan.

While we recognise the merits of a wider approach to the development and would encourage the landowner/developer to continue to pursue this wider masterplanned approach we can only have certainty on delivery of a proposal at this scale. We will allocate the entire development site but we will only provide detail on the what we will allow in Phase 1 of this development. It is anticipated that this Phase 1 should be located to the west of Barn Church Road.

	2011-2016	2016-2021	2021-2026	2026-2031
Residential (units)	300	450	875	875
Food Retail (m ²)	8000	0	0	0
Non-Food Retail (m ²)	1350	1000	1000	0
Office Accommodation (m ²)	2100	2000	1000	0
Health Centre (m ²)	1900	0	0	0
Church (m ²)	1000	0	0	0
Community Building (including Library) (m ²)	1700	0	0	0
Restaurant/Café (m ²)	375	0	0	0
Primary School (m ²)	0	1300	1300	0
Park and Ride	500 Spaces	0	0	0
Hotel	80 bed	0	80 bed	0
Commercial/Business (m ²)	0	9500		0

Justification for Phasing:

We believe this phasing will enable the delivery of the appropriate level of infrastructure for development of this site. This phasing will provide the opportunity to deliver elements of this site alongside the consolidation of the rest of the City of Inverness to the South.

Residential

It is of utmost importance to deliver the sites within the City of Inverness first, to enable the city to be consolidated. However it is also important to offer choice to the housing market, by allocating this land we believe that this choice is being offered. Within the first phase we would anticipate around 150 houses per year being delivered. No more than this amount would be permitted prior to the delivery of improvements to the Trunk Road network as there may be a detrimental impact on the network given the level of development. To ensure that residential development is focused on the available sites within the City of Inverness it is appropriate to split the first phase of residential development into two sub-phases the first 2011-2016 (450) and 2016-2021 (300)

Food Retail

The Inverness Local Plan identifies the need for an additional supermarket in this area to serve the existing communities, however a site was not identified through the development planning process.

The A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework identifies this area for the potential development of a supermarket to serve the existing areas of Smithton, Culloden, Balloch and the potential new residential development within the East Inverness area. The framework envisages up to 8000m² of Food Retail, 4000m² to provide for the current developments in the area, and 2011-2016 4000m² to provide

for future development in the area. As the timescale for this proposal is for delivery post 2011 the reason for the development of a food store of 8000m² rather than two smaller units is understood.

A Retail Impact Assessment for this proposal has been prepared to accompany the application. The Retail Impact Assessment considers this development not to be relevant in terms of the normal approach to retail impact assessments, for the reasons stated in the Retail Impact Assessment. As this development is outwith Inverness City Centre and is considered contrary to the Development Plan the sequential approach does need to be followed as recommended by National Planning Policy. The sequential approach should be applied and assessed against Inverness City Centre.

Non-Food Retail

As part of delivering a sustainable development a new district centre to serve both the existing and future developments can not rely solely on a food retail store. There should be a mix of retail opportunities which will encourage the location of local and independent retail stores. With this said, development of non-food retail at this scale should be supported by a retail impact assessment. We recognise that the delivery of this non-food retail is an essential part of the town centre which is to be created as part of this development. Within the early phases of this development the existing Culloden District Centre will be able to provide local district centre uses to new development. This said it would be appropriate to include these uses in the later phases of development as the development will out growth the current provision of local services at Culloden District Centre.

Office Accommodation

To promote a truly sustainable development it would be appropriate to include employment opportunities as part of any development. This offers the opportunity for people to reduce their need to travel for work. Providing offices in close proximity to the non-food retail and residential areas will provide a true mix of uses both horizontally and vertically.

Community Facilities

Given that a development of this scale will put significant pressure and provide homes for around 1500 people within the first phase it is necessary to provide the right level of community buildings within the site. This will include a site for a health centre, a site for a religious building, and a community building which should incorporate a library. It would be appropriate to co-locate most of these uses, to make the best use of the site and reduce running costs of the facilities in the longer term.

Primary Schools

A significant increase in population of this area would lead to capacity issues with the primary schools in the area. It is therefore appropriate to require new schools to be provided within this area, a total of two primary schools should be provided and contributions may be sought towards extending the capacity of Culloden Academy. Of this additional provision one primary school and contributions to Culloden Academy will be sought prior to completion of the first phase.

Park and Ride

The cumulative impact on infrastructure, of this and other developments should be fully considered when masterplanning. A way in which to encourage more sustainable modes of transport and to alleviate pressure on transport infrastructure is through provision of a Park and Ride. We believe that provision of a Park and Ride in

this area would offer significant benefits in terms of reducing carbon emissions, improving the air quality within Inverness City Centre due to less cars travelling into and through the centre and promoting onward active travel once people have arrived at the bus drop off point. A Park and Ride at this location, along side other interventions such as bus priority lanes, would significantly increase public transport use in the area.

Hotel

We believe there may be capacity for a hotel within this area to accommodate a growing economy and for business travel due to the sites proximity to Inverness Airport. However, given that there are a number of hotels already located in Inverness and others which have planning consent, we believe that a hotel in this area needs to be justified through a market analysis of the hotel industry in Inverness and the sequential approach to development should be applied. Until this has been carried out it would not be appropriate to consider a hotel in this area.

Commercial/Business

At this time the Council do not believe that it would be suitable for the location of the types of commercial and business uses (garden centre and car show rooms) proposed to be located in this area. In terms of a new garden centre in this area, there are already two major garden centres within close proximity of this area and therefore it is unlikely that there would be the demand for such a facility. In terms of car show rooms, it is not appropriate to locate car showrooms in this location at the entrance to the city when there is a more than adequate area of the City already available for these uses. In addition to this it would be inappropriate to locate this within the currently indicated area given the uncertainty of the final route of the Trunk Link Road. Therefore it would be appropriate not to consider development in this area until post 2021.

Developer Requirements

- Developer Contributions to Milburn Road cycle lane
- Developer Contributions will be sought to the provision of an A9-A96 Trunk Link Road;
- Developer Contributions will be sought to the provision of a local Distributor Road;
- A Park and Ride must be delivered onsite;
- Open space delivered in line with open space in new residential developments: supplementary guidance
- Recycling provision on site;
- A Retail Impact Assessment will be required for retail developments in each phase;
- Developer Contributions will be sought to aid in the provision of a solution at Inshes roundabout;
- Dualling of the A96 between the Smithton and Inverness Retail and Business Park roundabouts;
- At Smithton roundabout an additional lane from A96 west will be required.
- At Smithton roundabout a free flow slip road from Barn Church Road;
- Signalise all arms and changing lanes markings at Raigmore Interchange;
- Lane markings will be required on the B865 approaches to Millburn roundabout;
- Signalisation and changes to lane markings at Longman roundabout;
- Provision of a right turn lane at the signalised junction between Barn Church Road and Tower Road;
- Landscape Framework is required;

- Open Space should be delivered in line with the requirements of Open Space in New Residential Developments: Supplementary Guidance;
- Provide active travel linkages to key community facilities
- Provide active travel linkages within and out with the site.
- Developer Contributions will be sought to the Inverness-Nairn Coastal and Landward trails;
- Developer contributions will be sought towards public transport improvements;
- Developer contributions will be sought towards transport infrastructure interventions;
- Homezone principles will need to be applied;
- Consideration should be given to the treatment of monuments and events identified in the Historic Environment Record;
- Consideration of the impact of development on the Moray Firth SAC and Longman and Castle Stuart Bays SSSI;
- Recreation Management Plan will be required;
- A Badger Survey will be required;
- A flood risk assessment is required;
- No culverting of water courses will be permitted;
- Limited use of street lighting;
- All access arrangements to be ransom free;
- A detailed masterplan is to be produced for each phase of development;
- Primary School Contribution
- Secondary School Contribution

Stratton Lodge (HwLDP-MIR-138)

Decision

Site **not** to be included in the Highland wide Local Development Plan within early phases. Site to be allocated as medium term expansion (housing land) **post-2016**.

Justification

The proposal in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework identified this site for a hotel. In the a representation submitted on behalf of MacDonald Estates for this site they requested that the land on which Stratton Lodge currently site should be allocated as housing. As this request has been made we will consider this site for housing land at this time.

The allocation of sites to contribute toward the strategy for the development of the City of Inverness and its expansion in the Highland wide Local Development Plan needs to:

- Consider the current housing supply;
- Allow for the consolidation of the city; and
- Plan for sustainable growth of the city.

While the proposal at Stratton Lodge, Inverness contributes in part to each of the above, we would see it as being long term, beyond the first 10 year period in which we are allocating sites for the growth of the City of Inverness. Our reasoning for this is below:

Housing Land Supply

The current unconstrained housing land supply in Inverness is expected to last until 2020. This is based upon a supply of 6036 which within the next ten years would be able to meet the housing need which is identified in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment. In addition to this is a constrained supply of 1160 to which the restriction could be lifted in the life of this plan. We recognise the need to offer alternatives to these constrained sites, in case the necessary infrastructure can not be delivered in the life of this plan and therefore have chosen to allocate sites which would help to consolidate the city.

Consolidate the City

In seeking to consolidate the City of Inverness we will be looking to allocate sites which will help to achieve this. Given the above mentioned housing land supply in Inverness we will first be directing growth to sites which are already adopted as part of the Inverness Local Plan and then to the A96 expansion areas. We believe that a residential development at Stratton Lodge, in the medium to short term, at this time would not aid in the consolidation of the city in the short to medium term but in the medium to long term (post-2016) there is potential for it to do so.

Planning for sustainable growth of the City

In planning for the sustainable growth of the city we have chosen to allocate development sites to the east of the City which can meet the need established in development in the period 2011-2021 and then take a view as to where the growth could be in the City post 2021. The sites which we have chose to allocate in the proposed plan are close to the city centre and existing services, have the potential to deliver wider benefits in terms of active and sustainable travel opportunities, significant contribution to the green framework and delivery of the long term infrastructure needed in the area. Those of which we have taken a view as being long term sites have been chosen in order to identify land for the long term consolidation and sustainable growth of the city.

Conclusion

We believe that the site at Stratton Lodge, in the long term (post 2016), may be suitable for a level of development at the scale proposed. However, given:

- existing unconstrained land supply in Inverness
- the need for focus development to consolidate the city;
- the potential to impact on the green wedge between Culloden and Balloch;
- the location of the site in relation to others; and
- the infrastructure upgrades associated with this site

we believe that other sites in the area should be brought forward to deliver the sustainable growth of Inverness to the East prior to this development area. Therefore we propose to allocate this site as a long term housing expansion site.

Phasing

Post 2021

Developer Requirements

Developer requirements will be identified through the SEA process.

Land between Ashton and Beechwood Holdings (HwLDP-MIR-118)

Decision

Site to be included in the Highland wide Local Development Plan within early phases.

Site to be allocated as medium-long term expansion **2021-2031**.

Justification

The proposal in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework identified this site for a hotel. In the a representation submitted on behalf of Mr F Hutcheson it is requested that this is not land locked from future development.

Development on this site would not be possible until an adequate access solution has been identified. This may be possible through the provision of an east-west local distributor link road. However, this is not likely to be delivered in the short term, therefore it would only be possible to deliver this site in the medium to longer term.

Conclusion

We believe that the site between Beechwood and Ashton Holdings, in the medium-long term (2021-2031), may be suitable for a level of development at the scale proposed.

Due to the infrastructure constraints, we believe that other sites in the area should be brought forward prior to this site to deliver the sustainable growth of Inverness to the East prior to this development area. Therefore we propose to allocate this site as a medium to long term housing expansion site.

Phasing

2021-2031

Developer Requirements

Developer requirements will be identified through the SEA process.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

See Committee Draft papers and above for wording.

Issue (heading):	Easter Ross and Nigg
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Easter Ross and Nigg
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Duncan MacDonald (17), Alan Findley (20), HITRANS (33), Juliet Robinson(34), Graham & Sibbald - Mr Derek Mackenzie (35), Tarbat Community Council (49), Mrs J Mayhew (50), Nairn River Community Council (51), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), Paul & Helen Jenkins (74), Jane Arnold (77), I Wade (85), Mrs L Mackintosh (90), Kurt Larson (95), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), Inverness South Community Council (107), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - Mr Hamish MacKenzie, Mrs Catherine Charlish, & Mrs Kirsty Leonard (134), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - MacLean Family - Muir of Ord (136), Cromarty Arts (150), Friends of the Far North Line (152), Highlands and Islands Green Party (168), Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Tain (175), Carl Beck (178), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Ian Cowan (185), Colliers CRE (189), Highlands and Islands Enterprise (190), CB Richard Ellis Limited (193), Peter Roberts (194), Bernard Goodwin (195), Anne Thomas (197), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Floris Greenlaw (222), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Robert Goodwin (234), Ardress Community Council (236), William Grant (243), Patricia Roberts (247), Julian Paren (252), Eveline Waring (253), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Scottish Renewables (270), Helen Campbell (301), GVA Grimley - International Property Advisors (305), Brenda Steele (319), Scottish Government (324), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (326), EMAC Planning - Hill of Fearn West, Scotia Homes (334)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace / Amend Structure Plan Policies B1 & B5
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Nigg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments received indicated that the potential in Nigg Yard should be maximised with a diverse range of industrial opportunities including marine renewable construction. Some indicated that the petro-chemical element should be dropped. Other comment indicated that the useful life of Nigg as a large scale employment centre may be past. This development would need full consultation ▪ Comment was received indicating that the allocation at Nigg should include the Dow land to east ▪ Masterplan goes too far by permitting industrial use on Dow land ▪ Polluting industrial uses must be excluded because of location ▪ Nigg proposals need to take account of adjacent hazardous chemical site (oil) and have risk/consultation zone around it, Draw attention to previous SEPA comments re: flood risk ▪ Feel that proposals at Nigg need to take more account of residents local to the site ▪ Energy could be supplied by wind farm on Nigg hill ▪ Nigg development should be severely restricted as it lies in an area of natural beauty and is also vulnerable to sea level rises ▪ Concern was voiced that It is time project is up and running ▪ Support development if impact on ecology is minimal 	

- Concentrate on deep water activities, avoid haulage on roads, need to protect natural heritage and scenic qualities
- Highlands and Islands Enterprise are promoting Nigg as strategic site for Scotland in line with the National Planning Framework
- Any expansion or intensification of activity needs liaison with SNH
- History of large infrastructure projects with largely imported labour not suitable for Highland, smaller projects way forward
- THC should pursue compulsory purchase of yard to progress development
- Need to highlight great potential of area to serve marine and offshore renewables industry

Infrastructure

- Wish to see provision of public transport and pedestrian/cycle routes to strategic sites
- Development at Nigg needs assessment of onshore/offshore transport infrastructure and investment needed to improve water and waste water
- Roads infrastructure will be an issue to serve the development
- HITRANS indicated that the potential for marine/road/rail interchange should be identified in Easter Ross
- Consideration should be given to building railway spur to Nigg

Dispersal of employment and settlement growth opportunities

- Support for the dispersed growth option to promote development Easter / Mid Ross
- Support development of this area, but Inverness should remain priority
- Support given towards small and local levels of development in Easter Ross and Nigg, but not for Nigg as a major employment centre
- The preferred option is seen as potentially too narrow and that the potential of other areas in Easter Ross should be included (feel comment does not consider dispersal strategy at Q2)
- Would like to see the promotion of leisure activity with the development of a marina at Invergordon
- Highlands and Islands Enterprise are also keen to promote Deephaven and Delny
- Energy could be supplied by wind farm on Nigg hill
- Wish to see other development areas other than Nigg promoted for Easter Ross
- Effort should be concentrated on Ainess/Evanton
- The Nigg site should be utilised to provide nuclear power generation
- There appears to be an over-reliance on Nigg development
- It is important to specify and delineate areas to be screened from development , no provision for this exists in the MIR, Completely scattered development would adversely change the area's character
- Should Council wish to adopt Nigg masterplan as supplementary guidance, this should be clearly stated in proposed plan (Scottish Government)
- There was a call for growth and development to also be supported in local centres in Easter Ross
- Support role of communities in Ross-shire in supporting business and industrial development of Easter Ross and Nigg such as Hill of Fearn, Muir of Ord
- It was indicated that the option in the main excludes the Black Isle and

<p>Tain these areas should be included in Easter Ross growth potential as many Nigg workers stayed there</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to balance economic growth against securing sustainable communities and safeguarding the environment ▪ Support further development of Easter Ross communities utilising existing transport network, inclusion of further land at Tain and Marybank ▪ Improvements to the rail network and train frequency would benefit development in the area ▪ Invergordon should concentrate on developing on tourism/leisure sector ▪ Industrial uses at Invergordon should transfer to Nigg, improve environment of Invergordon and promote tourist related development ▪ Support delivery of small non polluting units being provided and promotion of tourism to the area ▪ Should expand the potential of other areas, where infrastructure improvements are also required ▪ Promote review of sites in Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan to determine effectiveness of existing allocated sites, Locate more housing with closer proximity to Nigg, this would support dispersed delivery strategy
<p>Policy sought by those submitting representations:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wish to see the focus for promotion of Nigg for the development of renewable energy • Consider that the Nigg Yard no longer has the potential to provide large scale employment opportunities and policy should be spread across other sites. • Wish Inverness to be the main focus for any business and Industrial development
<p>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</p>
<p>Easter Ross and Nigg</p> <p>The potential future use of Nigg Yard and proximal land was the subject of various comments as to the appropriateness of the future use and further development of the site. Comments were also received on the wider potential for Easter Ross</p> <p>Nigg</p> <p>Concern was voiced over the ability to ever accommodate substantial industrial development and also that the window of opportunity for entering the renewable energy sector had passed. The Nigg Yard and proximal lands offer the potential for the development of a sustainable future, delivering renewable technologies to serve local UK markets and also to be able to serve wider markets around the globe. While the development of wind turbines is well established in the Netherlands, there is scope for the yard to be involved in the construction of finished towers.</p> <p>Suggestions of the delivery of a wind farm on Nigg Hill is not supported as one on the uses within the masterplan developed for the future use of the site and as such would have to be the subject of further investigation.</p> <p>Within the tidal and wave renewables market there is greater opportunity to be in the leading edge of developing technologies and construction of tidal and wave generation equipment.</p> <p>Comments indicated that an allocation at Nigg should include the Dow land to east, the existing Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan includes the “Dow” land within the</p>

allocation as does the Nigg Development Masterplan. The options within the masterplan do indicate the potential for the development of fabrication of modules and also renewables on this area of land although development sites are constrained due to the topography of the site. As with other activities promoted on the remainder of the site environmental impacts would need considered when developing proposals. The masterplan has been adopted by the Council as non-statutory supplementary planning guidance and will form the basis for development of policy in relation to the future development of Nigg Yard and proximal lands.

It as indicated in comments received that there was an over reliance on Nigg in respect of major development and that this should be dispersed across the area. Nigg Bay has been identified within the National Planning Framework 2 and the Highlands and Islands Enterprise Strategy as having the potential to deliver for decommissioning oil and gas installations and the manufacture capacity and delivery of support services for the renewable energy industry. The deep water of the Cromarty Firth is an important asset of strategic importance. There are other development opportunities within Easter Ross that have capacity to support the economic development of the area and also provide support services for specialised industries such as the renewables sector. The plan delivers a policy in regard to business and industrial land and major existing sites have been identified in the Proposals map accompanying the plan in addition further work being undertaken by Highlands and Islands Enterprise is to identify specific locations where there is an identifiable need for the allocation of industrial land.

The Nigg Yard and proximal lands have been the subject of a development masterplan prepared to investigate and identify the potential development opportunities of the Nigg Yard and proximal lands in line with the existing policy approach in the Highland Structure Plan and the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, and investigate the potential for the development of renewable energy related developments. In terms of assisting in the delivery of these economic opportunities the masterplan would also support the compulsory purchase of land to facilitate the delivery of a viable site.

Comments considered it important to specify and delineate areas to be screened from development The adopted development masterplan addresses the issues regarding the flood risk to the site and also considers the potential implications of various activities being proposed for the Yard and adjacent lands. Further assessments and consultation will be required when applications come forward to assess and to propose mitigation against any potential environmental and landscape impacts.

The need to balance economic growth against securing sustainable communities and safeguarding the environment was highlighted along with the need for proposals at Nigg need to take more account of residents local to the site. The preparation of the Nigg Development Masterplan has involved wide ranging consultation of affected communities and has taken account of concerns raised in this respect. Any detailed applications will also be required to undertake consultation of major applications for the site. In regard to the environmental impact of development the proposals proffered in the plan have been the subject of strategic environmental impact assessment. Proposals following the options indicated in the brief will likely still be required to undertake an environmental impact assessment.

In terms of the progression of any development at the Nigg Yard this also receives support in the National Planning Framework as a strategic development site. In order to further progress the potential reuse and development of Nigg and the proximal

lands The Council wish to adopt the Nigg Development Masterplan as supplementary guidance, and this is to be indicated in proposed plan.

Infrastructure

The study involved in the preparation of the Nigg Development Masterplan has considered the existing transport links serving the site and until development proposals come forward the precise requirements in terms of the wider infrastructure provision. The Nigg Development Masterplan has made an assessment of the capacity of the transport infrastructure as stands currently and as previously served the pre-existing oil platform fabrication at Nigg. Provision is made within the existing Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan for the consideration of the development of a rail linkage. The development masterplan expects that the bulk of materials coming into and leaving Nigg will be by sea

In terms of the potential for a rail link the Nigg Development Masterplan does not propose any rail link from Nigg to the North Highland line though this does not preclude a study being carried out into this at a future date. It is expected that the bulk of materials coming into and leaving Nigg will be by sea. A further study of any rail link proposals (including costs) would be required to support a proposal of this nature.

The Council already supports the development of marine/road/rail interchange, with an identified site at Highland Deephaven included in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. Planning permissions at Deephaven have been secured that will allow an extension of the existing activities at the site and the potential for the development of a direct rail link into the site.

Dispersal of employment and growth opportunities

Comments indicate that they feel the area highlighted in the main issues report is too narrow and should be extended to cover a wider area that will be affected directly by a growth in economic activity at Nigg and through Easter Ross. The potential for the benefits of a revitalised Nigg Yard and the growth will extend beyond the immediate area of Nigg itself and employees likely to come from throughout the Highland area, the development opportunities for downstream industries will be able to utilise available industrial and business land in surrounding settlements. It is acknowledged that a skilled workforce would be likely sourced widely though Easter Ross and the Black Isle and beyond.

In terms of dispersing the potential for growth the Highland wide Local Development Plan the Council will support the development of strategic business and industrial sites/locations across the Highland area. These will be further specified through area local development plans but are identified in the Proposals Map with many other strategic sites shown in the Easter Ross area. Proposals for new business and industrial development will be directed to these sites/locations and to other existing or allocated employment locations.

In addition the issue of developing more housing opportunities closer to Nigg was raised. The existing housing allocations within the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan 2007 were made in response to the identified potential for significant growth in both employment and housing needs. Allocations were also made specifically to be able to accommodate demand led by an anticipated resurgence of industrial activity at Nigg.

It was indicated in comments to the MIR that heavy industry at Invergordon should

transfer to Nigg away from residences, Invergordon to concentrate on tourism/leisure. The development of the Nigg Yard will have the potential to accommodate elements of activities currently undertaken at Invergordon. However to move all of these activities would result in loss of spend from employees in local shops and to the wider economy of Invergordon.

The MIR also recognises that potential for significant growth is identified near Inverness, in terms of housing growth and also business/industry. It is acknowledged that Whiteness may still have potential for accommodating development into the renewables sector but the site does have competing interest as a site for large scale housing development. In terms of Nigg and the wider Easter Ross area this does have the benefit of clustering of existing industrial development and resource that can readily cross over to the activities indicated in the Nigg Development Masterplan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Inner Moray Firth Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Nigg

Policy - Business and Industrial Land

Proposals Map shows settlement hierarchy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Flooding
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Flooding
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
J. McDonald (11), L. Shadforth (15), D. MacDonald (17), I. Brandt (18), J. Robinson (34), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), RSPB (78), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), Kirkton Farms Ltd (106), Inverness South Community Council (107), A. Manson (143), Westhill Community Council (147), J. Walford (155), Philip Aitchison Ltd (162), Glenurquhart Community Council (174), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), A. Thomas (197), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Stop Highland Windfarms Campaign (213), Croy & Culloden Moor Community Council (218), Kincaig & Vicinity Community Council (225), M.Hutcheson & A. Lowe (226), Ardross Community Council (236), W. Main (238), P. Roberts (247), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), R. Piercy (257), D. Buchanan (265), Scottish Water (281), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Reynolds Architecture (302), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318), B. Steele (319), P. Christie (323), SEPA (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Structure Plan Policies / Proposals (NH1, NH2, NH3) with single policy
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Several parties support the preferred option policy</u> outlined in the Main Issues report (this includes: a requirement for developer funded flood risk assessments; mapping of areas of flood risk; a basic approach of directing developers away from areas of flood risk, and; support for development within flood risk areas if adequate mitigation is proposed)</p> <p><u>Others request a more restrictive policy</u> - for example: no-go areas for certain types of development; better vetting of developer flood risk assessments; adding precautionary allowances for climate change and sea level rise to the definition of risk areas because the public cost of flood defences and clear up would be so high; enforcement of mitigation needs to be more effective and works should not have other detrimental environmental effects; developer should be legally liable for costs of any post development flood damage; risk to animals should be included; mitigation should be on all sites not just those at risk; mitigation should eliminate all risk not just reduce it, and overriding principle should be flood avoidance not flood management.</p> <p><u>Others request a less restrictive policy</u> would be better - for example less land being mapped as at risk because the data that underpins current mapping is inaccurate; developers shouldn’t have to pay for flood risk assessments - Council should provide free data; preventing development within Inverness City flood risk areas is impractical</p> <p><u>Others suggest direct action</u> - for example: new flood protection defences; better watercourse maintenance; better flood warnings; use of more permeable surfaces within developments, and; safeguarding and creation of natural flood management devices such as wetlands and protecting against peat / soil damage</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<u>A more restrictive policy</u> - a combination of tougher restrictions on exceptional uses, areas and acceptable mitigation.	

A less restrictive policy - no requirement for developers to fund flood risk assessments and fewer areas being classified as at risk

Direct action - a list of proposals not policies plus a policy encouraging the safeguarding, maintenance and creation of natural flood management devices

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

The Council's current, general land use policy on flooding has been tested through two recent local plan inquiry processes which have involved considerable public and agency debate and judgement by a person independent of the Council. It would therefore be inappropriate to introduce wholesale changes to the Council's position on this topic. However, the Council should respond to new and emerging issues. In particular, greater emphasis on the use of natural flood management devices and a greater allowance for sea level and climate change in coastal flood risk assessment would be appropriate and reflect emerging best practice.

Many of the other representations particularly those relating to direct action are important but largely matters of operational practice (which can be partly addressed by supplementary guidance on this topic) and capital programme political priorities rather than policy.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Flood Risk
Policy - Surface Water Drainage
Policy - Peat and Soils

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Forestry and Woodland
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Forestry and Woodland
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Duncan MacDonald (17), EON (31), Mrs J Mayhew (50), Lochardil and Drummond Community Council (56), Laid Grazing Committee (83), 91 David Mathews (91), Kingairloch Estate (95), Forestry Commission (116), SNH (118), Elizabeth Budge (148) 174 Glenurquhart Community Council (174) Grantown on Spey Community Council (192) Anne Thomas R, Friends of the Earth (197), KinCraig and vicinity community council (225), Strutt and Parker, Balnagowan Estate (229), Highland Council (241) Shieldaig Community Council (245), Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Council (256), European Forestry Resources Scotland (275), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele(319), Scottish Government (324), SEPA (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace SP policies F1-F7
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>On woodland planting and the Highland Forestry and Woodland Strategy....</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase Scots Pine • Encourage all planting of forests and woodland actively. • In addition to link to HFWS, need for links and reference to other information that will assist to maximise opportunities and maximise benefits. • Encourage forestry particularly native woodlands enhancing environment and providing jobs. Scottish Forestry Strategy is too timid in encouraging afforestation in places like Sutherland. There should be more experimentation and investment in marginal areas to bring back native trees. • There should be presumption against tree planting in wild unspoilt areas where it should be restricted to natural regeneration of native species. Regret that the Moray area of Dava was recently infilled by planting with negative impact on attractiveness and amenity. • The Scottish Government target of 25% tree cover will impact most on upland areas as they offer less productivity due to higher rainfall and poor fertility. This needs sensitivity to the impact on landscape vistas. There is also a need to encourage selective fells as opposed to clear fells. • The emerging Scottish Government woodland policy is very inappropriate effectively discouraging anyone from planting trees and should be reviewed immediately. • Consider the HFWS was deeply flawed. • Stop spending money on this within Highland Council and let the Forestry Commission deal with. 	

- SEPA: policies should take account of some water bodies (such as Loch Shin) to the use of fertilisers which may significantly restrict the development of new forestry plantations in catchment areas.
- Concern expressed about the ability of the HFWS to meet Scottish Forestry Strategy targets for expansion.
- Support the preferred option, but plan should be at more appropriate scale to read the areas suitable for different type of woodland.
- Increase in woodland could help climate change but carefully as planting on peat land causes this to dry out increasing CO2 emissions. Increase in wood for biomass heating would reduce reliance on fossil fuels.

On Protection of Trees

- Concern about practice of people felling trees prior to submitting planning application, acknowledge difficult balance but over zealous protection may lead to more trees being felled unnecessarily.

Trees and Development

- Where within easy reach of bus routes or other service consider small housing settlements 10 -15 houses on Forestry Commission land (because this can be a source of cheap land for local communities).
- The woodland croft concept is supported because it can link housing, rural livelihoods, and woodland management. This has potential to bring new business development to crofting and enable ideas behind rural development and land reform to be realised.
- More importance should be given to forestry and woodland, there has been large investment on the West coast over last 20 years and scope for more, but need for proper management and long term protection of new woodlands.

Other comments

- Forestry is an important multi benefit resource.
- Mention should be made of significant timber processing industry, planned investment in this industry, and the rapidly developing biomass industry.
- Forestry slows run off and reduces flooding if applied to tributary areas why is this not mentioned.
- Without the correct policies being in place there could be a return to overgrazing and woodland degradation.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

On woodland planting and the Highland Forestry and Woodland Strategy....

- The alternative seems very reasonable (do not have an interim review), also avoids the expense of review
- See merit in the alternative but would incorporate the protective aspects of the preferred option.
- Forestry Commission: welcome the link to the HFWS and proposed interim

revision. They are happy to assist with this and point us to Government Rationale for Woodland Expansion.

- This section needs to cross refer to Safeguarding (and enhancing) our Environment section. SNH welcome input to interim review of HFWS and wish to see connectivity in relation to green networks/species adaptation to climate change included. Need to account for roll out of strategy and current/future woodland targets. A key limitation will be impact of infrastructure proposed such as deer fences, tracks, and drainage works and its impact on sensitive landscapes. HFWS and carbon sequestration and the role of woodland within green networks as key benefits to be nurtured.
- SNH and SEPA raised concerns about impact of new forestry plantations citing need to take additional factors into account; connectivity in relation to green networks, species adaptation to climate change, and impact on water bodies. SNH also pointed to limiting factors from the infrastructure such as deer fences, tracks, and drainage on sensitive landscapes.
- FCS Lochaber's current policy needs to be protected.
- Should be in perfect alignment with Scottish Executives ambition of achieving objective of creating 10,000 hectares of new woodland per year. Believe that there should be no new guidance and applications should be decided on a case by case basis so as not to put the national target in danger.
- Difficult to defend current practice of protecting designated ancient woodland when such land has been felled and replanted several times over the last two centuries, this is a restriction which is sometimes resulting in the loss of valuable farm land.
- Forestry Commission will be issuing guidance on planning for trees and woodland, including the preparation of local forestry and woodland strategies which should guide preparation of the Proposed Plan. Should we wish to adopt the HFWS as formal Supplementary Guidance we should indicate clearly.
- Do not review policy; consider applications on a case by case basis.
- Scottish Government: decision to be made as to whether the HwLDP adopts the HFWS as formal supplementary guidance.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

On woodland planting and the Highland Forest and Woodland Strategy (HFWS)

The role of the policy is to guide the decision making process making it robust and consistent. The area policy classification map from the Highland Forest and Woodland Strategy considers strategic constraints and opportunities across the region. Whilst increasing woodland cover is important we cannot ignore other considerations and the need to encourage the right type of woodland for any particular location (including no woodland in some instances). Having this type of policy allows us to be more strategic in consideration of opportunities for the whole of Highlands.

The next review of the HFWS will update the strategy but it is considered unlikely that the policy map (figure 2) from the current strategy will need to be revised. However

the review will enable us to take better account of the climate change agenda, and any other specific issues that are drawn to our attention, or are subsequently raised. The comments made relating to woodland management and planting are relevant to this review rather than the Trees and Development or Principle of Development in Woodland policies of the HwLDP or its future Supplementary Guidance.

It is recommended that the Highland Forestry and Woodland Strategy (2006) should be reviewed in due course, principally working with SEPA, SNH, and the Forestry Commission (including District Offices) before consultation with the wider public and other agencies. In the meantime it is proposed that the current Highland Forestry and Woodland Strategy (2006) should be considered non statutory guidance.

Woodland planting opportunities (for compensatory planting) and woodland removal has strategic land use implications in assessment of development proposals, and it would be helpful for this to be made Supplementary Guidance in due course. However it is felt that it should only gain the enhanced status of statutory Supplementary Guidance (as per Scottish Government Circular 1) when it has been updated, and subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Trees and Development

The Council recognises the potential that has been opened up by the National Land Forest scheme and if there is a housing element proposed alongside this then it can be considered on its merits with the policy proposed for new/extended township proposals. Where these involve management of woodland the expectation is that they should meet the UK Forestry Standard (the Forestry Commissions standard).

The new Crofting Bill does not discriminate within Highlands as to where new crofts can be created. However if other community woodland proposals can meet the criteria of the township policy and offer similar benefits and security in terms of land management, with a mechanism to retain in forestry tenure and not be sold on the open market, then they can also gain support.

Outwith the hinterland areas in our more fragile rural areas there will also be potential for houses on single crofts in the countryside subject to normal planning considerations.

It is also considered important that the Council positively supports appropriate housing development within new and existing woodland when it is in the longer term management interests and is suitable in terms of other planning policies. In addition to the policy context set out within the HwLDP, soon there will also be Supplementary Guidance which will provide more detailed guidance on how we wish to see trees and development integrated.

Whilst the opportunity offered to input advice on trees through the new major applications process is substantial, it is considered necessary to have an agreed policy approach and to have guidance available which can inform all applicants not just the major application proposals. The new policy and Supplementary guidance for protection of trees means that more information will be available upfront as to how the Council will protect trees. This will ensure a consistency of approach and raise awareness as to the Councils expectations.

Protection of designated woodland

With regard to the comment that good agricultural land has been lost partly because through our protection of designated woodland, the Council appreciates that there does need to be appropriate protection of both. Please refer to the schedule 4 on

Crofting and Agriculture to see how we have sought to protect good agriculture/croft land.

Scottish Government woodland policy

At world, EU and Scottish levels there is a strong presumption against deforestation with climate change considerations being a significant driver for that stance. It is recommended that the Council supports the new Scottish Government policy on control of woodland removal, and commends a policy on the principle of development in woodland to make sure the link between the HwLDP and this policy is clear. This Scottish Government policy is consistent with National Planning Framework for Scotland 2 and provides a strategic context to consider woodland removal.

It will be the Scottish Government who decides when they will review their policy; however it is not expected that this policy will be detrimental to future woodland planting as suggested in one representation. It is important that we have a strong policy presumption against woodland removal that does not achieve significant public benefit, and in appropriate cases obtains compensatory planting to form part of this balance.

Other comments

The other comments made are noted but it is not considered that the HwLDP is the correct place to consider these because its purpose is to concentrate on the land use planning policy. However these aspects will be either covered in the Councils Highland Forestry and Woodland Strategy or the Forestry Commissions own policies, which help inform the Local Development Plans where there are land use planning implications.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Trees and Development

Policy - Principle of Development in Woodland

Also intention to adopt/produce related Supplementary Guidance

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Gypsies/ Travellers
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Sustainable Highland Communities
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
D. MacDonald (17), I. Brandt (18), L. Johnston (41), J. Mayhew (50), B. Stewart (55), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), E. Budge (148), M. Meehan (156), Philip Aitchison Limited (162), Highlands and Islands Green Party (168), A. Stewart (172), Strathdearn Community Council (205), J. Martin (223) Kincaig and Vicinity Community Council (225), Strutt and Parker LLP Balnagowan Estate (229), Ardress Community Council (236), J. Waring (250), E. Waring (253) Nigg and Shadwick Community Council (254), D. Buchanan (265), Mr and Mrs C Stafford (272). Scottish Water (281), H.Campbell (301), Diane Hawskey (317), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), B.Steele (319).	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	No current policy on Gypsies/Travellers
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Unauthorised Encampments and Enforcement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred option has to be balanced by a swift and effective enforcement approach when illegal encampments appear, adopting that approach should not be left until new sites have been created. • Ensure there are laws/byelaws that make it easy to move travellers/gypsies on should they not use the allocated sites. • Strong consideration should be given to the representations of the Land Owner who may not wish to see this use accommodated on their land making any specific land allocation constrained. • Recommend that consideration be given to maintaining a register of the occupiers of such sites so that any clean up operation required following their departure can be appropriately recovered by the responsible parties. • Stringent legislation is required and on-going monitoring undertaken to ensure that it met with compliance. A consistent approach is imperative to avoid travellers decamping and moving to “easier” sites. • Proper policy should take care of unauthorised sites and by using this approach the local considerations will be properly taken into account. • Concern that there is too little regard for the Local Communities where vacant ground is simply occupied. <p>Permanent Pitches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal sites are preferred to unofficial sites, if properly managed. • Support for the provision of specific sites which can address some of the effects of not making any provision at all (i.e. unauthorised sites etc). • Permanent Council owned sites should be sold off to the gypsy groups and have no further development. • Large sites not only enjoy local suspicion and hostility, they are not favoured by this community themselves since it forces different family groups with different outlooks and expectations to be housed together in unforgiving and poorly located sites (i.e. the Longman). 	

Upkeep of sites and charges

- Sites should be kept clean and tidy and this should be a condition of use on any future site.
- Question of who pays for clean up, is it possible to have refundable deposit?
- If they do not pay Council tax perhaps there could be charges.
- Gypsies/Travellers should have some sites, but must maintain a good standard of cleanliness and keep up rules – upkeep of site.

General Approach –

- The plans should include some indication of the scale, numbers and locations(s) of the gypsy/traveller population providing basic data to allow for sensible planning.
- It is right to evaluate the particular needs/ expectations of this group. But it does not follow that they must automatically all be met. Part of the social contract of living in a wider community is that particular groups such as gypsies/travellers must accept responsibilities and obligations to that wider community, as well as an entitlement to the protection of their rights. It is of central importance to balance their needs against reasonable expectations of other communities. For this reason the criteria/tests for provision of special facilities will be critical, and the impact- assessments an essential element of planning.
- Sceptical of the alternative of a case-by-case approach. This could easily turn into a pass-the-parcel exercise, with consequent risks both of unauthorised sites and local friction.
- Need a better understanding and perhaps a plan which includes the group as being part of the solution.
- Suggest Community Councils ask their areas to identify suitable sites – if not policies very unpopular.
- Would expect a generally consistent approach to be taken.
- A different approach in different areas – this would depend on consultation.
- By definition you will need to look on a case by case basis in order to evaluate specific sites. Make sure that the Travellers are aware of the particular culture of the area they may find themselves in.
- Why can they not just keep travelling like they have done for Centuries. They are entitled to life choices, although if they don't contribute, maybe they shouldn't get.
- Prefer alternative - proper policing should take care of unauthorised sites and by using this approach the local considerations will be properly taken into account.
- It is understood policy does exist in the form of "Circular 1/94" which suggested that local planning authorities should assess the need for Gypsies/Travellers caravan sites in their administration areas and identify locations where the land use requirements of Gypsies and Travellers can be met. If suitable locations could not be found, then local authorities were required to set clear and realistic criteria for establishing caravan sites.
- Explanation required as to why it is important to cater for Gypsies/Traveller, there should be one law for all.
- Support for small scale sites owned by families themselves offer that allow Gypsy and Traveller families to closer integrate with the wider community.
- An aspect relating to all forms of caravan and motor home activity which SW would like to draw attention to is that of dealing with the disposal of waste from chemical toilets. Similarly the disposal of such waste in road drains has a serious impact on the water environment and likewise their disposal in

public toilets connected to a public septic tank can interfere and seriously degrade the biological processes at work. It is important to note that such disposal is prohibited. When considering developments for the servicing of travellers, it is important that suitable waste facilities are incorporated within the plan.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

Unauthorised Encampments

- The need for a swift and effective enforcement approach when illegal encampments appear, adopting that approach should not be left until new sites have been created.
- Recommend that consideration be given to maintaining a register of the occupiers of such sites so that any clean up operation required following their departure can be appropriately recovered by the responsible parties.
- Stringent legislation is required and on-going monitoring undertaken to ensure that it met with compliance. A consistent approach is imperative to avoid travellers decamping and moving to “easier” sites.
- Inclusion of a policy that takes into account regard for Local Communities where vacant ground becomes occupied.

Permanent Pitches

- A policy that favours formal to unofficial sites, if properly managed.
- Support for the provision of specific sites which can address some of the effects of not making any provision at all (i.e. unauthorised sites etc).
- Permanent Council owned sites should be sold off to the gypsy groups and have no further development.
- Policy favouring smaller sites to large ones.
- Inclusion of a policy that makes reference to the representations of the Land Owner who may not wish their land to be allocated for Gypsy/travellers.

Upkeep of sites and charges

- Sites to be kept clean and tidy as a condition of use on any future site.
- Policy to make reference to having a refundable deposit for clean up.
- If they do not pay Council tax perhaps there could be charges.
- Gypsies/Travellers should have some sites, but must maintain a good standard of cleanliness and upkeep of site.

General Approach –

- Policy that makes regard to the social contract of living in a wider community is that particular groups such as gypsies/travellers must accept responsibilities and obligations to that wider community, as well as an entitlement to the protection of their rights. Their needs to be a balance of their needs against reasonable expectations of other communities. For this reason the criteria/tests for provision of special facilities will be critical, and the impact- assessments an essential element of planning. – not been addressed.
- Exclusion of a case by case policy as it could easily turn into a pass-the-parcel exercise, with consequent risks both of unauthorised sites and local friction.
- A policy that includes Gypsy/ Travellers as part of the solution.
- Policy that allows Community Councils ask their areas to identify suitable

sites

- Consistent approach to be taken.
- A case by case approach in order to evaluate specific sites/area.
- A policy allowing them to continue to travel as they have for centuries
- If they don't contribute maybe they shouldn't get.
- Local considerations to be properly taken into account – including gypsy community.
- The Highland Council should assess the need for Gypsies/Travellers caravan sites in their administration areas and identify locations where the land use requirements of Gypsies and Travellers can be met.
- Policy should set clear and realistic criteria for establishing caravan sites.
- Explanation required as to why it is important to cater for Gypsies/Traveller, there should be one law for all.
- Policy that shows support for small scale sites owned by families themselves offer a way to allow for some justice towards these communities. This would also enable better access to schooling for children and better access to health care for invalid and elderly members and allow Gypsy and Traveller families to closer integrate with the wider community.
- A policy that addresses issues such as screening, environmental health, and site limitations.
- SW would like to draw attention to is that of dealing with the disposal of waste from chemical toilets. Similarly the disposal of such waste in road drains has a serious impact on the water environment and likewise their disposal in public toilets connected to a public septic tank can interfere and seriously degrade the biological processes at work. It is important to note that such disposal is prohibited. When considering developments for the servicing of travellers, it is important that suitable waste facilities are incorporated within the plan.
- Policy to include some indication of the scale, numbers and locations(s) of the gypsy/traveller population providing basic data to allow for sensible planning.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Unauthorised encampments

Many Gypsies/ Travellers will travel for part of the year and are otherwise settled on permanent sites or in houses. There may be a small group of Gypsies/travellers who travel all year round. Unauthorised camping can therefore occur when households have a form of permanent housing provision available to them. The issue of management of unauthorised encampments is out with the scope of the Development Plan. It is dealt with through The Highland Council Policy on Managing Unauthorised Camping, the revised and updated protocol of which was approved by the Housing and Social Work Committee in May 2010. For more information - [Travellers and authorised camping](#)

Permanent Pitches

In terms of accommodation provision the Highland Council provides 40 permanent pitches across 3 sites located in Lochaber and Inverness. A further 7 pitches are available on a seasonal basis at Newtonmore. This equates to 10% of National pitch provision. There are no plans currently to dispose any land to community ownership. Any new or additional provision will permit land owner representation. There is currently a register maintained for applicants on the Council sites in addition to unauthorised encampments register. These are reported to the Government for Gypsies/Travellers in Scotland: The Twice Yearly Count. This can be viewed – [Gypsies/Travellers in Scotland: The Twice Yearly Count - No. 15: January 2009.](#)

Upkeep of sites and charges

For those staying on Council owned sites charges are applied for rent and council tax. For permanent provision there are residential contracts with ensure security of tenure. The management and maintenance of permanent sites is undertaken by the Housing and Property Service on behalf of The Highland Council. Management procedures are also in place for unauthorised encampments; this includes the upkeep of sites during and after departure. For the upkeep of unauthorised encampments the procedures that are followed can be found in the previously mentioned Highland Council Policy on Managing Unauthorised Camping section 10. More information can be found through - [Travellers and authorised camping](#)

General Approach

There are basic principles encouraged by Scottish Government Guidance and accepted by the Highland Council which are fundamental. That is that the same standards of behaviour are expected from all members of the community, whether Gypsies or Travellers or the settled population, based on mutual respect and with equal rights, responsibilities, entitlements and obligations.

Scottish Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to recognise Gypsies/Travellers have specific housing needs, often requiring sites for caravans and mobile homes. It advises the needs of all Gypsies and Travellers for appropriate accommodation should be considered through the housing needs and demand assessment and local housing strategy. We have done this; the Gypsy Accommodation Needs Assessment can be found [Highland Housing Need and Demand Assessment](#). This Accommodation Needs Assessment seeks to identify the current and any emergent Accommodation Needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Highland.

Planning authorities are required to identify suitable locations for meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and set out policies about small privately owned sites. As set out by SPP - Gypsy and Traveller communities should be involved in decisions about sites for their use. In the future we would hope to liaise with Community Council's, the public and the gypsies/travellers on different accommodation options and where necessary to attempt to identify sites and our policy will make reference to this. We are choosing to create a consistent framework approach. Allow there have been representations supporting a case by case approach we feel this would lead to an inconsistent approach across the area. The policy will contain clear criteria on which an application will be based for additional provision including small privately owned sites.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Gypsies / Travellers

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Heritage (Designations and General)
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Heritage
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2), SNH (118), Ardross Community Council (236), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318), Gordon Mooney (71), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), David & Diana Gilbert (108), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Diana Buchanan (265), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Scottish Government (324), Staffin Community Council (13), Maria de la Torre (196), Elizabeth Budge (148), Annie Stewart (Keeping Nairnshire Colourful) (58), Mrs I Mackintosh (90), Ian Parsons (217), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), JG Walford (300), Juliet Robinson (34), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Bryden Associates – Strathdearn Community Council (205), Robert Goodwin (234), William Grant (243), Helen Campbell (301), Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Inverness South Community Council (107), Brenda Steele (319), Kirton Farms (106), Mrs H Rask (92) Kilearnan Community Council (144), Phillip Aichison Ltd (162), West Coast Energy (184), Ian Cowan (185), Ken Nicol (215), John Waring (250), Roger Piercy (257), Kinraig & vicinity Community Council (225), Eveline Waring (253), Patricia Roberts (247)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Policies which we intend to replace / amend: Structure Plan – N1, N3
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural heritage defines Highland so it is better to conserve what we have rather than reinstate or compensate, especially as development pressures increase. It would seem pragmatic to follow the approach of the general policy in the Sutherland and West Highland and Islands Local Plans. Perhaps ‘enhancing’ should be added to the title as opportunities to enhance should be taken. Some people do prefer the alternative option and think it would be good to develop more detailed information as part of a more protective approach. The hierarchy of features (international, national and local/regional) is dangerous as it implies that a local feature is less significant than a national feature. There is also concern over who decides the ‘importance’ of a designation. • Natural habitat cannot be replaced therefore it is important that developers are monitored to ensure compliance. Some concern that the preferred option allows for compromise as long as a developer addresses any issues. However there was also the opinion expressed that too much is already asked of developers and that there should be no policy for heritage as it hinders development. What laws are in place that requires developers to address heritage. • There was discussion about whether or not all local/regional features will be mapped in the Plan, or left to the three area local development plans, as some are currently unmapped. Areas in the wider countryside outwith designated sites are also important and valuable and require protection and enhancement; need to refer to Article 10 of the Habitats Directive. It is felt by some representors that this needs to be shown spatially e.g. peat land. The links between designated sites and the wider countryside needs to be explained. Need to define “address”. The Plan should provide detailed policy and clear guidance on the protection, conservation and enhancement of the environment, though it may come forward as supplementary guidance. The Plan and the spatial strategy should be informed by the key role of the environment in 	

delivering sustainable economic growth. Masterplanning to protect the environment is welcomed.

- SNH and Historic Scotland should map and detail features and it is important that existing features are mapped. Not all areas have been surveyed so all important features may not appear on the map.
- The vision of continuing development of expanding suburbanisation is in conflict with the policy of protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
- Rename Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation to Wildland.
- Local Nature Conservation Sites should be mapped. Areas of semi-natural habitat in wider countryside should be identified.
- Caithness Flow Country is of international importance, but not shown on map on pg44.
- Stop large developments which could have a negative effect on the physical and visual environment.
- Some people supported the preferred option but thought it may require further safeguards. The policy is essential to protect Highland. Alternatives should still be considered.
- Marine renewable developments may have an impact on important natural heritage sites.
- Developers should consult with local communities at pre-application stage and address concerns. Enough time should be provided for this.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Follow the approach of the general policy for natural, built and cultural heritage already developed through recent local plans.
- Add 'enhancing' to the title.
- More detailed approach to information on designations.
- Refer to Article 10 of Habitats Directive.
- Important areas in the wider countryside should be mapped e.g. peatland.
- Local Nature Conservation Sites should be mapped.
- Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation should be renamed as Wildland.
- Ensure the potential effects of marine renewable developments on the natural heritage are dealt with in the Proposed Plan

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

When a development proposal comes forward the outstanding built, cultural and natural heritage of an area has to be fully considered. The Proposed Plan will take forward a policy approach developed for the Wester Ross Local Plan and used in both the Sutherland Local Plan and the West Highland and Islands Local Plan. This identifies three categories of built, cultural and natural heritage. These categories are local and regionally important, nationally important and internationally important. The hierarchy of features does not mean that the relevant policy framework will be any less rigorously applied. Many of the designations are statutory and the Council must have policies in place in which to assess any impacts proposed developments would have; it is also already determined if they are for example, features of international or national importance. Heritage policies do not hinder development; they ensure that appropriate development is allowed and where necessary mitigation or enhancement is provided.

The alternative policy option of detailing all the legal and policy protection of each individual feature would not necessarily lead to a more protective approach than the preferred policy option. The same legal and policy protection of each feature will be applied regardless of the policy approach; however the alternative policy option

would considerably lengthen the Plan by simply repeating information that is available elsewhere. Rather than doing this we will follow the approach mentioned in the previous paragraph and the policy will have a link to an appendix which will provide a definition of the features, provide background and indicate the relevant policy framework.

The designations will all be shown spatially in the Proposed Plan, where we have the information digitally available. Where spatial information is available for local/regional features, these will be mapped in the Plan. The policy will make it clear that where features have not yet been mapped they will still be subject of protection. SNH and Historic Scotland do map features and detail many of the designations and provide the information to The Council. The Council is only responsible for designating or identifying some of the designations. This information will be provided in Appendix 6.3 of the Proposed Plan.

It is agreed that areas outwith designated sites and in the wider countryside are important and valuable. We will have a policy on the wider countryside which will seek to ensure that negative impacts on the environment are reduced. Our most recent Local Plans have had a policy for dealing with proposals in the wider countryside. We will have a suite of policies for species and habitats. These policies will ensure that Article 10 features can be protected, enhanced and created. Where information is available spatially, it can be mapped, however this information is not always available or where it is it can be out-of-date. Local Nature Conservation Sites (LNCS) will be mapped as and when the information is available.

The Proposed Plan will contain a suite of policies which will encourage sustainable development to occur alongside the protection and enhancement of the environment ensuring that all proposed developments are appropriate to their location; Therefore it is not necessarily about stopping all large developments.

We will be renaming Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation to Wild Areas in the Proposed Plan.

The designations on the Caithness Flow Country will be shown on a map in the Proposed Plan.

The wording that is provided in the Main Issues Report was to generate discussion and was not intended to be read as draft policies.

The Council has Aquaculture Framework Plans which help guide development to appropriate areas and minimise conflicts of interest. There will be a coastal policy in the Proposed Plan and also a renewable energy development policy in the Proposed Plan which will provide information on how the Council will deal with marine renewable energy proposals. Isolated coast will also appear as a local/regionally important feature in the Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage policy giving it protection. The Council has produced a Coastal Development Strategy which classified the coast in line with the expectation of the national guidance (NPPG 13) at the time. Major applications on the coast are likely to require an Environmental Statement.

Neighbours of any proposed development are neighbour notified. If the application is for a major or national development, the developer is required to carry out Pre-application Consultation with the local community and must submit a Proposal of Application Notice and a Pre-application Consultation Report alongside the Planning Application.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage

Policy - Protected Species

Policy - Other Important Species

Policy - Other Important Habitats

Policy - Sustainable Design

Policy - Wider Countryside

Policy - Peat and Soils

Policy - Aquaculture

Appendix includes wild areas as a local feature and breakdown other heritage features

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Heritage (Biodiversity)
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Heritage
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Keeping Nairnshire Colourful (58), John Waring (250), Eveline Waring (253), Stop Highland Windfarms Campaign (213), Kincaig & vicinity Community Council (225) William Grant (243), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2), SNH (118), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (Gareth Williams) (180), Maria de la Torre (196), Bryden Associates – Strathdearn Community Council (205)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Policies which we intend to replace / amend: Structure Plan – G2, N4-N5
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to be sure that there is sufficient input from biodiversity and environmental officers and we need to consult all organisations involved in the protection of features. The third bullet point in the preferred option should be expressed more strongly and should also be expanded to conserve and enhance, provide high quality greenspace and contribute to the local green network. Spatial information on protected and BAP species should be provided; reference should also be made to the biodiversity toolkit and a biodiversity checklist should be developed. Also need to consider requirements in terms of European sites. We need to be cautious with biodiversity as Environmental Impact Assessments are expensive. This policy should be set in the context of the biodiversity duty which places a duty on all public bodies to further the conservation of biodiversity. Green networks should be included in this section (and mapped) as they are important for people and biodiversity. Developers should be encouraged to provide details on green networks for recreation and wildlife when designing layout in developments. Creation of green corridors around settlements would enhance quality of life. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide spatial information on protected and BAP species. Develop biodiversity checklist and reference should be made to the biodiversity toolkit. Policy should be set in context of Biodiversity Duty. Green networks should be included in this section and mapped. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>The Plan will have policies for habitats and species and will not be relying on the bullet points in the Main Issues Report. The Main Issues Report purely gave information on the general thrust of the policy and was not a precise outline of the policy.</p> <p>We recognise that Environmental Impact Assessments are expensive, however sometimes these and other surveys are necessary.</p> <p>We have a biodiversity duty under the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 which we need to reflect. Currently The Council is taking steps to fulfil its Biodiversity</p>	

Duty through the Biodiversity Duty Delivery Plan approved by the PED Committee in March 2008.

The Council's Biodiversity officers and SNH have been involved from the beginning of this process and continue to be so. SNH is statutorily consulted.

The need for habitat, protected and BAP species mapping is recognised; some habitat mapping exists but it is now dated. There will always be a requirement for surveys of particular proposed development sites even if habitat mapping was available. The Council's biodiversity officers, with input from SNH and other consultees, have drafted guidance for planners and developers: Guidance on Development and Biodiversity – Highland's Statutorily Protected Species. A Biodiversity Checklist is also available. It provides advice for planners and developers on establishing what biodiversity issues may be found a particular site. Both went to PED Committee in March 2010 and both will be incorporated into the determination of planning applications where appropriate. A review of the guidance and its use is planned for 2011 alongside an assessment of the Council's performance under the biodiversity duty.

The Council's Biodiversity Officers will also prepare advice for planning staff on generic biodiversity issues. General biodiversity advice relating to development will be contained within The Council's Development Plan Policy Guidance, 'Designing for Sustainability in the Highlands'. During 2010 a set of standard planning conditions for biodiversity will also be produced.

SNH have also developed a Biodiversity Toolkit which is being trialled from March 2010 and finalised in Summer 2010. This can be mentioned in the policy as additional information that is available.

The Proposed Plan will include a map showing green networks identified in the A96 corridor. At present this is the only area where this work has been done. A policy on green networks has been developed for the Proposed Plan in the Open Space section.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage

Policy - Protected Species

Policy - Other Important Species

Policy - Other Important Habitats

Policy - Sustainable Design

Policy - Green Networks

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Heritage (Geodiversity and Interpretation)	
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Heritage	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Inverness South Community Council (107), Phillip Aichison Ltd (162), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Patricia Roberts (247), Ian Parsons (217), Kilearnan Community Council (144), Lochaber Geopark (201), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318)		
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Policies which we intend to replace / amend: Structure Plan – N1-N3	
Council’s summary of the representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A link needs to be made between archaeology based tourism and economic development; we need to advertise our historic environment. Heritage sites should be linked to their history e.g. old marching roads. • National policy for the historic environment is that planning should have regard to sustainable economic growth and this appears to be missing. • Redcastle/Kilcoy/Cadmire should be considered as a potential Conservation Area. It needs to be protected against inappropriate development. • There is no reference to the geological importance of Highland – geodiversity. The third bullet point in the preferred option should refer to this. This is important for education and tourism. Geological heritage should be given legal protection. • Please note petition PE1277 under consideration by Public Definitions Committee which calls for a geodiversity duty to be established in Scotland. • No reference to SSSI network or Geological Conservation Review database. 		
Policy sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to geodiversity. • More on interpretation of heritage 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p>The Proposed Plan will make reference to the link between the historic environment and sustainable economic growth. The Council has prepared Supplementary Guidance: Highland Historic Environment Strategy. The primary vision of the strategy is to ensure that the future management of change to the historic environment in Highland is based on an understanding of its economic, social and cultural values and that all future decisions are based on informed consideration of the heritage assets to ensure that they are protected and conserved for existing and future generations.</p> <p>Public petition PE1277 under consideration by Public Definitions Committee is noted. We note that it is urging the Scottish Government to establish a geodiversity duty. We also note that The Committee agreed on 9 February 2010 to suspend further consideration of the petition until the joint study by the British Geological Survey and SNH to establish the evidence base for the development of a geodiversity framework for Scotland is completed.</p> <p>In England there are Geodiversity action plans, but these are not obligatory in</p>		

Scotland. There will be a policy on geodiversity in the Proposed Plan and the minerals policy will also have reference to geodiversity. Geological heritage is already given protection through various designations which are outlined in the geodiversity policy, with further details to be found in appendix 6.3 of the Proposed Plan.

Conservation Areas – Scottish Ministers expect Local Authorities to designate only those areas which they consider to be of special archaeological or historic interest as Conservation Areas. A detailed appraisal and wide consultation is encouraged. Any proposals for potential Conservation Areas are welcome and will be considered in the first instance by the Council's Conservation Officer.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy references to interpretation

Policy - Geodiversity

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Heritage (Landscape)
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Heritage
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
SNH (118), Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Bryden Associates – Strathdearn Community Council (205), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace / amend: Structure Plan –L3, L4 Dropped Policies: Structure Plan – L1, L2
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference should be made to landscape character, scenic value and suite of designations including AGLVs and completed Landscape Capacity Studies. Suggested wording for landscape character is proposed. Quality of the landscape and the visual resource is also important outwith designated sites and there should be acknowledgement of the need for inter visibility i.e. long distance views. The Proposed Plan should refer to the UK’s signature of the European Landscape Convention which makes clear that all landscapes require consideration and care. Management plans for NSAs should be developed. There appears to be a new national approach to facilitating positive change in the landscape rather than simply to safeguard it. Landscape-scale planning and conservation of the wider countryside are vital. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested wording for landscape character is proposed. Proposed Plan should refer to the UK’s signature of the European Landscape Convention. Management plans for NSAs should be developed. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no plans at present to develop management strategies for National Scenic Areas. A joint project between The Council and SNH has been carried out on refining AGLVs. These will now be called Special Landscape Areas. We acknowledge that the landscape and visual resource outwith designated areas is also important and this is acknowledged in the policy. Reference is made in the policy to Landscape Capacity Studies and Landscape Character Assessments and to other landscape designations. The European Landscape Convention itself is not specific in the obligations it places on signatories, allowing scope for interpretation of its measures and significant flexibility in how states apply these, however the policy on landscape does say that development proposals should show how they relate to the landscape character of the area. 	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
Policy - Landscape Policy - Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Policy - Wider Countryside See Committee Draft papers for wording.	

Issue (heading):	Housing in the Countryside
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Housing in the Countryside
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Irene Brandt (18), Auchengill & Nybster Grazings Committee (21), Juliet Robinson (34), Joan More (45), J Mayhew (50), Brian Lynch (54), Lochardil & Durmmond Community Council (56), Gordon Mooney (71), Paul & Helen Jenkins (74), Paul Maden (88), David Matthews (91), Kingussie Community Council (93), Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), Shaun Macdonald (106), Inverness South Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Highland Council-TECS (114), SNH (118), Crown Community Council (122), GH Johnston Building Consultants (132), Badrallach Grazings Committee (142), A Manson (143), Killearnan Community Council (144), Westhill Community Council (147), Elizabeth Budge (148), Cromarty Arts (150), Ian Nicholson (151), Strathnairn Community Council (157), Philips Aitchison Limited (162), Highlands and Islands Green Party (168), Annie Stewart (172), Tain Community Council (175), SCDI (180), Martin Mackay Solicitors - Dingwall Auction Mart (181), Peter Roberts (194), Maria De La Torre (196), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Bryden Associates - Strathdearn Community Council (205), Ken Nicol (215), Joyce Wilkinson (216), Floris Greenlaw (222), John Martin (223), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (229), Alistair Croall (232), Ardross Community Council (236), Patricia Roberts (247), Eveline Waring (253), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Colliers CRE - Whiteness Property Group (260), Crofters Commission (271), Mr and Mrs Stafford (272), European Forest Resources (275), Scottish Water (281), Graham & Sibbald - Trustee's of Smithton Church (282), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Pete Campbell (290), Mr JG Walford (300), Helen Campbell (301), Reynolds Architecture Ltd - Miss Joyce Hendry (302), Bowlts Chartered Surveyors (309), Inverlochty & Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), Scottish Government (324).	
Intended impact on approved development plan "general" policies	Replace / amend – Structure Plan Policy H3 - Housing in the Countryside Supersede (effectively over-ride) hinterland areas within Caithness Local Plan
Council's summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Infrastructure/Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many rural roads are unsuitable for significant levels of development, increase on pressure for provision of services and infrastructure ▪ The Council should be considering transition towns in future, travel will be more limited; areas where public transport not available should be discouraged ▪ Emphasis should be on existing groups with shared access to existing public roads ▪ Applicants should be aware water and waste water may not be available ▪ Good public transport connections should be a strong factor for consideration 	

Siting and Design

- There is a need to improve the siting and design of housing in the countryside and also a need to ensure that any guidelines are adhered to.
- Support potential to build houses in the wider countryside but not in groups, keeping spacing requirements in the wider countryside consistent
- Stronger emphasis on siting and design but to also allow innovative design, retain rural setting avoid street lighting
- Positive discrimination should be given to sustainable house design especially in countryside, make planning easier for these
- Character and rural ambience will be lost if further housing is allowed, think preferred option will lead to too much piecemeal development
- Proposals should be considered on merit, the design guide shouldn't be rigid
- Do not appreciate need for Housing design guidance
- Danger of creating urban sprawl by allowing housing development would rather support new settlements
- Support the conversion of traditional buildings and reuse of brownfield land
- Large inappropriate developments should not be considered

Hinterland boundary

- Seek redefinition of the hinterland boundary, Feel that the current extent can be reduced without compromising wider aims.
- Boundary should be extended around further areas under pressure from housing development
- Seek clarification of the relationship between the Housing in the Countryside policy and the approach to the wider countryside and fragile areas
- Consider Redcastle / Kilcoy / Coulmore area should be a conservation area
- Protection around settlements should only apply where it can be demonstrated it is required

Policy approach

- Housing in the Countryside should only be through enlarging existing groups/settlements
- "Generous" supply of land should apply to both rural and urban areas – currently not reflected
- Adopting a more cautious approach will not address wider Council aim of allowing growth
- Oppose housing in the countryside unless around established groups
- Relax current restrictive system with a clearer statement requirement for Caithness
- Allowing development then sets precedent for further proposals undermining ability to refuse subsequent applications
- Presume against HIC other than for essential land management
- Creating urban sprawl will reduce attractiveness of Highland area, tourism would diminish
- Proposals should be considered on merit rather than a blanket refusal in Hinterland
- Capacity for development should be clearly identified in areas attracting a lot of development

- Houses should be built to accommodate working population
- Presumption against ribbon development
- Need for policy and supporting guidance to consider role of existing capacity studies and the potential for cumulative developments to impact on the landscape and visual resource
- Seek inclusion of derelict “land”
- The potential to develop in garden ground is open to abuse
- Extend exemption to retiring farm workers, restrict to those having lived locally for 5+ years

Sustainability

- Policy should remain restrictive it is not sustainable to allow further building outwith settlements.
- Housing in the countryside should be encouraged to support fragile communities
- The Council should be encouraging the development of transition towns
- Restrictions do not allow a proper choice of housing
- “Generous” supply of land should apply to both rural and urban areas – currently not reflected
- Would like policy allow the development of more housing that supports the development of small land holdings and consequent support for local economy

Rural development

- Need to restrict otherwise we will lose rural character the countryside is our greatest asset and must be protected
- Hinterland boundary should be extended around other areas under pressure from housing development.
- Consider role of crofters commission in applications for new crofts
- Permission should not be granted unless part or whole of energy needs are supplied by renewables
- Housing in the countryside development should not sterilise renewable energy opportunities
- Confused as to differences in Wider Countryside and Hinterland
- Single house development should be supported where assurances given that land will be managed sustainably, Support option 2 coupled with siting and design guidance,
- Extend exemption to retiring farm workers, Restrict to those having lived locally for 5+ years
- Design element should be precluded from affordable housing
- Regeneration should not come with the cost of permissive development
- Are houses that have tourist accommodation classed as business?
- Scottish Government supports proposal for more consistent Highland-wide approach.
- Would support the development of small land holdings and consequent support for local economy
- How would this affect crofts?
- Houses should be built to accommodate working population
- Agree but fine balance with allowing development and protecting farmland and landscape
- Existing approach relating to employment is acceptable
- Wish to see detailed settlement plans for all rural areas

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Restriction of development in the countryside other than for required development.
- Opposition to housing in the countryside unless around established groups
- Would prefer to see the expansion of smaller sustainable settlements and creation of new settlements reducing the need for travel.
- Wish policy to presume against development where public transport is not available.
- Positive discrimination for development providing sustainable house design.
- Wish to see the hinterland boundary redefined, both in terms of expansion and contraction of the boundary.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**Infrastructure/Services**

The availability and ability to provide services and infrastructure will be a consideration in the potential of housing development. The lack of infrastructure and any related deficiencies would need to be addressed by a developer.

The policy does focus on the development potential in areas where development already exists and access to transport infrastructure may have been established. Essentially low levels of development are permitted that will have a minimal effect on the existing infrastructure, however the impact on wider existing infrastructure will be a consideration on the viability of development proposals.

The delivery of sheltered housing in rural areas would need to consider wider accessibility issues. However this would not obviate the need to comply with other policy considerations.

Siting and Design

The preferred policy option seeks that development within the “hinterland” areas be primarily based on the existence of current groups of housing that can be developed without a negative impact on the overall countryside setting.

The Council is currently preparing guidance to inform decision making of house building proposals within the countryside. Issues covered will relate to the acceptability of various physical forms of housing development, the interpretation of housing groups, the layout and siting of proposals and also the acceptable use of materials. Equally the guidance will advise on things to consider when proposing any ancillary or other buildings to be sited in the countryside.

Advice on methods and technologies to achieve a more sustainable form of development will be contained in the guidance although advice in greater detail is available in the Councils existing Designing for Sustainability Guidance.

Hinterland

The hinterland around towns and the housing in countryside policy are aimed primarily at maintaining the countryside in the areas of housing pressure. The potential to refine the existing hinterland boundaries will be available through the preparation of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, where issues relating to housing pressure and impact on the landscape can be considered in more detail. The boundaries defined in the recent preparation of the West Highland and Islands Local Plan and the Sutherland Local Plan will stand until review but have been the

subject of recent consultation. In relation to the hinterland as defined within the existing Caithness Local Plan, in having reference to the policy approach to regenerate the Caithness economy and reverse population loss there is a need to take a less restrictive approach to housing development in the outlying areas of Caithness. This supports the removal of the hinterland areas around Thurso and Wick allowing the potential for further development to support the outlying areas. Proposals will be determined by the Wider Countryside policy, with reference to the guidance contained with the Supplementary Guidance: Housing in the Countryside and the Siting and Design Guidance.

Scale

The policy seeks to encourage the development of housing in appropriate locations and of a scale that relates to the existing development. Support is given primarily to the opportunity for single house development in the “rounding off” of existing groups.

Redevelopment and rehabilitation of existing buildings and land offer the opportunity for slightly larger scale of development. This will always be of a scale that is commensurate with a rural location.

Sustainability

Suggestions were received encouraging the development of transition towns, and that the housing in the countryside guidance should emphasise the use of renewables and sustainable materials. The Council is encouraging through its various policies the introduction of energy reduction measures and the development of sustainable principles. Policies are also aimed at utilising existing services and infrastructure in existing settlements and making more sustainable use of these resources. The Siting and Design guidance for housing in the countryside will identify the principles that need to be considered when seeking to locate in rural areas. This includes the use of appropriate locally sourced sustainable materials and use of high levels of insulation and low energy equipment.

It was indicated through comment that the “generous” supply of land should apply to both rural and urban areas and was that reflected. The current policy advice on Housing in the Countryside provides greater opportunity for the development of housing on the countryside. By its very nature the development of housing in the countryside tends to fall under the “windfall” category, ie where proposals are not specifically identified within the development plan. The Preferred Option policy approach does offer opportunity for an increase in the amount of development that can occur under it.

Rural development

Comments indicated that they would like policy to allow the development of more housing that supports the development of small land holdings and consequent support for local economy. Within the hinterland areas around towns support for housing related to agricultural use would be supported on a business requirement basis, within the wider countryside potential exists for the development of housing related to land holdings subject to meeting general policy requirements and complying with siting and design requirements.

In the hinterland, housing that supports crofting activities will be supported where proposals meet agricultural requirements or bring a wider public benefit to the area. In the wider countryside Council policy supports more widely the development of housing particularly where this will support fragile communities through maintaining

population and services.

It was suggested that the exemption to retiring farm workers, Restrict to those having lived locally for 5+ years. In regard to extending exemptions to the existing supplementary guidance on Housing in the Countryside, currently a policy exception for retiring farm workers and spouses is operated, it would be appropriate to extend this to workers in other rural businesses where residences were required for new incoming workers on their retiral. This would be limited to rural businesses that require workers to sited on or close by their place of work.

The affect on crofts was questioned and the Council recognises that there is a genuine need to promote and support crofting communities and activities. However, we must also ensure that crofting-related development does not conflict with the Council's other policies and objectives; in particular the Housing in the Countryside policy (especially those relating to the hinterland around towns) or result in unsympathetic development in our rural areas. A careful and considered balance must therefore be struck.

Indications from the Crofters Commission are that the main thrust of new croft development should be focussed on more fragile areas suffering from depopulation. The Crofting Bill currently going through parliament currently indicates that you only need to stay within 32 km, not on a croft itself. Given the spread of settlements within the hinterland area and the potential to secure appropriate housing, the exception for housing to support crofting should be removed as an exception from the policy, and houses associated with new crofts only form an exception where a wider community benefit can be demonstrated. This position will be confirmed within new crofting policies contained within the proposed plan.

Suggestion was put forward that single house development should be supported where assurances given that land will be managed sustainably. The current exceptions to the policy cover opportunities for the development of a house where this is directly related to the operation and management of a business that requires to be sited within a countryside location. This would also extend to operations meeting the criteria that would support sustainable enterprises.

Comment indicated that it was felt that regeneration should not come with the cost of permissive development. In regard to the Preferred Option this seeks to strike a balance between the demand for opportunities to live in the countryside with the need to retain the essential character of rural countryside areas. The adoption of option 1 would give a more restrictive approach and not offer the opportunities for residential development to support rural communities as envisaged by Scottish Planning Policy. The emphasis on the successful interpretation of the Preferred Option would be the development primarily on existing housing groups thus assisting in reducing the wider impact on the countryside. The development of single house sites, in the hinterlands around towns would be restricted to exceptional needs as indicated in the policy. Within the wider countryside there may be greater scope for new single houses in the countryside but in these areas also the development within existing groups is encouraged. The ongoing preparation of Siting and Design Guidance will provide the necessary information to guide both applicants and decision makers in delivering an acceptable form of development.

Policy approach

Comment supported an approach that housing in the countryside should only be through enlarging existing groups/settlements The current and proposed restrictions

to development within the hinterland areas are focussed on discouraging inappropriate housing development within areas of high housing pressure. Changes to the policy present more opportunities for housing development in appropriately located sites. The issue of the development of garden ground has been raised as an area that will be the subject of abuse. Feedback on the operation of the policy suggests that the interpretation of this policy aspect is unclear and applications for development in garden ground outwith existing groups have come forward with inappropriate plot sizes and compromised access. In order to address this issue the garden ground option will be removed from the guidance. The potential to “round off” existing groups may still utilise garden ground where this forms an appropriate infill opportunity and plot size.

Concern was given that restrictions do not allow a proper choice of housing. The policy does restrict the development of housing in the hinterland areas to the consolidation of groups and not the outward expansion of the identifiable extent of existing groups. This relates to the use of infill sites within groups of houses whether these are tightly knit or more loosely dispersed. The potential for individual house sites relates, within the hinterland, to the defined exceptions; land management; business related or affordable housing need. Overall this increases the potential for housing development whilst reducing the impact on the environment.

In areas of particular pressure it was felt that the capacity for development should be clearly identified. The monitoring of planning applications has identified areas of countryside under significant pressure from the cumulative impact of development. In these areas a capacity study will be required to determine the potential for development.

The current Council policy in regard to the development of housing in the countryside has been amended to reflect changes to the policy in August 2009, in line with Scottish Planning Policy in order to allow more housing opportunity within countryside areas.

The preparation of the Highland wide Local Development Plan gives the opportunity for the consolidation of recent changes to the policy interpretation and also to reflect on issues that require further clarification.

Current supplementary guidance continues to support a 2 tier approach, as contained within the existing Highland Structure Plan, to the development of countryside areas. Within the hinterland areas around towns where greatest development pressure is felt, flexibility has been added to increase opportunities through the potential to augment existing housing groups and develop degraded land and buildings all subject to appropriate siting and design. This approach has the benefit of reducing the impact on both landscape and environmental terms, through clustering of development and also the use of existing infrastructure and services.

For wider countryside areas a more permissive policy approach is taken but with the requirement that proposals support the viability of the wider rural community, taking into account locally important croft/farm land and provide appropriate siting and design.

In order that the policy is applied on a consistent basis the Council has prepared a siting and design guide that will inform the application of these issues for both the hinterland and wider countryside areas. The guidance provides interpretation of the policy as it relates to the hinterland areas and the identification of development opportunities. An assessment checklist as to the issues any potential developer

should consider to ascertain the appropriateness of the site for development.

A policy approach where new community backed croft or agricultural proposals, with associated housing proposals, which bring about a wider community benefit will be supported subject to meeting the criteria set out in Policy: Crofting Township of the Highland wide Local Development Plan will be supported in the hinterland area. Proposals for single croft house development will then fall to meeting the other criteria within the policy to be acceptable.

In addition the existing exceptions to the policy currently extend to include the potential for retiring farmers to build a retirement home. There is a need to consider the broadening of this exception to include other rural business related need where existing accommodation is required for new operator. There would be the need to indicate that employment has been continuous at this location for 10 years. Where relevant such proposals will be secured through planning condition or legal agreement, otherwise where a development site meets other qualifying requirements that permit the development of the site.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Housing in the Countryside (Hinterland areas)

Policy - Sustainable Design

Policy - Crofting Townships

Policy - Wider Countryside

Policy - Natural Built and Cultural Heritage

Proposals Map defines Hinterland areas

Commitment to prepare/adopt Supplementary Guidance on Siting and Design

See Committee Draft papers for wording

Issue (heading):	Other Inner Moray Firth Development Sites & Vision & Spatial Strategy For Inner Moray Firth
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	A96 Corridor and Dispersed Growth Option
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
S. Coreth (64), F. Leith (65), Fairways Leisure Group (69), J. Morrison (99), R. Gordon (117), Home Farms Ltd (123 & 131), Achareidh Estate (125), GH Johnston (128), Brahan Farms Ltd (129), Maclean Family (Maryburgh)(130), S. Kelly (133), St Vincent Farm (134), Lochuichart Estate (135), Maclean Family (Muir of Ord) (136), County Properties (Northern) Ltd (137), L. Daly (139), J. Marr (154), J. MacDonald-Brown (161), Davidson Family (182), Blair Farm (183), Dingwall & Highland Marts (186), D. MacTavish (269), J. Ross (294), Reynolds Architecture (303), I. Stewart (306), Bowlts Surveyors (309), I. Mackay (311), Horne (312), Scotia Homes (Croy) (314), Druim Farm (315), Scotia Homes (Hill of Fearn) (334).	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Structure Plan Spatial Strategy for Inner Moray Firth
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Various landowner / agent <u>suggestions</u> for additional development sites at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balloch Farm, By Culloden (housing) • Fairways, Inverness (housing) • South of Muir-of-Ord (unspecified) • Various Green Wedge sites, Inverness (housing and greenspace) • Achareidh, Nairn (mixed use residential neighbourhood) • Flemington (housing) • Maryburgh (mixed use residential neighbourhood) • Cradlehall (expansion of neighbourhood centre) • North of Muir-of-Ord (unspecified) • Maryburgh (reallocation of existing local plan site) • East of Croy (unspecified) • South West of Tain (unspecified) • Marybank (unspecified) • Various Black Isle (unspecified) • Knockbreck, Tain (retail and housing) • South East side of Muir of Ord (open space and housing) • Easter Muckovie, By Culloden (housing) • Invergordon (reallocation of existing local plan site) • South West of Mart, Dingwall (unspecified) • Grantown Road, Nairn (housing) • North of Ardersier (caravan site and possible housing) • South of Culbokie (unspecified) • Newmore, Alness (community and housing) • South of Kiltarlity (housing) • Leanach By Culloden (housing) • East of Daviot (housing) • South West of Croy ((mixed use residential neighbourhood) • East of Nairn (housing) 	

- West of Kirkhill (housing plus pony paddocks)
- Hill of Fearn (housing)

Variety of reasons given (one or more of the following) including that the sites proposed: are deliverable; are more deliverable than allocated land; are more deliverable than the proposed allocations in the A96 Corridor; will help meet housing and other requirements; will not compromise the environment; are cheaper to develop than brownfield sites; are close to existing community and employment facilities; will deliver a proportion of affordable housing units; could secure public greenspace; are part or fully allocated already; are infill opportunities within established settlements; are serviceable; are more serviceable than allocated or proposed alternatives; locally allocated land exhausted or close to exhausted; are consistent with the established settlement hierarchy; would be natural extensions of existing settlements; are consistent with the proposed expansion of larger villages within the A96 Corridor; are close to potential employment expansion areas in Easter Ross, and; have no productive alternative use including farming.

Two more strategically significant proposals are promoted as alternatives to / or complementary to the key growth areas promoted in the Main Issues Report:

- A new settlement is suggested at Brahan because the land has a good southerly aspect, is close to the trunk road network and could form part of the Easter Ross Growth Corridor as endorsed by the Main Issues Report and Structure Plan Spatial Strategy.
- A new / expanded settlement is proposed at Tore because the land proposed in the A96 Corridor is not feasible in short term.

One representor seeks a specific open space safeguard for land at Viewfield, Nairn because of its importance to the community and townscape character of Nairn.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- The specific allocation (or re-allocation) of the sites/areas suggested for the uses indicated.
- A specific public open space safeguard on the land at Viewfield, Nairn or a policy that achieves a similar purpose.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Almost all of the representations raise matters of site-specific detail that are not relevant to the strategic nature of the Highland wide Local development Plan.

The majority of suggestions for new development sites will be considered through the review of the relevant area local development plan (the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan), which is due to start its process with a landowner call for sites at the end of 2010. Some suggestions are very small in scale or on land already allocated for development so they could proceed to planning application now and be considered via the development management process without delay.

The two strategically significant proposals at Brahan and Tore require a response through the Highland wide Local Development Plan process. It is accepted that the Council's Inner Moray Firth Ports and Sites Strategy which was approved in 2006, highlighted the potential for significant development at Tore and Brahan. However, these were not confirmed as the preferred option within the Main Issues Report for the following reasons.

Both Brahan and Tore lack existing community and employment facilities. Similarly they would both result in the loss of relatively good agricultural land. Although close

to the trunk road network both have severe constraints in terms of the cost of adequate foul drainage arrangements. Both are not connected to the rail network. Tore's location at the hub of trunk and A road connections is a benefit but also a potential curse in terms of severance of active travel movement across any new community. Tore too has a fragmented pattern of existing development and ownership that will inhibit an efficient layout for any new/expanded community. Policy woodland, designed landscape and other heritage constraints affect Brahan. Unless the new communities provide local jobs then both locations would be likely to increase commuting to Inverness worsening the existing pinchpoint at the Kessock Bridge. Larger, established towns and villages in Mid and Easter Ross are much better placed to accommodate the growth envisaged for the Easter Ross Corridor. These possess: rail links; already allocated land; existing and likely future jobs; more spare servicing capacity; more spare capacity in community facilities, and; fewer heritage constraints.

Brahan and Tore are closer to Inverness than many Easter Ross alternatives but this should not be seen as an advantage as the Easter Ross Growth Corridor is planned to achieve a greater degree of self containment for that area - i.e. more people living, working, shopping and being schooled in that area and not having to travel to Inverness across the Kessock Bridge / A9 junctions pinchpoints. If Brahan and Tore are judged as Inverness City growth options then they do not compare well in terms of sustainability. Completing the City and then gradual development of the A96 Corridor better fits the capacity, employment prospects and travel movements of this area.

A site-specific open space safeguard would not be appropriate to the strategic nature of the Plan but the issue will be addressed by a general policy.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Highland Vision and Spatial Strategy
Inner Moray Firth Vision and Spatial Strategy
Policy - New Settlements

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Inverness and the A96
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Marie Cruickshank (14) John Wood (16), Duncan MacDonald (17), Irene Brandt (18), Greg Riddle (19), A Moore (23), Holm Community Council (25), HITRANS (33), Juliet Robinson (34), UBC Group Limited (46), J Mayhew (50), Brian Lynch (54), Brian Stewart (55), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), Halliday Fraser and Munro Planning-Tulloch Homes (North) Ltd (57), Keeping Nairnshire Colourful (58). Joan Noble (67), Gordon Mooney (71), Mary Harrison (73), Jane Arnold (77), RSPB Scotland (78), Rose-Miller Farms (80), Alastair Owens (84), I Wade (85), John Mackie (86), L Mackintosh (90), David Matthews (91), H Rask (92), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), James Barr Ltd. (98), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), N Wilkinson (104), Inverness South Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), Portee Community Council (110), Staffin Community Council (111), The Highland Council (TECS) (114), Raasay Community Council (115), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Kyleakin & Kylerhea Community Council (119), Brora Community Council (121), Crown Community Council (122), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd.-Home Farms Ltd, Inverness Properties Ltd, Mrs F Newton, Mr I Alexander, Mr D Thomson & Mr H Young (123), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd.-Cawdor Scottish Discretionary & Cawdor Marriage Settlement Trustees (124), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd.-Mr Hamish MacKenzie, Mrs Catherine Charlish, & Mrs Kirsty Leonard (134), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd.-Lochuichart Estate (135), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd.-MacLean Family - Muir of Ord (136)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replaces and updates the spatial strategy from the Highland Structure Plan and the Inverness Local Plan.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some do not agree with the preferred option because of concern about timing/delay of infrastructure upgrades. • Others are concerned that the Council will restrict opportunities at South and East Inverness and along the A96 unless significant improvements are implemented. • Whilst some recognise that existing infrastructure capacity and future upgrading have still to be fully assessed and that our approach will hinge on this work. • Another point was that new methods of delivery should be investigated to avoid delays. • The Scottish Government believes it is key to address phasing to deliver sustainable successful communities particularly in relation to infrastructure provision and services. • There is unease about loss of prime agricultural land in the A96 corridor. Given the need to protect agricultural land for food security, because of climate change, concern as to why is development/growth concentrated on good agricultural land. • There is a feeling that we should not assume growth will continue in the same way. • There is support for regeneration/brownfield sites, and consolidation of existing settlements. 	

- There is desire to see Natural Heritage assets retained/improved.
- One comment considered that commercial development should only serve local need.
- That we should be looking to development of local industries across Highland to support growth
- There is concern that the A96 will draw people from elsewhere in Highlands; there is desire for dispersed growth instead, and there is concern about the effect on fragile areas.
- Consideration also needs to given to the impact on the wider surrounding communities
- Landscape mitigation would be achieved through consolidation of Inverness
- That SEPA agree with the preferred option.
- SNH support the integrated approach being taken but recognise that water quality impact on the Moray Firth SAC and possible recreational disturbance to birds on the Inner Moray Firth SPA are key associated issues.
- SNH state that LBAP, designated sites, and protected species need to continue to be part our consideration.
- SNH recognise that water supply could affect Loch Ashie, whilst disposal could affect the Moray Firth SAC.
- SNH suggest it is necessary that mitigation (eg on water quality) is in place at the outset rather than have us suffer environmental consequences of an incremental approach.
- SNH recognise that designated areas would also be associated with the alternative option growth points at Fearn-Kildary and at Kirkhill.
- Norbord is problematic site in terms of odour and emissions and may cause issue if housing is built close by.
- A proposed development at Alturlie Quarry for a waste processing plan (currently a developer is considering heat treatment of Municipal Solid Waste to produce ethanol) may also be contentious for any housing built close to it.
- Inverness should make the most of the river and its banks
- Environmental damage would be caused by a bridge crossing the river at Ness-side.
- Various sites proposed for development and open space

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- Suggest that we need to reassess growth projections
- Development in areas outwith the A96 corridor should not be discouraged
- There is a need for a major site search outwith this area and infrastructure studies.
- It is key that phasing issues are addressed.
- Prioritise brownfield sites and regeneration opportunities
- New city vision should take a holistic view of the city.
- The Scottish Government feel there is merit in accelerating existing plans for growth at Nairn and Inverness before there is major expansion in other areas however the principle of some early phasing of development in the corridor prior to completion of major infrastructure is sound.
- Scottish Government and its agencies will collaborate on further phasing of development and infrastructure including further transport modelling. This will help inform location, scale and phasing for the proposed plan.
- Scottish Government acknowledges that the alternative option seems to support new commuter rail link and that their policy is to maximise use of existing rail network and associated infrastructure.
- SEPA advise that the master planning process takes into account Flood Risk

constraints and potentially contentious sites with respect to emissions, noise and hazardous chemicals.

- SEPA expect that the finalised HwLDP incorporates a clear policy statement that requires all new phases of development in the A96 corridor to be connected to a public sewer and Waste Water Treatment Plant from the outset.
- SNH are happy to assist in the habitats regulations appraisal considering impacts on the Moray Firth SAC and Inner Moray Firth SPA.
- SNH feel there is a need for green network links to be maintained and enhanced, and that development should be matched by ambitious natural heritage projects (country parks or new habitats).
- SNH recommend that a A96 landscape character assessment is prepared.
- SNH suggest green network work which is being progressed needs to be integral to A96 corridor framework supported in the proposed HwLDP.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Suggest that we need to reassess growth projections

See Schedule 4 on Population and Housing.

Development in areas outwith the A96 corridor should not be discouraged

The HwLDP will identify strategically important sites in the Inner Moray Firth, Caithness and Sutherland. The West Highland and Islands and Sutherland Local Plan have recently been prepared and therefore these set the context for development in these areas. The Council will support development of all the communities in Highland where they comply with the relevant general policies of the plan.

There is a need for a major site search outwith this area and infrastructure studies.

National Planning Framework 2 identifies Inverness and the A96 Corridor as an area for co-ordinated action and this is where there is an identified need for major development in this area. The West Highland and Island and Sutherland Local Plans identify significant sites in areas outwith the Inverness and A96 as do the other adopted local plans. The area Local Development Plans will involve a site search and appropriate infrastructure studies will be carried out at this time.

It is key that phasing issues are addressed

Phasing is important and these will be addressed taking into consideration infrastructure restrictions/requirements and the cumulative impact of development in the area.

Prioritise brownfield sites and regeneration opportunities

The Council support redevelopment of brownfield sites and will encourage regeneration. While this will be carried out there are limited supplies of brownfield land in Inverness and the A96 Corridor, the existing local plan for Inverness identifies action areas and these will be form part of the Strategy for Inverness to ensure that these areas are brought forward as a priority.

New city vision should take a holistic view of the city.

The City Vision will take a view of the City as a whole and set a strategy for development of the city. It is intended that this will be Supplementary Guidance to the plan

The Scottish Government feel there is merit in accelerating existing plans for

growth at Nairn and Inverness before there is major expansion in other areas however the principle of some early phasing of development in the corridor prior to completion of major infrastructure is sound.

Noted. This is the Council's preferred approach and it will be set out in the spatial strategy.

Scottish Government and its agencies will collaborate on further phasing of development and infrastructure including further transport modelling. This will help inform location, scale and phasing for the proposed plan.

Noted. We will continue to work with the Scottish Government and its agencies on these matters.

Scottish Government acknowledges that the alternative option seems to support new commuter rail link and that their policy is to maximise use of existing rail network and associated infrastructure.

Noted the Council will ensure that this stance is brought through the Highland wide Local Development Plan policies on transport.

SEPA advise that the master planning process takes into account Flood Risk constraints and potentially contentious sites with respect to emissions, noise and hazardous chemicals.

Noted. These will be set out in developer requirements which will be identified through the Strategic Environmental Assessment Process.

SEPA expect that the finalised HwLDP incorporates a clear policy statement that requires all new phases of development in the A96 corridor to be connected to a public sewer and Waste Water Treatment Plant from the outset.

Noted. This will be a policy in the Highland wide Local Development Plan.

SNH are happy to assist in the habitats regulations appraisal considering impacts on the Moray Firth SAC and Inner Moray Firth SPA.

Noted. The Council will continue to work with SNH in the preparation of the Appropriate Assessment which is part of Habitats Regulations Appraisal.

SNH feel there is a need for green network links to be maintained and enhanced, and that development should be matched by ambitious natural heritage projects (country parks or new habitats)

Noted. The Council will include a specific policy on green networks and prepare Supplementary Guidance on the issue. The Supplementary Guidance will also contain priorities for each of the identified green networks in Highland which may include the creation of new spaces, places or active travel linkages.

SNH recommend that an A96 landscape character assessment is prepared.

The Inner Moray Firth Landscape Assessment was completed in 2004 and this has informed the Highland wide Local Development Plan in this area and has been a key consideration in the SEA process.

SNH suggest green network work which is being progressed needs to be integral to A96 corridor framework supported in the proposed HwLDP.

This will be integral and brought forward through Green Networks: Supplementary Guidance and a policy on Green Networks will be set out in the HwLDP.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy including Housing Requirements Table

Policy - Waste Water Treatment

Policies on Consolidating the City and Longer Term Phasing of many A96 sites

Policy - A96 Corridor - Phasing and Infrastructure

Specific Policies for A96 Corridor Development Areas

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Minerals
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Minerals
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
The Coal Authority (38), Laid Grazings Committee (83), Leiths Scotland Ltd (87), Mrs LM Macintosh (90), Mr David Matthews (91), Kingairloch Estate (95), SNH (118), Phillip Aitchison Ltd (162), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Ian Cowan (185), Ian Parsons (217), Ardress Community Council (236), Roger Piercy (257), Diana Buchanan (265), Scottish Water (281), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318), SEPA (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace/amend: Structure Plan - M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, M7 Dropped policies: Structure Plan - M5
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of the representations supported the preferred option. Some people feel that it is the only viable alternative otherwise potential developers will satisfy their requirements elsewhere. There are however some representations that do not support the preferred option. In some cases the alternative option is preferred; identifying new sites allows for discussion around existing land use and neighbouring houses and it could help limit development of new quarries to non-sensitive locations. Other people feel that further alternatives should be explored; Mineral development should be encouraged and left to developers to ‘discover’. However there should be restoration conditions via Section 75 Agreements. A representation raised the issue that the alternative option would raise search for coastal exporting quarries. • The following phrase from the (draft) SPP is preferred wording, “an adequate and steady supply of mineral is essential to support economic growth”. Demand is cyclical. The industry should always be consulted. Established search areas should not necessarily be removed, modified or deleted. • The Council should require, not expect, mitigation and restoration measures. Extreme care must be taken when considering large scale developments with their long term consequences. • Disagrees with statement that there is unlikely to be deficiencies within the plan period, due to the extent of development proposals within the Main Issues Report, however reserves have already been well mapped. • Strongly supports representation from Laid Grazings Committee to the Draft Coastal Strategy. • There should be a policy for the recycling of construction and demolition waste to reduce the amount of raw materials that need to be quarried. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify new sites in order to facilitate discussion. • Retain established search areas. • Do not wish to see any mention of coastal quarries in proposed plan. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	

It is noted that the majority of representations support the preferred option for this policy, however it is also recognised that some people feel that the alternative option should be pursued. The Council will not be specifically identifying new sites or broader areas of search through this Plan, however this may be a potential way forward in the three area local development plans. We will develop a policy for assessing proposals which recognises that minerals are important to support economic growth.

We acknowledge that demand is cyclical but we will not be encouraging mineral development by leaving it to developers to 'discover' minerals. This is unsustainable and leaves us open to not having the necessary supplies that are required.

The Council will not be identifying coastal export quarries.

We acknowledge that large scale minerals developments can have long term consequences therefore the wording of the policy will convey that the Council will expect mitigation and restoration measures.

We will consult the industry during any monitoring that we do. Established search areas – we do not have the information mapped at present but we intend to have in the future and we will consult the industry. Therefore we have no plans at present to delete or modify any search areas. This work will be taken forward through the three area local development plans.

There will be a policy encouraging the re-use/recycling of mineral, construction and demolition wastes.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Minerals

Policy - Minerals Wastes

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Minerals
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Minerals
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
The Coal Authority (38), Leiths Scotland Ltd (87), SNH (118), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Ian Parsons (217), Scottish Water (281), SportsScotland (320), Scottish Government (324)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace/amend: Structure Plan - M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, M7 Dropped policies: Structure Plan - M5
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>There is support for the policy to safeguard economically significant mineral resources from development that would sterilise the resource. It is essential that this is done but it may be difficult to define significant mineral reserves without a high level of geological expertise. The Preferred option has no discussion of sand and gravel reserves likely to underlay the A96 corridor and the possible desirability to extract prior to development.</p> <p>Policies in the Plan should not lead to future public safety hazards. This is not a constraint to development but an opportunity to make things safe. The mining legacy should be remembered – potential public safety and stability problems. Some representations feel that a ‘cordon sanitaire’ around existing operations would be a useful way forward, but Scottish Government policy discourages standard buffer zones.</p> <p>Sports and recreation interests should be added to the list of things that all new and extension minerals development should not damage. Operators should be encouraged to consider after uses of extraction sites that result in environmental improvement rather than simply restoring to previous state e.g. sport and recreation use.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard economically significant mineral resources from sterilisation. • Sand and gravel reserves to be extracted prior to development. • Encourage after uses of extraction sites which result in environmental improvement. • No standard buffer zones. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>The policy will ensure that all economically significant mineral reserves are safeguarded from incompatible development. We will concentrate on safeguarding, improving and possibly extending existing operations/reserves rather than identifying new search areas. The Council is currently working through information supplied to us by the British Geological Survey and is developing a process of continuous monitoring. This will allow us to use up to date information for areas which must be safeguarded. We will also use information supplied to us by the industry.</p> <p>In accordance with Scottish Planning Policy the policy will include safeguarding principles to ensure that where land allocated for development is underlain by minerals, these will be extracted prior to development, if desirable.</p>	

In accordance with Scottish Planning Policy, the policy will not include standard buffer zones between sites and settlements. Whilst it is accepted that a buffer zone or 'cordon sanitaire' is necessary for reasons such as safety, it is better for it to be done on a case by case basis to take account of the specific circumstances of any proposal.

Environmental Impact Assessments will routinely be requested for minerals applications where The Council considers that the proposal is likely to create a significant impact in terms of its nature, size or location; this will be available for comment as part of the planning application.

The policy will encourage after uses that result in environmental improvement rather than just restoring land to its original state. We will also encourage after uses that add to the cultural, recreational and environmental assets of an area. We will not mention specific environmental improvements that would be encouraged so as not to discriminate against the various potential after uses.

The supporting text to the policy will discuss the coal legacy specifically around Brora. It will discuss how development can trigger public safety and land stability issues. It will not however discuss Brora in detail as this is dealt with in the Sutherland Local Plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Minerals
Policy - Mineral Wastes
Policy - Peat and Soils

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Minerals
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Minerals
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
SNH (118). Scottish Government (324), Lochaber Geopark (201)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace/amend: Structure Plan - M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, M7 Dropped policies: Structure Plan - M5
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no discussion of peat extraction either in terms of its conservation for nature conservation, archaeology or as carbon sinks. This requires policy and to be spatially mapped. This would be a component of consideration needed with regard to the Scottish Soil Framework. • The preferred option should cover the review of existing minerals consents and highlight enhancement where impacts already exist. Search areas for minerals should be identified as should a land bank of permitted reserves for construction aggregates for a minimum 10 years. • There is no discussion of geodiversity; minerals extraction needs to safeguard geodiversity value. Geological heritage should be given legal protection. Pleased that GCR and RIGS sites have been included as local/regional features in the Sutherland Local Plan and the West Highland and Islands Local Plan. • Please note petition PE1277 under consideration by Public Definitions Committee which calls for a geodiversity duty to be established in Scotland. • No reference to SSSI network or Geological Conservation Review database. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peatland to be mapped. • Review of existing minerals consents. • Identify Search areas for minerals. • Landbank of reserves. • Include discussion on geodiversity. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>The Plan will discuss peat extraction and will state that commercial extraction of peat will not be acceptable unless it is an area of degraded peatland which has been significantly damaged by human activity and where the conservation value is low and restoration is not possible. All other areas of peatland will be protected. Some areas of peatland are already covered by designations such as SSSIs. The Council does have a layer on mastermap that shows peatland. However, this data does not make any indication of the different qualities of areas of peatland and surveys would be required on order to get that information.</p> <p>The Scottish Government has developed a Scottish Soil Framework with the aim of promoting the sustainable management and protection of soils consistent with the economic, social and environmental needs of Scotland. It acknowledges in the framework that the most significant pressures on soil are climate change and loss of soil organic matter. This has developed a series of actions to be taken forward by</p>	

the Scottish Government and key stakeholders. Lots of policies have overlap to soil but the Council has not had specific soil protection policies. The Plan will address that all development must avoid unnecessary disturbance, degradation or erosion of peat and soils. We will encourage soil sustainability.

Through the three area Local Development Plans the Council will review existing minerals consents, highlighting the importance of environmental enhancement where significant natural heritage impacts already exist. We will not be specifically identifying new sites or broader areas of search through this Local Development Plan, however this will be taken forward in the three area Local Development Plans.

Public petition PE1277 under consideration by the Public Definitions Committee is noted. We note that it is urging the Scottish Government to establish a geodiversity duty. We also note that The Committee agreed on 9 February 2010 to suspend further consideration of the petition until the joint study by the British Geological Survey and SNH to establish the evidence base for the development of a geodiversity framework for Scotland is completed.

Geodiversity will be addressed in the Plan making it clear that it must be considered when assessing proposals for minerals developments covering working methods, restoration and after use to safeguard the geodiversity value. However there will also be a separate geodiversity policy which will contain more detail.

Geological Conservation Review (GCR) Sites, Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) and Sites of Local Nature Conservation Interest were identified as local/regionally important features in the Sutherland Local Plan and the West Highland and Islands Local Plans and will also be identified in the Highland wide Local Development Plan. They have been partially digitally mapped and where this is available it will be shown spatially in the plan. SSSIs will be shown spatially in the Proposed Plan and the policy on heritage explains the protection afforded to them.

The relationship between geodiversity and tourism will be addressed in the geodiversity policy.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Geodiversity
Policy - Minerals
Policy - Mineral Wastes
Policy - Peat and Soils

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Nairn – Bypass & Infrastructure
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Marie Cruickshank (14), Irene Brandt (18), Greg Riddle (19), Peter Mason (24), J Mayhew (50), Keeping Nairnshire Colourful (58). Frances Atkins (59), Joan Noble (67), Mary Harrison (73), John Mackie (86), David Matthews (91), H Rask (92), Nairn West Community Council (101), N Wilkinson (104), The Highland Council (TECS) (114), Westhill Community Council (147), E Holland (153), John Dolan (173), Peter Roberts (194), Doug & Joan Piggott (208), Nairn Residents Concern Group (NRCG) (209). Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Ardrross Community Council (236), Patricia Roberts (247), Roger Piercy (257), Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council (258), C Stafford (272), Jeff Baker (284), J G Walford (300), Helen Campbell (301), Inverlochy and Torlundy Community Council (318), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Partial amendment to Nairnshire Local Plan
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Bypass –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority should be given to the necessary and long awaited infrastructure and improvements detailed in the current Local Plan; Nairn bypass, Town Centre regeneration, upgrading of Waste Water Treatment Plant. Any further development applications must as a prerequisite have secured infrastructure improvements from appropriate partners, I.E Scottish Water, Transport Scotland, vis Developer contributions or other mechanisms before consideration is given to approve, therefore strengthening the link between development and infrastructure provision. • The bypass should not be reliant on development; it is needed to relieve flow of traffic through the town. • Element of scare mongering with regard to the bypass. Bypass should go ahead regardless of development or not. • Limiting the growth in Nairn should eliminate the need for a bypass • Bypass is essential to the town’s continued economic success. • Hope that the bypass precedes development • Nairn needs a bypass but it should be done sympathetically so Nairn is not effectively “cut off”. • Bypass should be in place before major development. • Where is the funding. • Need a bypass and its strategic importance should not be tied to the contribution of future development in Nairn. • Necessary infrastructure for such development should not be seen as simply the bypass. Updated links to the hinterland around will also require to be in place • Bypass should be given priority over everything else and should have three entry points; start, finish and middle. • Where does it state that there has to be development to get the bypass? It is our understanding that Scotia/ Robertson/ Barratt were asking the public to 	

consider (at their Enquiry by Design event) alternative road improvements rather than a bypass; a bypass which the developers felt would not materialise

- Utmost priority must be given to a Nairn Bypass.
- Important to preserve the broad corridor for the bypass
- Need clarity on timeframe.
- Agree with preferred option; delivery of the bypass has to be major consideration.
- Bypass would have the benefit of easing traffic flow but could be double-edged sword in economic terms.
- All plans so far that accommodate the bypass will result in the construction of new local/district centres and this is not acceptable and will lead to fragmentation of the Nairn community and further degeneration of the Town Centre.
- Scottish Government - The Framework Plan for Nairn includes a roundabout on the bypass adjacent to the proposed Nairn South housing allocation. The bypass would be strategic in nature and Transport Scotland cannot at this time commit to any proposals for developments to be accessed from it.
- All proposals should take into account the bypass/ traffic dimension and not just the “longer term proposals”

Infrastructure

- Infrastructure improvements and a bypass are a vital pre-requisite even for 2011-2016.
- Highland Council Planners need to develop a specification on the type and standard of roads and services improvements required to satisfy to gain planning acceptance important any developer led local infrastructure improvements with retrospective developer contributions as the town evolves.
- Importance of increased and improved rail travel from Nairn should be emphasised.
- Stress infrastructure should be fully in place before development goes ahead.
- Alternative to the bypass is to consider the provision of an A96 relief road divorced from and routed well to the South of the coastal towns such as Nairn.
- Nairn needs to be rid of through traffic completely and not be tied to the dichotomy of satisfying National transport infrastructure needs through local development plans. Until a National position is agreed, development should be in accordance with the alternative option, with a focus on regenerating the Town Centre on the needs of the Town and not the needs of through traffic. For a location as sensitive and focussed as Nairn, incremental development should be the preferred option based on plans to regenerate the existing Town Centre and encouraging growth that fits with this regeneration.
- Double tracking the rail line will help, improving rail will provide a brief respite for the centre of Nairn until the by-pass is built.
- Agree in principle with the preferred option the Nairn framework Plan shows possible development including road infrastructure in areas which may be susceptible to flooding. Sites at potential risk be identified and assessed for flood risk as part of the development planning process to ensure compliance with SPP7. Our preferred approach would be for any allocations found to be at risk of flooding to be removed from the land allocations – we are likely to object to sites in this category.
- Plans for transport should look east and south not just west
- A public transport interchange should be provided at the railway station, with

improved parking, cycle and pedestrian access and cycle storage.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

Bypass

- A strategy that shows a clear detailed bypass route with timescale
- A broad corridor for the bypass should be preserved
- Bypass should not be tied to contribution of future development in Nairn.
- Strategy showing no development until the bypass is in place.
- Limiting the growth to the South would eliminate need for bypass
- Bypass to be done sympathetically so that Nairn does not become “cut off”
- Wish for updated links to the hinterland to be in place
- Strong support for infrastructure led development
- Suggestion of alternative road improvements rather than a bypass
- The strategy must take out the roundabout on the bypass adjacent to the proposed Nairn South housing allocation. The bypass would be strategic in nature and Transport Scotland cannot at this time commit to any proposals for developments to be accessed from it.
- The bypass will result in the creation of new local/district centres – this is not acceptable as it will lead to the fragmentation of the Nairn community and further degeneration of the Town centre.
- Requirement for a specification on the type and standard of roads and services improvements required to satisfy to gain planning acceptance important any developer led local infrastructure improvements with retrospective developer contributions as the town evolves.
- Alternative to the bypass is to consider the provision of an A96 relief road
- A plan showing the alternative option for the spatial strategy.
- Transport links should look east and south not just West
- should take into account the bypass/ traffic dimension and not just the “longer term proposals”

Rail

- Requirement for a public transport interchange should be provided at the railway station, with improved parking, cycle and pedestrian access and cycle storage.
- Importance of increased rail to be emphasised
- Strategy should not allow for any other interim arrangements such as an “inner ring road” through the residential areas of Nairn South
- Provision of sustainable Transport solutions – including improvements to rail.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

The Council has continued to discuss the delivery timescale for a Nairn by-pass with Transport Scotland. Although the project is highlighted in the Scottish Government’s Strategic Transport Projects Review, there is no clear timescale of funding available for it’s delivery. Transport Scotland have begun the next stage of design review for the A96 Corridor between Inverness and Nairn, and this work is expected to be complete by the end of March 2010.

The Council fully support and agree with many of the points raised in the consultation, but given the uncertainty associated with the by-pass project, it is not

feasible to put an embargo on future development until such time as the by-pass is in place. That said, much of the longer term development contained within the A96 Corridor Development Framework has not been included in the proposals map for Nairn, and will not be brought forward until a much clearer picture of infrastructure delivery emerges.

A more pragmatic solution is to ensure that housing and other expansion proposals that progress in the 2011-2016 period offer mitigation (or improvements) to the existing road network through Nairn. The approach being adopted in Nairn West and Nairn South is that early development must provide contributions towards local and strategic road network. It is clearly set out that these improvements are required and that future phases will only be permitted when there is a much clearer picture on the long term development of a by-pass. The improvements required have been and will be informed by the strategic transport study prepared by the Council, in discussion with Transport Scotland, and which will be published with the Local Development Plan.

Whilst an indicative route has been identified in the Proposed Plan, this will be subject to change pending the outcome of the design review by Transport Scotland, and it is purely speculative at this stage, based on the engineering overview prepared by the Council.

In line with Scottish Planning Policy, opportunities for personal travel will prioritised by mode in the following order - walking, cycling, public transport, car and other motorised vehicles. Buildings and facilities should be accessible on foot and by cycle. Improvements to active transport networks, such as paths and cycle routes, in urban and rural areas will support more sustainable travel choices. The aim is for urban areas to be made more attractive and safer for pedestrians and cyclists, including people with mobility difficulties. The Council's active travel plans will assist in this respect and the transport policies in both the Local Development Plan and the Local Transport Strategy will encourage their use in development management decisions.

The importance of all modes of travel, including rail, is part of the Plan strategy.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

An indicative route for the Nairn bypass is presented in the Proposed Plan, and efforts will continue to lobby Scottish Government to deliver a timescale and funding stream for the Nairn by-pass. The outcomes of the design work currently being done by Transport Scotland may be available at the later stages of plan preparation.

The developer requirements for the expansion sites in Nairn clearly set out the requirements in line with a phased approach to the delivery of infrastructure improvements in Nairn.

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Nairn Expansion Areas
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Marie Cruickshank (14), Sheena Baker (22), Peter Mason (24), Keeping Nairnshire Colourful (58), Halliday Fraser Munro Planning - Deveron Highland Ltd (62), Joan Noble (67), Mary Harrison (73), Alastair Noble (76), Visit Nairn Tourism Association (79), John Mackie (86), H Rask (92), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Nairn West Community Council (101), The Highland Council (TECS)(114), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd. - Achareidh Estate (125), G. H. Johnston Building Consultants Ltd. - John Gordon & Son (126), E Holland (153), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Doug & Joan Piggott (208), Nairn Residents Concern Group (NRCG) (209), Muir Smith Evans - Mr Allenby, in respect of Nairn South (220), Nairnshire Farming Society (221), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (229), William Main (238), Keppie Planning & Development - William Gray Construction (248), Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council (258), Diana Buchanan (265), Des Scholes (273), Scottish Property Federation (291), Alexander Forbes (316)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Partial amendment to Nairnshire Local Plan
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not want huge conurbation- improve what Nairn has instead of expansion. • Do not want development to swallow up our quaint little town. Fear of creating Inverness to Forres Corridor. By all means improve/ move forward – but do not jump into huge plans. • Development in Nairn must consider what impact it may have on fragile areas such as the West Coast • Clarity is needed on densities, feel that high density is not in keeping with Nairn. • Prefer a more limited but balanced plan of development for Nairn which may include sites at Delnies and the south but does not threaten the farmland and natural environment surrounding the town. • Before any growth occurs, the need for a southern distributor road pre a bypass is needed urgently. • It would appear that the Nairn expansion is a cheap and easy option. • If we leave expansion areas as they are set out to be, Nairn will see communities and traditional sources of employment severely damaged by huge sprawling, inappropriate and un-necessary housing development. • Fear over inadequate water and sewage capacity for the proposed developments. The road system is at capacity at present, and impinges hugely on the quality of life of local residents, the ability to travel, and the number of deaths and injuries on the road. Unacceptable that we are recommending developers allow people to make a start on projects and infrastructure will in some way catch up. • Brownfield sites should be used. • No evidence exists as to where the extra jobs will come from. There is 	

- already serve pressure on Public Sector jobs
- Why should we build massively on the A96 and depopulate the north and west when we cannot afford any new infrastructure. We should provide more council houses perhaps even buying some of the many houses which are for sale to meet the demand for local people. Sandown should be a sensible, well planned development if and when it is required.
 - Clarity is needed on the types of development and what guarantees will be put in place to ensure that developers follow-through on commitments to support infrastructure.
 - Natural growth only. No encouragement to build on green sites.
 - Gradual phasing of development needed.
 - Such a large expansion like the one described in high scenario is unacceptable and not in keeping with the existing character and the architectural context of the town.
 - Particular concern about high density 4 storey apartment blocks out of keeping of architectural character.
 - Would like the Highland Council to include strict specifications to maintain architectural quality, preserve green space, and ensure high quality design. To ensure developments are in the character of Nairn we would like the Highland Council via the Local Plan to develop a specification on the type and standard of development that will be required to satisfy planning acceptance.
 - Would like consideration of land at Achareidh. The Local Plan enables some development at Achareidh, but does not make a specific allocation of land. The preferred option and the alternative need not be mutually exclusive; and the principle of maximising the potential of the urban area would give added choice and flexibility in development opportunities, particularly in the present economic climate. In terms of whether as part of the HWLDP or the subsequent Inverness and Inner Moray Firth LDP, the Achareidh holdings are an important contribution.
 - Recent years the extent and density have been excessive.
 - SCDI supports the Council's preferred option, which would identify the expansion sites at Delnies and Nairn South in the Proposed Plan.
 - Expansion of Nairn seems to be an unnecessary component of the A96 corridor development framework.
 - We fail to see the benefit of housing construction commencing before sources of employment are secured.
 - Boundaries in the A96 report should remain and there should be no creeping developments. Nairn needs to retain its unique historical identity. Seek assurance that as stated in Nairnshire Development Framework major expansion to housing land supply will only be taken up following the delivery of the existing Local Plan allocations are built out.
 - We are writing with regard to the Farmer's Showfield in the centre of Nairn and to confirm that approximately 1.2 ha of the showfield adjacent to Lodgehill Road is currently designated for housing under Allocation 10(f) and is still zoned for development in the Nairnshire Local Plan. We would be grateful if you could confirm this is still the current policy. The Farming Society is aware that the Council would like to safeguard part of the Showfield as an open space which would be attractive to the Town and its amenity or potentially utilise the space for educational or community facilities.
 - Whilst we would agree with the recognition of existing Local Plan sites within an updated strategy for the town we would caution against any further allocations in this area until those sites already identified are delivered. The question must be asked why sites in this location have not been brought

forward in the short to medium term and whether they are in fact truly “effective”. Again we would reiterate our consideration that site specific details should be more appropriately dealt with at the relevant site allocation document stage, whilst this Plan should focus on strategy and policy.

- Too much development is proposed for Nairn to the detriment of the current residents.
- In agreement that the existing Local Plan sites should be retained. Where appropriate these sites should be expanded as the adjacent land will offer the most sustainable sites for development.
- The expansion of Nairn would appear to be an unnecessary component of the A96 Corridor written in by its developers. The development of both Sandown and Delnies will create huge traffic problems if both these sites are to be served by one access roundabout prior to the construction of a bypass.
- Not sufficiently familiar with the sites in the preferred option but not stated alternative in principle. Believe that tactful expansion of infrastructure (road and public) around Nairn would make sense.
- Growth yes but not on this massive scale. Proposals for A96 Inverness to Nairn Corridor are reckless to say the least. Developer led – need to listen to the people.
- Urge an approach that continues to encourage development investment while seeking to manage demands on infrastructure as they occur.
- Enclosed photos of wet areas to avoid. The preferred option is 90% sandy ground and will save multi thousands of k (£) (wet areas are peat bog.)
- The strategic plan should recognise explicitly that housing issues should only be addressed after infrastructure requirements. Concern the new waste – processing unit is to be located next to Nairn.
- Support for “major expansion to housing land supply only to be taken up following the delivery of the existing adopted Local Plan allocations are built out.”
- The framework perversely suggests that the town’s response to landward traditions should be to build a large housing development on agriculture land at Nairn South and that it should respond to its seaward context by building extensive housing land at Nairn West. Such propositions betray a dearth of imagination as well as being sheer sophistry.

Sandown

- Support for Sandown to be carried forward, as the site can be delivered without costly infrastructure requirements such as Nairn bypass.
- Sandown is immediately effective and this is an important consideration in the delivery of housing to meet identified residential shortfalls. The preferred option is to concentrate development on identified sites but to advocate and approve housing densities, which accord with recent Government policy and advice. Such an approach may also reduce the need to allocate all the land currently proposed for allocation.
- Sandown should be a sensible well planned development if and when it is required, with wetland to the south of the A96
- Many do not seem to want as much development as is proposed. The Highland Council should become a developer itself in conjunction with housing associations to provide truly affordable accommodation, for example using the common good land at Sandown. Sustainable because it truly will be used for the common good.
- Concern over the 4 storey buildings proposed for Sandown and the first impression this would create.

Delnies

- Density levels seem more suitable. Delnies development utilises the natural assets of Nairn to provide economic growth by enhancing tourist and outdoor leisure opportunities.
- There is now an embargo on developing undeveloped coast, and a presumption against developing undeveloped coast, which makes the proposals for Delnies unacceptable.
- An environmental report on the A96 work says very clearly that both the high quality land and the SSI on the Carse of Delnies should not be developed. The Halcrow criteria were not met and the Delnies proposal failed more than any other alternative.
- The development at both Sandown and Delnies will create huge traffic problems on the A96 if both of these sites are to be served by one access roundabout prior to the construction of the bypass which, as just stated is highly unlikely to commence before approximately 2025. The Delnies site is high quality farmland which should not be built on.
- Delnies land is high quality farmland.

Nairn South

- If southern expansion can be justified then road improvements should precede development and at a minimum include increasing the span of the railway bridge on Cawdor Road to provide adequate footpaths and a safe junction with Balblair Road and providing a southern distributor road from Grantown Road to Balblair Road along the southern flank of the development relieving pressure on the town centre.
- Density levels seem more suitable Nairn South. The southern proposal seems to contribute to the regeneration of the Town centre. Development to the South is impossible without a new road.
- Infrastructure issues need addressed before any development to Nairn South.
- Vital no other interim arrangements such as an “inner ring road” through the residential areas of Nairn South.
- Development to Nairn South should be dependant on the improvement connectivity across the railway for all modes of transport but particularly for walking and cycling in order to improve links to the Town centre. Should be complimentary to the provision of a bypass.
- Submission by Scotia Homes, Robertson Homes and Barratt Homes seek to bring forward development at Nairn South, subject to further masterplan.
- Landowner at Nairn South support the review of development options in Nairn on a strategic basis including proposals for other sites, although the proposal submitted by Cawdor Estates for a linear pattern of development to the west of the settlement is not supported and is not well related to the remainder of the settlement structure. Diagram enclosed showing the strategic approach to the south side of Nairn which encompasses the principles of concentric growth, a compact walking town, a sensitive response to landscape and topography and deliverable rate of development and infrastructure. The submission made on behalf of Charles Allenby seeks to identify Nairn South as a key growth area of the town for development in phases to provide a mix of community, commercial and residential uses in a well planned and well designed sustainable urban environment. Specifically, this submission objects to the extent of the allocation shown in the A96 Corridor Study for industrial development on the Northern portion of the Balblair land as this would not be

appropriate land use adjacent to the school and would detract from the potential for a pedestrian bridge across the railway, from a residential area serving the school. In addition the contextual framework provided demonstrates how the first phase of development at Nairn South fits into the wider area; how a inner distributor road can be provided in the medium term as long as a route is safeguarded to the West to connect to the A96; and how the area sits within the potential line of the Nairn bypass.

- Wish for the allocation of housing and mixed-use development land to Nairn South within the short, medium and long term periods of the LDP.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

General

- Strategy showing a reduction in the amount of development proposed for Nairn
- Scaling back proposals or removing them completely.
- Clarity needed on densities; reference is for low – medium density in keeping with Nairn.
- Prefer a more limited but balanced plan of development for Nairn which may include sites at Delnies and the south but does not threaten the farmland and natural environment surrounding the town.
- The water and sewage capacity for the proposed developments to be addressed
- Preference for Brownfield sites to be developed.
- More council houses to be provided - perhaps even buying some of the many houses which are for sale to meet the demand for local people. Sandown should be a sensible well planned development if and when it is required.
- Gradual phasing of development needed.
- The proposed plan should include strict specifications to maintain architectural quality, preserve green space, ensure high quality design. To ensure developments are in the character of Nairn we would like the Highland Council via the Local Plan to develop a specification on the type and standard of development that will be required to satisfy planning acceptance.
- Consideration of inclusion of land at Achareidh. The Local Plan enables some development at Achareidh, but does not make a specific allocation of land.
- A strategy that mixes the preferred and alternative option with the principle of maximising the potential of the urban area would give added choice and flexibility in development opportunities, particularly in the present economic climate.
- SCDI supports the Council's preferred option, which would identify the expansion sites at Delnies and Nairn South in the Proposed Plan.
- Expansion of Nairn seems to be an unnecessary component of the A96 corridor development framework.
- Boundaries in the A96 report to remain and there should be no creeping developments.
- Seek assurance that as stated in Nairnshire Development Framework major expansion to housing land supply will only be taken up following the delivery of the existing Local Plan allocations are built out.
- Support for Farmer's Showfield in the centre of Nairn and seeking of confirmation that approximately 1.2 ha of the showfield adjacent to Lodgehill Road is currently designated for housing under Allocation 10(f) and is still zoned for development in the Nairnshire Local Plan. The Farming Society is aware that the Council would like to safeguard part

of the Showfield as an open space which would be attractive to the town and its amenity or potentially utilise the space for educational or community facilities.

- Would caution against any further allocations in this area until those sites already identified in the Nairnshire Local Plan are delivered.
- A strategy where the existing Local Plan sites should be retained. Where appropriate these sites should be expanded as the adjacent land will offer the most sustainable sites for development.
- The development of both Sandown and Delnies will create huge traffic problems if both these sites are to be served by one access roundabout prior to the construction of a bypass.
- Believe that tactful expansion of infrastructure (road and public) around Nairn would make sense.
- Enclosed photos of wet areas to avoid. The preferred option is 90% sandy ground and will save multi thousands of k (£) (wet areas are peat bog)
- Concern the new waste – processing unit is to be located next to Nairn.
- Support for Sandown support to be carried forward
- The preferred option is to concentrate development on identified sites but to advocate and approve housing densities, which accord with recent Government policy and advice. Such an approach may also reduce the need to allocate all the land currently proposed for allocation.
- The Highland Council should become a developer itself in conjunction with housing associations to provide truly affordable accommodation, for example using the common good land at Sandown. Sustainable because it truly will be used for the common good
- Support for Delnies development as it utilises the natural assets of Nairn to provide economic growth by enhancing tourist and outdoor leisure opportunities.
- The embargo on developing undeveloped coast, and a presumption against developing undeveloped coast, makes the proposals for Delnies unacceptable
- An environmental report on the A96 work says very clearly that both the high quality land and the SSI on the Carse of Delnies should not be developed. The Halcrow criteria were not met and the Delnies proposal failed more than any other alternative.
- Delnies land is high quality farmland and should not be built on.
- If southern expansion can be justified then road improvements should precede development including a number of points.
- Support for density levels at Nairn South.
- Nairn South proposal seems to contribute to the regeneration of the Town centre.
- Development of Nairn South should be dependant on improvement of connectivity across the railway for all modes of transport but particularly for walking and cycling in order to improve links to the Town centre.
- Inclusion of Nairn South for residential mixed-use within the short, medium and long term periods of the LDP.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

General

The concerns over levels of development in the expansion areas of Nairn have been assessed and the approach in the proposed Plan is of a more proportionate,

masterplan-led approach to development on the key sites. The more local issues raised in relation to the town centre, and other smaller sites will be brought forward as part of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, which will start during 2010. The submissions received to this Plan will be carried forward as part of that process.

The proposed expansion of Nairn is part of a wider strategy for the A96 Corridor. With only one major site under development within Nairn there is a constraint on the operation of a housing market. Housing completions were significantly down in 2009, to a greater extent that can be attributed to the economic slowdown. Inclusion of further releases of housing land to serve the Nairn Housing Market Area will assist in providing choice and stimulate the housing market.

A review of the housing need and demand in Nairn has been undertaken and this has concluded that very long term aspirations identified in the A96 Corridor Framework do not need to be brought forward at this time. Instead the intention set out in this spatial strategy is to focus on the immediate 10-20 year requirements. This approach reflects the views received from the community consultation which sought a more proportionate amount of growth for the town. Given the outcome of the Public Local Inquiry for the development of 550 houses at Sandown, there is now the opportunity to refocus attention on what will be an acceptable level of development on this land, and ensure that the Sandown site is brought forward with clear links and shared infrastructure provision with the adjacent Delnies site. The onus is very much on the developers and landowners involved to ensure community involvement in their ongoing masterplanning work.

Nairn South may have the potential to serve much of the longer term housing requirements for Nairn subject to transport infrastructure improvements being put in place. However, in the first instance, there is an opportunity for some more modest development to take place if the impact on local infrastructure, including the current pinch points on the local road network and the junction onto the A96 in Nairn town centre. Two main areas of land are considered at Nairn South, and submissions have been received from both interests. It is essential that these interests work together to deliver a development in Nairn South which promotes the links to the town centre, whilst providing quality living environments. The issue of the existing sawmill is also important and for that reason there will be a buffer area between any development at Nairn South and the sawmill to protect its future operation and expansion abilities.

The development of Nairn must be seen in the context of long term aspirations for a bypass and the Council will continue to lobby Scottish Government for the funding and design work to be progressed. Taken together, the land identified in Nairn has the capacity to deliver the following housing across all sites:

Nairn South

The Nairn South area was identified in the A96 Corridor Development Framework as offering significant potential in the long term, subject to delivery of the Nairn by-pass. Similarly to Nairn West (Delnies) the allocations to be brought forward as part of the spatial strategy are much reduced from that set out in the Framework document. It is recognised that the long term development of Nairn South requires some significant interventions – whether that is an inner relief road or the by-pass itself. The spatial strategy indicates the potential for a limited release of land in this location in order to supplement the land supply in Nairn, and offer a further degree of choice in the market. It is essential that the delivery of the first phase of housing in this area – subject to a detailed masterplan and conclusion of the Enquiry by Design exercise

already started – will demonstrate that the current pinch points associated with the existing railway bridge and the junctions on to the A96 in the centre of Nairn can be sufficiently improved to enable this development.

Phase 1 will be mainly residential with localised employment opportunities as part of a mixed use masterplan for the area. Key to any development in Nairn South is the need to protect the existing timber yard and to ensure that its possible expansion in the future is not compromised. A buffer area will be maintained as part of that allocation in the local development plan.

Delnies

Whilst the A96 Corridor Framework indicates a much longer term land supply to the west of Nairn, the spatial strategy of the Local Development Plan will focus only on the ability of the Delnies site to deliver in the order of 300 houses over the lifetime of this Local Development Plan, along with the opportunities for small scale leisure and hotel development including a new golf course. This development must progress in line with the Sandown site which is adjacent and which benefits from an adopted Local Plan allocation. A phasing strategy will be developed to guide the developers involved.

Employment

Employment opportunities are very important and wherever possible, there is an encouragement for mixed use developments to be brought forward with small scale business opportunities linked to housing opportunities.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Specific policies and allocations for Nairn.

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Nairn	
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	The Spatial Strategy	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Marie Cruickshank (14), Duncan MacDonald (17), A Moore (23), Peter Mason (24), Brian Stewart, - 55, Keeping Nairnshire Colourful (58), Joan Noble (67), Alastair Noble (76), Visit Nairn Tourism Association (79), John Mackie (86), H Rask (92), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Nairn West Community Council (101), N Wilkinson (104), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), E Holland (153), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Anne Thomas (197), Nairn Residents Concern Group (NRCG) (209), Graham Dunbar (230), William Main (238), John Waring (250), Eveline Waring (253), Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council (258), Turley Associates - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd. (267), RMT (276), Scottish Water (281), Jeff Baker (284)		
Intended impact on approved development plan "general" policies	Partial amendment to Nairnshire Local Plan	
Council's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred option is a curate's egg. • Framework falls to offer a vision for the function of Nairn • Safeguard the Greenfield spaces such as the Farmer's Showfield, Viewfield Park and areas for allotments. • Keep vistas to the coastline and across the Moray Firth. • Need to mention links to the south and east of the Town. • Need to enhance the leisure facilities. • Ageing population: Nairn has a huge and increasing percentage of elderly. There is particularly poor social provision for the existing. • Need to address the issue of Nairn's ageing population and the services they require. • Need mechanisms in place to ensure that the impact is managed in a way that not only maintains but improves the attractiveness and quality of life – left to its own devices it will become an urban sprawl. • Steps need to be taken to reduce the risk of Nairn becoming a dormitory Town. • Recognise Nairn's attractive features; protect the valuable assets it already has. • Lack of clarity on and a need for more joined up thinking over the numbers and location of any new schools if the Town expands. • Designated areas nearby include the Moray Firth SAC and Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar. The Habitats Regulation Appraisal of this plan should consider the proposed development at Nairn, alone and in combination (including Whiteness). Other designations nearby are the Kildrummie Kames SSIS (geological and biological). Further discussion will be necessary between Transport Scotland, the Council and SNH. The Proposed Plan should cover this issue in the necessary detail. The green network work for the A96 Corridor will be able to consider if the route of the bypass raises any loss of connectivity or fragmentation issues that should also be addressed in detail in 		

the Proposed Plan. Protected species that should be taken into account here are potentially otters, bats, badgers and red squirrels.

- Nairn is an example of a small Town which retains local independent businesses due to the lack of competition from large scale supermarkets. Traffic going through is able to stop off at local shopping areas. A bypass might alleviate congestion at peak periods but could undermine the viability of the local shopping area.
- Prefer stated alternative; improve infrastructure to meet needs of those living in the area. Direct resources to attracting business and industry to the area. Provide housing and amenities to cater for the growth in population.
- Need to address the identified shortfall in retail provision - The site at Forres Road should be put forward for such development whilst providing for appropriate local infrastructure improvements, as agreed.
- Scottish Water are currently engaging with HC and Key developers to discuss the available options to enable delivery of their individual projects in parallel to the other developments within the entire A96 strategy.
- Nairn Schools are at capacity.

Employment/ Economic Growth

- Economic issues fundamental to growth
- Opportunity for economic growth and better retail facilities is needed;
- Need economic growth in Nairn.
- Employment should be secured before houses.
- No suggestion of how new employment might be achieved.
- Creation of sustainable businesses with opportunities for young people to live in the Town is necessary.
- Encouragement for the Highland Council to relocate selected admin to Nairn and other sub–regional centres.

Tourism

- Need to address the importance of tourism as an economic driver and significant employer.
- Fear that the scale of proposed development would kill tourism in the Town stone dead.
- Most jobs in Nairn are tourist dependant. Incorrectly placed large-scale housing developments could potentially destroy the basis of Nairn's tourist trade.
- There is a need for studies on the impact on community, jobs and tourism to be conducted.
- Proposals should be made to improve Nairn's existing visitor attractions along with the development of new and sustainable enterprises – art, culture, heritage etc.
- Recognise the importance of the traditional activities based on tourism, farming and service sector.

Enhancing Nairn/ Benefits for Nairn

- New development needs to be integrated in such a way that ensures clear benefits for the Town alongside the desire to meet housing targets and aspirations.
- Must be delivered by developers to a specification that is negotiated and

agreed with the community.

- No suggestion offered of how the facilities and services in Nairn can be protected, or how Nairn's tourist offering can be enhanced. What new and life-enhancing benefits can the people of Nairn expect?
- Swimming pool is at full capacity; if more development takes place an additional swimming pool should be planned for.
- Create and preserve a "wow factor"; this is likely to be preservation of seaside frontage and the opportunity to create a new Town park. Focus not only on the new but protect our heritage.
- The proposed doubling of population will strain the recreational facilities.
- How will the proposed development enhance the distinctive role and historical development of Nairn?
- Affordable housing is always an issue especially in a place like Nairn where the care of the elderly and tourism are the main industries.

Town Centre

- Improve Town centres and the eyesores using compulsory purchase.
- Development of Town centre needed
- Enhance and develop the existing Town centre. Do not believe building new housing developments on the outskirts and along the main access will enhance the Town Centre which has been neglected for over 20 years; no evidence that previous waves of housing at Tradespark, Achareidh and more recently Lochloy have made any contribution to the revival of the sites in the Town centre. Specific planning measures should be introduced and aimed at reviving the Town centre. It is of critical importance that the development plan should set out broad guidelines for other kinds of development in Nairn, such as retail, supermarkets etc., as well as housing. Developing an attractive Town centre should be a core element of the local plan,
- Careful thought should be given to any "district" shopping zones, for reasons of access, traffic viability of the Victorian High Street. This has many properties of architectural interest and merit to be protected. Perhaps reintroduce the earlier proposals for a conservation area.
- Sympathetic redevelopment of the Town centre as a priority. To people that are partially sighted the one-way High Street and mix of shops is particularly useful.
- Proposed plan should adopt a strategy that addresses the identified shortfall in retail provision for the Town. It should put forward the site at Forres Road for such development whilst providing for appropriate local infrastructure improvements as agreed with the Council as part of a recent planning application.
- Nairn has a large and under-utilised Town centre. Under-utilisation in this instance means that the quality of retail outlets which the existing population is able to support is rather dismal. Early encouragement of a growing, thriving prosperous community would quickly alter the quality of the retail environment. The Town centre has much potential "brownfield" land, the development of which is being stifled by Highland Council not taking action over proper disposal of its assets there and by potentially permitting edge of Town ahead of Town centre development.

Consultation

- Existing community should have major input into any new development.

- Concern over Halcrow's consultation methods (detail given about this).
- Consultation must take place to reduce conflict.
- Only succeed if prior consultation takes place.
- Would like to see here whatever development is most favoured by residents.
- Ask the people of Nairn how they would like to see their Town developed.

Active Green Travel/ Sustainability

- The Highland Council staff spoke enthusiastically of Nairn as a walking town – pleasure for those with time but not those carrying a daily shopping load.
- We should be following green policies and not encouraging commuting.
- Better connection is required from central Nairn with its employment, retail and community facilities, to these new areas to deliver the vision of encouraging active travel and reducing CO₂ emissions.
- The already relatively high bicycle and pedestrian journeys should be encouraged by building more cycle routes and footpaths particularly in any new housing development. The lack of hills and compactness of current facilities together with supportive local schools encouraging cycling could facilitate a much higher proportion of local journeys by cycle. In addition a more frequent train service between Inverness and Aberdeen would enable longer journeys from Nairn to be made by train further reducing congestion. It has been shown that the more roads are built the greater the traffic.

Agricultural Land

- The plan makes no mention of the importance of the farmland around Nairn. There is likely to be an increased demand for locally produced food. This farmland must be protected.
- Food and agriculture are very important. There should only be building on brownfield sites, rather than on agricultural land.
- It is foolish to build on agricultural land given the dangers to the country's food supply in the future.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

General

- Strategy showing opportunity for economic growth and better retail facilities.
- The wish for the strategy to offer a vision for the function of Nairn
- Reference to safeguarding Greenfield spaces such as the Farmer's Showfield, Viewfield Park and areas for allotments.
- Vistas to the coastline across the Moray Firth to be protected.
- Links to the south and east of the Town need mentioned.
- Need mechanisms to improve the attractiveness and quality of life.
- The Habitats Regulation Appraisal of this plan should consider the proposed development at Nairn; the Proposed Plan should cover this issue in the necessary detail.
- Protected species that should be taken into account here are potentially otters, bats, badgers and red squirrels.
- Prefer stated alternative; improve infrastructure to meet needs of those living in the area. Direct resources to attracting business and industry to the area. Provide housing and amenities to cater for the growth in population.
- Seeking Forres Road to be included for retail to help address the identified shortfall in retail provision.
- Policy should clearly address school provision, community and leisure

facilities, provision for the elderly population, retail.

Employment/ Economic Growth

- Strategy that identifies job locations - Employment should be secured before houses, with regard to Nairn's economic growth.
- Creation of sustainable businesses with opportunities for young people to live in the Town.
- The strategy to encourage The Highland Council to make reference to relocating selected admin to Nairn and other sub-regional centre.

Tourism

- A strategy that addresses the importance of tourism as an economic driver and significant employer.
- The plan should address the need for impact studies on community, jobs or tourism to be carried out.
- Proposals should be made to improve Nairn's existing visitor attractions along with the development of new and sustainable enterprises – art, culture, heritage etc.

Enhancing Nairn – Benefits to Nairn

- New development needs to be integrated in such a way that ensures clear benefits for the Town alongside the desire to meet housing targets and aspirations.
- Need new and life-enhancing benefits for the people of Nairn.
- Recognise the importance of the traditional activities based on tourism, farming and service sector.
- Preservation of seaside frontage and the opportunity to create a new Town park.
- Strategy to address affordable housing issues is always an issue especially in a place like Nairn where the care of the elderly and tourism are the main industries.
- Reference to be made to the importance of safeguarding and enhancing the unique qualities and assets of Nairn.

Town Centre

- Priority should be given to sympathetically redeveloping improving the Town centre.
- Improve town centre and the eyesores using compulsory purchase.
- Specific planning measures should be introduced and aimed at reviving the Town centre;
- The development plan should set out broad guidelines for other kinds of development in Nairn, such as retail, supermarkets etc., as well as housing.
- Careful consideration of "district" shopping zones.
- The town centre has many properties of architectural interest and merit to be protected.
- Perhaps reintroduce the earlier proposals for a conservation area.

Consultation

- Existing community should have major input into any new development.
- Consultation must take place to reduce conflict.

Active Green Travel/ Sustainability

- We should be following green policies.
- Delivery of active travel opportunities including cycling, walking, increased rail
- Better connections from central Nairn with its employment, retail and community facilities to deliver the vision of encouraging active travel and reducing CO₂ emissions.

Agricultural Land

- Importance of safeguarding agricultural land.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

General

The delivery of development in Nairn must be brought forward at a pace which can be accommodated by the existing infrastructure. Many of the comments raised in relation to schools, water supply, waste water treatment and leisure facilities are relevant and have been considered in determination of the plan strategy. A full assessment has been done of education and transport needs in relation to Nairn, which do highlight issues that must be addressed by future development opportunities.

The preferred option as set out in the Main Issues Report was to identify the expansion areas at Delnies and at Nairn South in the Proposed Plan. Following consideration of the consultation responses and indeed the lack of certainty over long term infrastructure like the by-pass, it is proposed that a more pragmatic and proportionate approach to development is taken forward. Much of the development land at Nairn West and Nairn South will not be brought forward to the Local Development Plan framework at this stage, and the focus instead will be on the immediate development requirements at Sandown, Delnies and Nairn South. Other smaller scale opportunities may come forward as part of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, preparation of which starts later this year (2010).

Employment/ Economic Growth

SPP states Planning Authorities should ensure that there is a range and choice of marketable sites and locations for businesses allocated in development plans, including opportunities for mixed use development, to meet anticipated requirements and a variety of size and quality requirements. In addition Development plans should support small business development and growth and promote opportunities for low impact industrial, business and service uses which can co-exist with housing and other sensitive uses without eroding amenity. New development will contain opportunities for business. The mixed use sites in Nairn South, Delnies and at Sandown do provide opportunities for business development, and in that respect will offer significant benefits to employment growth. The Council will also continue to work at enhancing the attractiveness of Nairn as a business location.

Tourism

It is understood that tourism is an integral part of the town of Nairn. The tourism industry is one of Scotland's largest business sectors and in line with national policy, planning authorities should support high quality tourism related development, including the provision of appropriate facilities in key locations across urban and rural Scotland. New tourism policies have been added to the Proposed Plan.

Enhancing Nairn/ Benefits for Nairn

The approach that is being taken towards a masterplan led approach to the development of the strategic sites around Nairn, will hopefully lead to a much better context for our development sites. The Enquiry by Design process which is being followed at Nairn South for example has been a very useful means of ensuring that the future development of the site will be set in the context of the historic development of Nairn. That process is still to be completed and will form an important element of work on bringing forward the first phase of development at this location. All development will be expected to contribute towards deficiencies created by the development as well as to affordable housing.

Town Centre

We understand that there is a strong wish for the sympathetic redevelopment of Nairn's town centre. Work is already underway on the second stage of the streetscape works. Consideration is also being given as to the next moves on how development can be brought forward on the former community centre site. These matters will be covered in more detail by the Local Development Plan, which will focus on many of the smaller sites in the town.

Consultation

The Council fully encourage consultation with the community at all stages of the process. As well as efforts being made as part of the Local Development Plan, new regulations mean that communities will be able to comment on major development proposal before a formal planning application is made. This is known as a pre-application consultation (PAC) and applies to planning applications submitted from 3rd August 2009.

Active Green Travel/ Sustainability

One of the key improvements that the planning system is well placed to deliver is an enhanced active travel network through Nairn. An active travel plan has been prepared by the HITRANS and the Council and that will be used to inform planning decisions at the major expansion sites. The links into the centre of Nairn are fundamental to this.

Agricultural Land

In terms of the loss of agricultural land, the approach taken by the Council in preparing the HWLDP reflects that outlined in the consolidated Scottish Planning Policy document. This states that development on prime agricultural land will be acceptable where it is an essential component of the settlement strategy. It is an essential component of the A96 Corridor Growth Strategy and required to meet the housing demand within the Inner Moray Firth area. By developing Nairn South, Delnies, a greater choice location and type of housing will be provided and development pressures on other areas such as will be significantly reduced. There is

not enough brownfield land to develop for the housing needs that are required, and therefore it is inevitable that Greenfield sites will be used.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Specific policies and allocations for Nairn

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Open Space and Physical Activity
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Healthier Highland
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
The Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2), J Mayhew (50), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Elizabeth Budge (148), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Kinncraig & Vicinity Community Council (225), Graham & Sibbald-Mr & Mrs Brian Grant (231), Ardross Community Council (236), John Waring (250), Eveline Waring (253), Roger Piercy (257), Graham & Sibbald-Trustee's of Smithton Church (282), Helen Campbell (301), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), SportScotland (320), Scottish Government (324), Allotments for Inverness Comann na Lios' (331)	
Intended impact on approved development plan "general" policies	<p>Replace Structure Plan SR1, SR2</p> <p>Drop Structure Plan SR3, SR4, SR7, SR8, SR9</p>
Council's summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard settings for outdoor activities • Creation of open space should plan for wooded areas. • Supportive of green networks. • Should look to "expand and protect open space" • Developers do not always provide good provision of open space and is delivered after everything else. • Benefits of green network should be clearer and included in proposed plan. • Should reference the need for an open space audit/strategy. • Need to plan for larger scale sports facilities such as swimming pools. • Facilities planning model should be a core policy document and updated regularly. • Need to consider the extension of tree cover in response to climate change. • Fit for purpose open space should be protected. • General grassed areas should not be protected as open space if not used or fit for purpose. • Identifies a site which should not be protected open space. • Need to liaise with schools to establish their need for open space. • Open spaces are good but also need to plan and create sport and leisure centres. • Developers need to be aware of open space needs in rural areas. • Open spaces in built up areas should be supervised to avoid vandalism • It should not be up to developers to provide open space – Council should take lead and say where open space should be and enforce it. • Allotments should be created near new housing developments and managed by the Council. • Open space audit and strategy will help to identify areas of deficiency. • Need to be clear on level of contribution and how it will be spent otherwise open to abuse. 	

- Can't envisage that any alternative would be practical
- delivery of new open spaces need to be enforced
- Support the provisions of the SPP.
- Support for green network creation.
- Results of Facilities Planning Model can be used as potential to deliver necessary facilities – should be used to as a means to an end with a priority list being referred to in assessing planning applications.
- Should include a policy on protection and enhancement of playing fields. LDP should identify playing fields on proposals maps.
- Any new development should encourage physical activity and wellbeing.
- May be merit in protection of green networks in and around towns.
- Concern at lack of green wedge.
- Allotment provision should be in context of better public and natural green space.
- Important to take a long term view to open space planning.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Safeguarding the setting for outdoor activities
- Policy to protect and enhance open space.
- Plan for new indoor sports provision.
- Open Space provision should be enforced.
- Clear policy approach for green networks.
- Policy specifically protecting playing fields.
- Need for creation of new allotments.
- Need to plan for appropriate landscaping in open spaces namely tree cover.
- Need for reference to the Open Space Audit/Strategy.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Safeguarding the Setting for Outdoor Activities

The Highland Council are of the view that the policy approach to the Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage, sufficiently covers the safeguarding of settings for outdoor activities, given the protection afforded to areas of great landscape value, views over open water, remote landscapes of value for recreation, and national scenic areas.

Policy to protect and enhance open space

It was the Council's preferred approach at the Main Issues Report stage, to have a policy which would offer protection and enhancement of open space. We will be bringing forward a policy on this matter, in the spirit of Scottish Planning Policy, through the Proposed Highland wide Local Development Plan.

Plan for new indoor sports provision

In considering these responses we have considered where it would be best to bring forward a suitable plan for the development of new or protection and enhancement of indoor sport facilities. The Highland Council's Facilities Planning Model (FPM) identifies the quality and quantity of sports facilities through out Highland. The FPM will be used to inform the location of new or improved indoor sports facilities in each of the Regional, sub-regional and local centres. We will seek to allocate sites for these uses in each of the area Local Development Plans.

Open Space provision should be enforced

As with all of the policies within the Highland wide Local Development Plan we will be seeking to enforce them. If enforcement action is required we will take the necessary steps proper procedure has been followed by a developer.

Clear Policy Approach on Green Networks

The Proposed Highland wide Local Development Plan will contain a policy which recognises the importance of green networks for their recreational and biodiversity value. The policy will encourage the protection and enhancement of green networks and where appropriate, avoid fragmentation and improve connectivity of existing networks. Green Networks will be identified around the Regional and Sub-Regional Centres in Highland.

Policy Specifically Protecting Playing Fields

Following publication of Scottish Planning Policy we will be including a policy on protection of playing fields. This policy will contain a presumption against development of playing fields unless it can meet the criteria set out in the policy. These criteria will be based upon the be criteria contained within Scottish Planning Policy (Para. 156).

Need for land allocations for new Allotment Gardens

The Open Space in New Residential Development: Supplementary Guidance contains standards for the provision of new allotment gardens in relation to new residential developments. It is unlikely that the Council will allocate specific land for allotment gardens, through either the Highland wide Local Development Plan or area Local Development Plans, however it will seek to protect and enhance the existing provision and where appropriate seek new provision in line with the requirements of the Open Space in New Residential Developments: Supplementary Guidance.

Appropriate Landscaping in Open Spaces, Namely Tree Cover

The Open Space in New Residential Development: Supplementary Guidance covers what types of planting and biodiversity elements are suitable for each different type of open space.

Need for Reference to the Open Space Audit/Strategy

The Highland wide Local Development Plan will be supported by an Open Space Audit. This will be referenced in the supporting text of any appropriate policy and the sites identified within will be mapped within area Local Development Plans.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Green Networks
 Policy - Open Space
 Policy - Playing Fields and Sports Pitches
 Policy - Public Access
 Policy - Long Distance Routes

Also intention to adopt/produce related Supplementary Guidance

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Population and Housing
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Population and Housing
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Coriolis Energy LLP (1), Thurdistoft Farm (8), Duncan MacDonald (17), Irene Brandt (18), Sheena Baker (22), Peter Mason (24), Sheelagh Southwell (28), Juliet Robinson (34), Graham & Sibbald - Mr Derek Mackenzie (35), J Mayhew (50), Brian Lynch (54), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), Halliday Fraser Munro - Tulloch Homes (North) Ltd (57), Jennifer Denholm (61), Halliday Fraser Munro - Deveron Highland Ltd (62), Joan Noble (67), Halliday Fraser Munro - Fairways Leisure Group Ltd (69), Gordon Mooney (71), Mary Harrison (73), Paul & Helen Jenkins (74), Alastair Noble (76), Rose-Miller Farms (80), Laid Grazings Committee (83), I Wade (85), John Mackie (86), Paul Maden (88), Mrs L Mackintosh (90), David Matthews (91), Mrs H Rask (92), Kingussie Community Council (93), James Barr Ltd - MacDonald Estates PLC (98), Nairn West Community Council (101), Inverness South Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), SNH (118), Brora Community Council (121), Crown Community Council (122), GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - MacLean Family (136), GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - County Properties (Northern0 Limited (137), GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd - Mr Leo Daly (139), Westhill Community Council (147), Cromarty Arts (150), Highland and Islands Green Party (168), Annie Stewart (172), John Dolan (173), SCDI (180), Martin Mackay Solicitors - Dingwall Auction Mart Limited (181), Ian Cowan (185), Martin Mackay Solicitors - Dingwall & Highland Marts Limited (186), Peter Roberts (194), Anne Thomas (197), Bryden Associates - Strathdearn Community Council (205), Doug & Joan Piggot (208), Nairn Residents Concern Group (209), Hugh Robertson (214), Ken Nicol (215), Joyce Wilkinson (216), Croy & Culloden Community Council (218), John Martin (223), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (229), Graham Dunbar (230), William Main (238), William Grant (243), Knight Frank LLP - Mr Morrison, Land at Muir of Ord (244), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council (258), Colliers CRE - Whiteness Property Company (260), Mr and Mrs Stafford (272), Mr J Bingham (283), Jeff Baker (284), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Homes for Scotland (293), Thomas Munro & Co (296), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), SportScotland (320), Scottish Government (324), WYG Planning & Design - The Cawdor Maintenance Trust (325), Transition Black Isle (330), EMAC Planning - Barratt Homes & Robertson Homes (333), EMAC Planning - Hill of Fearn West, Scotia Homes (334)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Structure Plan Policy H1 Housing allocations for Areas
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Aspirational growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not appreciate driver for population growth with these being aspirational, will lead to over-allocation ▪ Question aspirational growth with targets, in-migrant population may not be maintained should not support natural change only, population increase not sustainable ▪ Would advise caution on using high migration scenario, Lack on in-migrants would lead to unpopulated developments ▪ Need for clarity on why high growth chosen and reconciling need with 	

land allocations

- Effects of recession likely to last 10+ years, surplus of housing land now for sale in Nairn
- There is a need for this policy to support the retention of population in fragile areas.
- The Council should take a proactive approach to housing due in areas of greatest decline. Wish to see population dispersed in line with THC mission statement
- Infrastructure not adequate for population growth, negative impact on tourism with growth
- The use of high estimates is unwise given current and future economic realities
- Housing should be provided to accommodate local working people, not those from other areas
- We need to consider other options and show this through strategic environmental assessment
- Figures should be re-appraised, larger households now evident so demand for housing is less
- SCDI recommend measuring of levels of new homes built in Inverness and wider Highland compared to other areas in Scotland as a way of monitoring growth
- Allocations should be based on existing infrastructure and service capacity opposed to hierarchy
- Development should avoid best agricultural land, Larger existing properties utilised by families with older population trading down, New development needs to be as close to zero carbon as possible with at least 25% affordable
- There are differences between A96 masterplan figures, and the Main Issues Report population and housing figures (See Cameron's note)
- We should encourage young to stay through provision of more jobs and affordable homes.
- There should be a table to show low migration and we should plan for lower end of projections
- Transfer development to areas where there is adequate supply of low quality land,
- Concern that major development here will lead to other areas depopulating and will encourage more commuting. The over-development of Nairn has impact outwith Highland boundary i.e. Moray
- Support preferred approach on basis that continued in-migration is required to drive growth

Employment

- Where will jobs be to meet the employment needs for a growing population in line with the preferred option? There is the need for an employment strategy.
- Where are jobs coming from?

Population/household growth

- Should concentrate on sustaining population, not growth prefer alternative on lower or zero population growth
- Is there breakdown of age balance during growth period?
- Concern over increasing an already elderly population
- Support growth option as long as existing residents get priority

- Overly optimistic assumptions on population projection means MIR is flawed
- No indication of where substantial increase in population comes from.

Housing Land Requirement

- Table needs clarification, what are units in Land supply table?
- The table does not show proportion allocated to social and affordable housing
- Phasing should be built in to take account of slow down or reversal of inward migration
- Clear deficit in land supply, we seek allocation of land to support the growth in Inverness and the A96 also in other areas across Highland (various)
- The table indicates we don't have enough housing land to meet proposed population growth – should show other population projections
- Why have sites with existing permissions been excluded?
- The table does not show proportion allocated to social and affordable housing
- If a significant proportion of population cannot afford to buy, why are the majority of new houses to be open market?
- Allocating too much housing land will hopefully reduce rental and property prices
- The identification of the housing land requirement should come before identification of locations.
- There is a need to ensure that market is not compromised by over regulation of housing land supply.
- Housing will become available as baby boomers release larger properties
- Unless the economic situation improves in Caithness no requirement for more land
- Existing allocations should be time barred, if not developed in timescale then remove allocation
- Does HNDA use same figures as the MIR?
- We should not make provision for holiday homes.
- An oversupply of housing land will assist in reducing housing costs
- Do not agree with preferred option we should seek to promote growth in other areas
- Would like to see development of an assessment framework to help consider how settlements can grow in a sustainable manner utilising existing and expandable infrastructure and inform the phasing and location of development
- Whilst provision of generous supply can overcome constraints effecting current allocations, The Council should seek to remove such constraints, Plan should indicate how much windfall is expected
- The Main Issues Report does not explain adequately how the Council will support all communities
- Support further allocations in East Ross, Black Isle of Mid Ross, the role of smaller settlements important, effective land is available in East Ross, Black Isle and Mid Ross
- Development rates have been too fast in recent years. This is not sustainable, slow down development and reduce impact on environment
- Support preferred option, proactive delivery of housing land, more cautious approach fails to address wider Council aim of strengthening the economic role
- Support preferred option, particularly in Inverness where land allocated in

'94 is not yet effective through lack of infrastructure

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Population growth targets should be reduced as growth has happened too quickly and the development of jobs not clear, also impact of increasing an already elderly population.
- Focus should be shifted to retaining population rather than growing.
- There is an inadequate supply of housing land and as a consequence lower growth targets should be set.
- Seek the identification of specific allocations across Highland
- Expand the overall strategy of growth on sustainable principles to inform the what, where and when of growth

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Aspirational growth

In response to the questions regarding aspirational growth targets, and migrant population the Council's approach has been guided by national policy and population trends. The Scottish Government, through the National Planning Framework and Planning Policy has stressed the principle that population growth is essential for economic growth, and that through the preparation of aspirational but realistic development plans a generous supply of land must be made available to meet identified housing requirements across all tenures, including affordable housing. Further, the Government's Housing Need and Demand Assessment Guidance urges authorities;

".....to ensure that development planning embraces Government's aspirations for Scotland, reflected in targets for greater economic and population growth, that imply higher overall household growth than current projections indicate. Planning for housing should reflect the need to accommodate this."

In assessing what a generous supply of land means in Highland, we have taken account of the target agreed between Government and Highlands and Island Enterprise (HIE) to grow the HIE area population to 500,000 people over the next 20 years, which HIE has taken as an annual growth rate of 0.7% over the next decade. HIE has yet to translate this into targets for the individual authorities which make up its area, but given the ageing population in Eilean Siar and Shetland, recent population decline in Argyll & Bute, and the threat to the defence industry in Moray, it is clear that Highland must make a major contribution which may well exceed the rate for HIE overall. The 0.7% annual growth rate translates into growth of around 1,600 people per year as a minimum, and provision must be made to house at least this rate of growth if these targets are to be achievable. This compares with rates of growth over the next decade of 1,350 and 1,800 for the principal and high migration scenarios respectively.

The delivery of housing on development land will respond to the demand for housing. In the absence of demand for housing development programs will slow down to respond to the market. The Plan has identified the need to phase development in areas of high housing need, within the A96 corridor development will be phased in gradually taking account the existing housing land to be built out

Across the Highland area existing land supplies have the capacity to meet the short to medium term housing land requirements, reviews of the area based local development plans will give the opportunity to ensure that all land supply requirements can be met.

Employment

The allocation of land to accommodate employment uses will be made across the A96 corridor as well as across the Highlands. Ongoing work being undertaken by Highlands and Islands Enterprise will identify the wider need for provision of employment land.

Population/household growth

The MIR population and housing figures are based on the Housing Need and Demand Assessment utilising a high migration scenario and also taking account the requirement to allow for flexibility and choice in the market place to formulate a housing land requirement. One of the main changes to the development strategy outlined in both the A96 Corridor Framework and the Main Issues Report is that the numbers of houses proposed in the corridor requires to be pared back to reflect what the likely needs are over the next twenty years. Whilst it is important to retain long term aspirations, the spatial strategy has effectively refocused the content of the A96 Corridor Framework, with significant reductions in the land allocated during the 2011-2031 period around Nairn, East Inverness and in the smaller villages.

Housing Land Requirement

The existing supply of established housing land does show an adequate land supply to meet the next several years supply. The Local Development Plan identifies the shortfall in land supply for future years development that will be specifically identified through the rolling programme of local plan reviews.

The plan seeks to identify an adequate supply of housing land to meet the projected need in household growth. The affordable housing policy seeks to ensure that a percentage of all housing developments meet the needs of those unable to secure open market private sector housing. Housing land is allocated for housing as a land use, land may be specifically be allocated for affordable housing where there is limited land supply along with an identified need. The majority of affordable housing will be delivered on land alongside private sector housing. The Housing Need and Demand Assessment identifies the levels of housing land requirement that are required to meet affordable housing needs. In addition to the policy, Scottish Government funding can deliver affordable housing directly.

The strategy for the whole Highland area is aimed at sustaining the whole of the Highland area, from seeking to stem population in the more fragile areas to encouraging and maintaining an environment for the continuation of growth in other areas. The provision of affordable housing remains a priority and the Council's approach to this issue is given more detail in the Highland Housing Strategy. The Highland wide Local Development Plan continues to progress policy aimed at assisting in the delivery of affordable housing stock across the Highland area.

The wider policies of the plan are aimed at supporting the future development of the Highlands. Encouragement is given to development in fragile areas where this will support communities, services and infrastructure in rural areas.

The spatial strategy for the Highland wide Local Development Plan has been redrafted to better reflect the wider needs and demands for the whole of the

Highland area. The main focus for development is focussed on the development prospects of the existing settlements in Highland. The recently reviewed local plans for West Highland and Islands and Sutherland already progress the role of settlements in these areas with this now being better reflected. The strategy for development of Caithness highlights the opportunities for renewables, the continued importance of Dounreay and regeneration potential at John O'Groats and Castletown. Potential for development in Inverness and the A96 primarily looks at the continued development of existing land allocations to the south of Inverness and also incremental growth to the east utilising and enhancing existing infrastructure. The role of Tornagrain new settlement as a means of meeting our 20 year land supply requirements has been retained. However, it is clear that the delivery of this long term development will take place at a moderate pace.

The monitoring report indicates the historical trends in terms of uptake of windfall, assumptions on future levels are derived from this historical information and also from the outcomes of the housing land audit. The report to the May Planning, Environment and Development Committee has already indicated the levels of development for the A96 area with the anticipated levels of windfall development. The Housing Land Audit 2009 also provides information on the levels of windfall development coming forward.

The Housing Need and Demand Assessment, a supporting document to the MIR has detailed breakdowns of the changes to both population and household change over the 10 – 20 year periods.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy including Housing Requirement Table

Link to Housing Need and Demand Assessment

Phasing of Larger Development Areas

See Committee Draft papers for wording

Issue (heading):	Previously Used Land (all issues)
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Previously Used Land
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Staffin Community Council (13), D. MacDonald (17), Highland Council Contaminated Land Team (47), Mrs J Mayhew (50), M. Harrison (73), P. Maden (88), Kingairloch Estate LLP (K. Larson) (95), James Barr Ltd-MacDonald Estates (98), Inverness South Community Council (107), SNH (118), J. Walford (155), SCDI (180), HIE (West Highlands & Islands) (190), Keppie Planning & Design for Mr D MacDonald (199), Bryden Associates (Strathdearn Community Council) (205), E & P. Hodges (219), Kincaig & Vicinity Community Council (225), Strutt & Parker LLP for John Wright (227), Dingwall Community Council (235), Ardross Community Council (236), P. Roberts (247), Keppie Planning for William Gray Construction (248), J. Waring (250), E. Waring (253), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), I. Wilson (255), Kirkhil & Bunchrew Community Council (256), R. Piercy (257), Colliers CRE-Whiteness Property Company (260), D. Buchanan (265), Scottish Water (281), Scottish Property Federation (291), S. Melville (313), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318), B. Steele (319), Scottish Government (324)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Update and expand on SP Policy G2 (6)
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Agree with preferred option – 16 Disagree with preferred option – 3 Agree with stated alternative – 2 Disagree with stated alternative – 2</p> <p>Comments regarding the preferred option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take more account of local community • Redevelopment of previously used land is consistent with the principles of sustainable development • Agree that there should be target to aim for (however unclear what exactly). • Proposed Plan policy must include arrangements for close liaison between councils Contaminated Land Team and Planning and Development • Redevelopment of brownfield land should be a priority and must take precedence over agricultural land • The Council should seek ownership of under-utilised land to bring it back into use, lots of vacant land needs major investigation with pressure on failing landlords • New development on previously used land will close the gap between the wealthy and most disadvantaged areas of the region • Agree with Preferred Option as long as the policy is uniform and no unreasonable conditions are imposed • Preferred Option should be adopted in order to preserve greenfield sites, especially those that are either currently used or have the potential for food production • Agree with principles of the preferred option but feel that assistance may need to be given to developers to encourage consideration of the use of such land, as otherwise they may be put off by the potential additional costs. • It is important to encourage use of previously used sites so that they are not left as eyesores 	

Comments regarding future uses of previously used land

- Agree with preferred option but never for waste incinerator plants
- Re-using land should not just be considered in the needs for housing but also community use (open areas for recreation), forestry or agriculture.
- More detail is required regarding what kinds of new use will be permitted i.e. a flooded field should not be transformable into housing development if in the middle of agricultural area.
- Agree with preferred option, as long as such sites like that one in the photograph are not used as a back door to underhand development of countryside
- The Council should encourage the development/replacement of out-dated farm buildings as well as the conversion of venicular buildings including areas within the A96 Corridor

Comments regarding planning permission

- Automatically approve any planning application that provides for redevelopment of previously used land, regardless of the age
- An alternative approach is to decide applications on their own merit in line with national policy
- Agreement and regular review of appropriate planning conditions is also required (provision should be made to allow subsequent review so that the conditions do not become ineffective)
- Some never developed land which has still got viable long term planning permission would be best returned to green field status (which it is in all but name)

Comments regarding wording/terminology

- This issue does not sit comfortably within a section on Safeguarding the Environment – could be re-titled ‘Safeguarding and Enhancing our Environment’. It is recommended that this is also incorporated better by referring to the improvement of environmental/landscape condition through development and enhancement measures, and how this can contribute to sustainability by avoiding development on ‘green field’ sites.

Development on PUL

- HIE – The statements made require to be reviewed and clarified. Availability of vacant and brownfield sites vary considerably through the region. Recognition should be given to the extraordinary site development associated with contaminated land, particularly in the Highland area. Developers should only be requiring to remediate to ‘reasonable’ levels for the development they are proposing
- In the first instance there should be a presumption in favour of redevelopment of previously used land particularly where evidence of previous structures and the effects of previous land uses remain. These should be supported in principle subject to access, servicing and where necessary site investigations and risk assessment identifying required remediation works
- The reuse of land can often be highly beneficial especially as there will often be former infrastructure that may be usable. However previously used sites may also bring contaminated land costs and other risks. We welcome a policy that would seek to identify these costs in advance of potential redevelopment.
- Developers must adhere to any site investigation findings

Relationship to other policies

- A provision for this should be incorporated in the new Housing in the

Countryside Policy as a category of development that will supported in principle subject to other factors

- Point 2 of the PO is consistent with part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and PAN 33.
- Guidance for the construction of water mains in previously used land is contained within Water for Scotland 2nd Edition (2.2.2 Ground Condition Assessment) and should be consulted in all instances

Specific location based comments

- Brownfield sites are not being used – Fort William needs a boost
- On basis of MIR Whiteness should not be preferred location for further growth along the A96 in advance of any greenfield

Comments in disagreement with preferred option

- Object to proposed setting of targets. It is important to increase opportunities for development of brownfield sites however in some instances they are not suitable due to restrictions such as contamination, layout etc.
- An unyielding focus on in the re-development of brownfield sites could lead to the oversight of better placed proposals being refused planning permission
- Previous use does not necessarily qualify it for development. There are many eyesores of dereliction which could be removed compulsory and land reinstated to natural condition
- However, it should be ensured undeveloped land in sustainable locations are not dismissed in favour of such sites if these are not locate at least as sustainably in geographical terms.
- Targeting derelict land is not useful. Much of it was military and is not relevant to modern needs

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- More provision for community consultation
- Inclusion of policies should prevent PUL being used for waste incinerator plants
- Inclusion of targets for redevelopment of PUL
- Provision to allow for continued review of planning conditions for redevelopment of PUL
- Inclusion of policies to ensure redevelopment of PUL can be for a range of community uses/ policies to outline exactly what re-uses will be acceptable
- Automatically approve any planning application that provides for redevelopment of PUL
- Decide all applications on their own merits i.e. brownfield land is not always suitable compared to other sites
- Re-title section as 'Safeguarding and Enhancing our Environment'
- Inclusion of policies to include recognition of extraordinary site costs and provide assistance to developers as an incentive
- Inclusion of policy to establish a presumption in favour of redeveloping PUL
- Inclusion of policy to seek to identify contaminated land costs in advance of potential re-development
- Inclusion of policy that will ensure preservation of green field sites
- No settling of targets
- Less focus on the redevelopment of PUL
- Policy must ensure re-development of PUL is not at the expense of more suitable opportunities elsewhere
- Policy to ensure countryside remains protected
- Reference to be made to Water for Scotland 2nd Edition (2.2.2 Ground

Assessment) with regard to construction of water mains
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority
<p>Comments regarding the preferred option</p> <p>(i) <i>General</i> - National planning policy advises local authorities that decisions on the location of new development should promote regeneration and re-use of land. The proposed plan will therefore make provision for the development management process to positively view sites that will see previously used land back into suitable use wherever possible.</p> <p>(ii) <i>Ownership of underutilised land</i> – the Council will make use of Compulsory Purchase Orders, where necessary, to assist in land assembly that will see previously used land brought back into use</p> <p>(iii) <i>Acceptable uses</i> – the Proposed Plan will not restrict the re-use of previously developed land to any one particular use, such as housing. There will be opportunities for the redevelopment of previously used land for other uses that will benefit the community and bring about wider environmental improvement, notably in terms of visual impact. In terms of proposals for waste incinerator plants, these will be determined in line with the Council’s waste management policies which direct such facilities to preferred sites or Class 5 & 6 (industrial/ business) sites and should be in line with other criteria based policies</p> <p>(iv) <i>Funding</i> – the Council currently utilises Scottish Government’s Vacant and Derelict Land Fund (VDLF), allocated to local authorities to see such sites brought back into suitable use</p> <p>(v) <i>Contaminated Land Team</i> – the Council operates close working links between the Planning and Development Service and the Contaminated Land team</p> <p>(vi) <i>Previously Used Land target</i> – at the current time it is not felt appropriate to set a Highland-wide target for the development of previously used land. This is felt necessary due to the current economic climate, as well as being potentially difficult to enforce. In comparison with other local authorities, the Highland area does not have a great deal of brownfield land, the setting of a target may therefore lead to the Council missing out on more suitable opportunities elsewhere, such as within the A96 Corridor.</p> <p>(vii) <i>Planning permission</i> - planning applications will be decided based on a variety of criteria, as outlined in the Policy - Sustainable Design, this includes the extent to which they make use of brownfield sites, existing buildings and recycled materials. Proposals which do so will be viewed positively by the Council, however they will also have to demonstrate that they benefit the local community and accord with national planning policy. Where necessary, planning conditions will be imposed to ensure the necessary remediation and de-contamination of brownfield sites with provision for subsequent review to ensure conditions do not become ineffective.</p> <p>(viii) <i>Development of Previously Used Land</i> - The proposed plan will outline that proposals will be assessed on the extent to which they make use of previously used land, <i>existing buildings</i> and recycled materials, amongst other criteria. This will be subject to any necessary site investigations and other risk assessments so that remediation costs can be identified prior to development occurring.</p>
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content
<p>Policy - Previously Used Land Policy - Sustainable Design Policies on Specific Development Areas - e.g. Longman, Nigg, Dounreay etc</p>

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Renewable Energy – 1 - General and Other also Climate Change
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Renewable Energy – Q.23 also Climate Change
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Coriolis Energy (1), Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2), Melness Tongue Community Trust (7), Mrs J MacDonald (11), Lucille Shadforth (15), Duncan MacDonald (17), Irene Brandt (18), Roderick MacLean Ass. (27), HITRANS (33), Juliet Robinson (34), International Power Marine Developments (40), Lawrence Johnson (41), Nigg Awareness Group (43), Martin Sherring (48), Penny Edwards (52), RSPB Scotland (78), Mrs LM Mackintosh (90), Mr David Matthews (91), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Mrs Amy McDonald (102), David and Diana Gilbert (108), Jones Lang LaSalle - Wind Energy Glencalvie Ltd (113), TEC Services (114), Forestry Commission Scotland (116), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Mrs E Holland (153), Julian Walford (155), Roland Mardon (156), Strathnairn Community Council (157), Phillips Aitchison (162), Terence O'Rourke (164), Highlands & Islands Green Party (168), Glenurquhart Community Council (174), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), West Coast Energy Ltd (184), Highlands and Islands Enterprise (West Highlands and Islands) (190), Anne Thomas (197), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Ann Macleod (206), Joyce Wilkinson (216), Kinraig and vicinity Community Council (225), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (229), Ardrross Community Council (236), Highland Council- Lochaber (241), Robertson Homes (246), Patricia Roberts (247), Ian Wilson (255), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Jones Lang LaSalle – Scottish and Southern Energy (268), Scottish Renewables (270), Anonymous (275), Mr J Bingham (283), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Scottish Property Federation (291), JG Walford (300), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), Peter W Christie (323), Scottish Government (324), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (326), Transition Black Isle (330)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies:	Replace Structure Plan Policies E1, E2, E4, E7, E8, U1, G4 Drop E3, U2
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Policy Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to embrace the full range of opportunities. Climate change the biggest threat to our environment therefore need for positive policy for renewables. Argument that although there are impacts these are less than those produced by conventional fossil fuels and power station energy production. • Urge that policies do not place unjustified constraints on renewable energy proposals. • One of the main issues in addressing national targets will be the efficiency of the planning system. • Agree with the preferred option. Developers are eager to focus on the areas identified as suitable by the Council; this would save all parties involved in the approval process much time and energy. Defining which locations are appropriate 	

will increase certainty and reduce risk taken by investors. The Council should identify areas that are suitable, unsuitable and potential. In light of national targets, suitable locations should cover an area at least as large as unsuitable locations.

- Important to note the role of renewable jobs replacing oil and gas production over next twenty years.
- Key investment decisions are often made on development plan policies. Need to follow commitment given in HRES to work in partnership with the private sector when developing further SG. Welcome the review of SPG.
- Need to consider development within local/regionally important designations.
- Wish to have policy written in plain English, non ambiguous and easy to interpret, and must set out the need to support renewable energy. Lead role in educating public about climate change.
- The stated alternative option as expressed in the MIR is not something the public can reasonably respond to (complex, little to do with LAs). Offer a strategy for renewable for the public to comment on including broad statements on the downsides of options. Also the alternatives to renewables should be offered up alongside for public comment.
- Do not agree with the preferred option nor the stated alternative. Why is there no mention of development of conventional and nuclear energy, as we cannot live on renewables alone?
- Power is in the control of Spanish, French and German companies and there should be more public control.
- Agree with both the preferred option and the stated alternative option. These two could and should be combined with advantage.
- We should do more to attract the manufacturers of wind turbines into the area.
- Consider that wild land could present a significant constraint and therefore prefer it not to be identified considering this a conflict with SPP6 planning positively for renewable energy.
- Endorse the policy at a high level but much more detail is required. The Highlands are clearly seen as a natural resource for this type of development and there will be great pressure from developers and the government for a wide range of projects. Features such as wind farms can have a significant impact on how the Highlands will look in 10 years time and therefore we recommend strong well considered policies. There should also be provision made to ensure wind farm companies cannot leave the Highlands with a major liability should the farm come to the end of its useful life and no longer be required. Finally we would guard against comments such as supporting smaller developments for micro-renewables without some sort of caveat about the wider environment.
- Targets underline the urgency and the transition to a low carbon economy should also be viewed as an opportunity. The scope for developments to contribute to national or local economic development priorities should be a material consideration. An updated HRES should be prepared and there is an important role

which pre-application discussions should play. Flexibility for developers to bring forward sites outwith the development plan should be retained. Grid reinforcements are vital. The vast majority of the policy options focus on electricity and not heat or transport. There should be a specific reference to small and community developments and to the associated infrastructure required in rural areas. There may additionally be scope for larger scale geothermal. An equivalent degree of support should be offered in planning for biomass as for wind farms where appropriately located and more detail is required on planning requirements.

- Any approach which aims to identify areas of search and preclude areas for protection should be informed by detailed study and national policy should be taken into account. Development should not be ruled out outwith the areas of search.
- Criteria and guidance for consideration of proposals for renewables developments would be useful from developers' perspective but if too prescriptive and protectionist could result in the region being perceived as a no-go area for commercial scale project developers.
- Agree with preferred option, on assumption that areas to be protected from renewable energy development will include areas that rely heavily on tourism and large areas of carbon trapping peatland. Sustainable crofting should also be considered in line with evidence that high nature value farming produces less emissions than intensive farming.
- Agree with preferred option but with provisos. It is vital that the natural nature of the Highlands is not lost by unsightly structures. Wind turbines as a renewable source of energy have been proven to not give the output that is promised. They have, however, been proven to affect wildlife as well as people living in the closer proximity. It is, therefore, vital that any plan should have protection of open areas as the priority.
- Agree with the preferred option. However, in order to get local support such developments must contribute to the local economy in terms of permanent jobs. Why should Scotland export electricity to London over the grid to support their jobs?
- Agree with the preferred option, and would add encouragement to small scale rural developments using micro-renewables especially if incorporating a good element of social/ affordable housing.
- The Plan should make it clear that smaller renewable energy projects will be supported, as well as micro-renewables.
- Partially agree with the preferred option, as not sure about setting out updated targets, nor about identifying broad areas of search, nor about identifying location of land based supporting development for marine renewables.

Grid and Other Supporting Infrastructure

- Agree with the preferred option. The Council should strongly support the upgrading of the grid, as at the moment work on many renewable energy projects is at a standstill.

- The sector is being constrained by limited grid connections resulting in long lead-in times for developers and this needs to be resolved urgently. Work needs to be done to upgrade mainland power lines to allow these developments to happen as well as a west and east coast subsea inter-connector.
- Priority needs to be given to grid connections in remote and rural areas; connection can give problems to many communities.
- Agree with the preferred option. If you only grant planning permission to meet existing grid capacity, the grid will not need to be upgraded and there will be no incentive for developers to pursue renewables.
- Agree with the preferred option, although electricity production will require increased capacity in the national grid network including consideration of under-sea options.
- Do not agree with the preferred option. What is the point of generating electricity if the take up of the excess by the National Grid is not always available?
- Agree with the preferred option. Transmission and distribution costs are high so therefore localised micro-renewables are best.
- Agree with the preferred option. More local use of energy reduces the need to transport it and provides an alternative to feeding into the National Grid.
- Agree with both the preferred option and the stated alternative. Surely you need both. There is no point in generating electricity if the grid is incapable of taking it away.
- The stated alternative has merit in that it could result in bringing development to fragile communities in the north and west of the Highland Region and reduce the need to install either new or upgraded transmission lines to other areas.
- NGET and SHETL only proceed with grid connection upgrade where an application is submitted by a developer so need to avoid chicken and egg situation.
- Encourage more grid capacity especially in more outlying areas in the West Highlands so that developers can take advantage of mini or micro hydro opportunities, planning should be made so you can submit a block of micro hydro proposals as a single application.
- The UK grid code needs to be considered as they do not consider current capacity but are based on the lowest cost options for rate payers for additional capacity to be made available.
- National Grid - The alternative option seems to be contrary to the existing code legislation and discriminates against renewable energy towards more conventional energy. Also grid code legislation provides for the operators to provide capacity for generators. Without transmission development there is little capacity in the grid for new developments, additional grid capacity is provided on the strength of the commitment from proposed energy generating development.
- The stated alternative does not recognise the way in which the electricity industry is regulated and governed and would significantly frustrate the development process

and restrict the contribution of the Council to achieving national targets. Also, the Plan should recognise that electricity infrastructure requires to be developed now.

- The Council should also consider overhead electricity transmission lines, there may be local issues such as existing overhead lines that could be removed consequent upon any upgrade.
- Support most of the preferred option, but unhappy with the way generation is decoupled from access to the grid, they feel the alternative is too passive and that we need to engage with those responsible for planning the grid.
- Grid constraints should not be used to preclude development where renewable energy potential exists. The grid should not be considered a constraint to development. The regeneration potential that this brings should not be unreasonably held back by restricting development to areas in close proximity to the existing grid network. The grid needs to be enabled to respond to appropriately sited and designed renewable energy projects. Many of these exist or can exist in the remote parts of the Highlands. Highland Council will miss out on these opportunities and fail to make significant contributions to Scottish Government targets for renewables generation and carbon emissions if existing grid constraints remain.
- The stated alternative option is opposed. Available grid capacity is an issue which should only be dealt with by developers and should not impact on the planning merits of a proposal.
- Whilst we broadly support the preferred option, in particular the identification of broad areas for search and areas for protection from renewable energy schemes, we consider that in identifying these areas the capacity in the national grid, and improvements required, should be major considerations. Therefore we consider there is a balance between the alternative and the preferred options in this case.
- The production and transmission of massive renewable energy projects in the Highlands is becoming increasingly unsustainable. The transmission over large distances on overhead lines is very inefficient. The Highland Council need to oppose any increased building of overhead power lines, they should be undergrounded. Whilst the pursuit of so called wet renewables is laudable, careful consideration should be given to how the electricity produced is transmitted the hundreds of miles to its market. The use of overhead power lines is not supported by our community council. It is because of this push for renewables and its associated infrastructure that many people in our community are cynical that the Highland Council want to help preserve the wild lands of the Highlands.
- Communities where renewable energy sources become developed ought not to be blighted with unsightly transmission lines that would benefit only those living in other parts of the nation.
- The MIR fails to identify the National Developments that are located within the Council area. The Council should provide a policy framework to be consistent with the National Developments, particularly the electricity network reinforcements. While the National Planning Framework does in part promote a sub-sea network (as acknowledged in the MIR), it also promotes inland reinforcements and upgrades. This is not explicitly recognised in the MIR which is a shortcoming. We recommend that appropriate policies are put in place to specifically support and

promote the appropriate upgrading of existing and new electricity infrastructure of all types and to make provision for onshore infrastructure required in relation to the offshore network to be sited in appropriate locations. This in turn should be carried through to the Coastal Development Strategy for consistency.

- Where existing infrastructure passes through sites that have been designated for protection since the infrastructure was built, any proposals for upgrades or replacements should be considered in the context of the existing infrastructure and its function.
- Strongly object to the stated alternative. The development of the grid is long-term and the Council will not be in a position to decide where it will or will not be whilst projects are in the early stages of development. To some extent the grid will go where the projects go and the industry must be left with the flexibility to consider grid capacity when considering project proposals and to make its own decisions.
- Oppose the stated alternative. The grid was designed at a time when the value of renewables was not well understood; its location should not determine the potential for renewable energy. The UK and Scotland are working together to increase grid capacity; furthermore, placing such a constraint would eliminate numerous projects which is contrary to Scottish targets.
- HITRANS is undertaking work on the transport requirements for renewable development and wishes to work with the Council in identifying areas of search and support locations for land based support for marine renewables. Need to work to maximise community benefits for renewables.
- In areas suitable for renewable energy schemes there may be the opportunity for a coordinated approach to road improvements funded by developer contributions.

Community Benefit and Community Renewables

- Reference to SPP6 about use of 'sweeteners' and how if the benefit cannot be considered material in planning terms then it shouldn't be taken into account when assessing any proposal.
- Partners in Lochaber agree that they would wish to see a planning policy pursued, similar to that for affordable housing, where there is a direct link between the number of units built and the number allocated as affordable housing and where this is built in at the planning application stage. Similarly where a planning application is submitted for eg five turbines, then the community automatically receives the profit from one of them. Otherwise, the potential for real community benefit will remain unrealised.
- Opportunities for skills training in both construction and maintenance need to be made available if any benefit is to be accrued from renewable technology in the wider Highland area.
- Agree with the preferred option but only provided there were conditions attached. The guidance should include a statement that developers will be encouraged to work in partnership with communities to ensure that the latter benefit from developments and are not just negatively impacted upon. Community benefit ought to be a condition of all planning permissions granted for such developments and

the Highland Council should set the minimum level of contribution that would be required.

- The creation of additional employment opportunities would be more beneficial than a cash hand out in sustaining fragile communities.
- There is significant opportunity for community benefit, particularly where the community wholly owns or has an equity stake in such developments. Limited wind power schemes are also possible.
- Encouraging the local building and manufacture of affordable smaller renewable sources and identifying sites for this. Possible township schemes, offering financial help to use smaller renewable energy sources feeding back into the grid whereby re-payment is partially through the extra power fed back.

Technologies

- With a lot of Highlands being off mains gas the importance of biomass in helping to meet renewable energy targets could be significant.
- Policy framework required for hydro and pumped storage schemes.
- It is important that supporting infrastructure such as high voltage cabling is planned to maximise the potential for renewable energy. It is also important to improve pump storage capacity so that excess renewable energy can be stored without the need for conventional back up generation. Development of tidal energy should also give more predictability of supply.
- Clearer guidance on and support for micro-renewables should be fast-tracked as Supplementary Guidance. Current arrangements are slow and expensive for the householder wishing to engage.
- The Council should support micro-renewables including biomass.
- The MIR refers to biomass but does not detail any particular development issues. Consideration should be given to the potential port infrastructure requirements and to the need to reconcile biomass with the Highland Forestry and Woodland Strategy. It would be appropriate for policy provision to be made to support biomass plants located next to gas transportation infrastructure and significant heat users.
- Lochaber has the landscape to deliver significant renewable energy projects. Concentration on hydro and tidal would be welcomed, although it is recognised that after construction there is little economic benefit in hydro from eg job creation.
- Agree in part with the preferred option, but a clear policy for development should be put in place. As an alternative to large scale windfarms or expensive tidal wave machines the use of micros should be encouraged together with solar panels on suitable south facing roofs of houses to decrease the use of power for water heating. As an alternative the use of more hydro power should be investigated.
- The Proposed Plan should give more detail on how more combined heat and power and district heating schemes will be facilitated.

- Strongly recommend the inclusion of a policy on recovering energy from waste and the thermal treatment of waste and biomass as part of any renewable energy approach. SEPA's Thermal Treatment of Waste Guidelines (2009) should be followed where they apply, and in other cases sustainable development policies should be complied with.
- It would be appropriate for the Council to include in the Plan a supportive policy framework for upgrades to the gas network.

Climate Change, Peak Oil and Sustainable Development

- The Scottish Government welcomes the Council's intention to reduce energy consumption arising from new development. The Council will wish to take account of the requirement, in Section 72 of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, for development plans to include policies requiring all new buildings to avoid a specified and rising proportion of greenhouse gas emissions.
- SEPA's Interim position Statement on Planning, Energy and Climate Change sets out SEPA's commitment to a partnership approach in developing tools to identify the most sustainable locations for renewable energy locations and for the identification of the most sustainable options to support decentralised energy generation and distribution (including the provision of onsite low and zero carbon technologies as required (through development plan policy) under Section 72 of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 and supported by emerging SPP).
- The Council identifies a number of ambitious possibilities for the development of renewable energy which are welcome. Each new renewable energy development will of course be likely to require infrastructure in its own right. Our concern, having considered the changes to national planning guidance following the recent Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, is that policies may be adopted by local authorities relating to the requirement for low and zero carbon technologies that are simply unrealistic and impractical. We believe that in relation to the demands of S.72 of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 the Council must adopt a pragmatic approach to development plans as suggested we believe by the draft consolidated SPP.
- New households should be carbon neutral and best practice in terms of energy efficiency.
- Permission should only be given for housing to builders who will include solar panel heating and also adequate insulation and other environmental aids.
- Permitted development rights for photovoltaic panels should be more widely advertised to make people more aware of them.
- The peak of oil production is likely to arise between 2009 and 2031 i.e. at some time during the period affected by the Plan. If demand continues to increase and production starts to fall, we will have to dramatically restrict our oil usage, and our lifestyles will need to change. The need to take rapid action to mitigate the impact of climate change is more widely recognised, and Scotland has adopted demanding targets. The action required will be far-reaching and expensive. Taking these two phenomena together, the cost of all forms of energy will increase dramatically, and consequently the economy of 2030 will need to change to reflect

this. However, the Vision for the Highlands set out in the MIR assumes that the economic position will be broadly similar to today's. The vision should be based on a much reduced use of energy, and consequently reduced consumption, so that a high quality of life can be sustained with less income. The Plan should take a comprehensive approach to climate change matters and also to issues arising from peak oil.

- Concerned that the MIR fails to take serious account of climate change and peak oil. There is nothing sustainable about the underlying tenets of the Plan, namely economic growth and population expansion. We should be looking for economic transformation that will enable us to constantly reduce our energy requirements and re-localise our economy. We should also be planning a gradual reduction in population to a level that the carbon free economy can sustain.
- RSPB Scotland believes that climate change is the single biggest threat to people, wildlife and the environment and is therefore a key topic that needs to be addressed as part of the Local Development Plan and in the more detailed documents to follow. RSPB Scotland supports the Scottish Government's ambitious target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050 and believes that the LDP should look at how it can contribute to this target. The LDP should look at options that balance the requirements of housing and economic growth with a reduction in carbon emissions through, for example, the promotion of zero-carbon developments.
- The MIR appears to take no account of Scottish Government commitments for reducing carbon emissions and generating energy from renewable sources or show any sense of obligation to participate in them, or other critical issues resulting from the impacts of climate change and increasing pressure on oil reserves. There appears to be no serious innovative thinking about the urgent need to reduce dependence on oil in particular, but also generally regarding low energy alternatives to the current forms of development. The vision for sustainable communities appears in conflict with the stated definition of 'sustainable'. Continuing growth and population expansion has to have a negative impact on the environment and will increase the region's carbon and energy budget. The Plan should reflect the radical holistic commonsense approach of the Transition Movement and actively help spread this thinking, thereby truly establishing Highland as an exemplary region for modern 21st century living.
- Proposed policy changes to SPP requires local authorities to discharge their functions in accordance with the principles of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009; requiring them to take climate change action, and mitigation into account as well as focussing on planning for national outcomes (such as greenhouse gas reduction targets).
- Background text needs to refer to the UK Renewable Energy Strategy (UKRES) (July 2009) and the Low Carbon Transition Plan (LCTP) white paper (July 2009).
- UKRES sets out the means for the UK to meet the legally binding target of 15% of energy consumption from renewable sources by 2020. The lead scenario of 30% of electricity from renewables the majority of which is expected to come from on and offshore wind.
- The vision should pick up on the challenge of responding and adapting to the effects of climate change. This will cover a large number of issues, including the

most appropriate future locations for development taking account of flood and coastal inundation risk and other natural hazards, the move towards a low carbon economy, locating development to reduce the need to travel and enabling wildlife to adapt by macro-scale movements.

- Responding and adapting to climate change should form an overarching framework for much of the Proposed Plan. Using climate change as an overarching key issue for the Plan and the future changes for Highland over the next 20+ years might enable more innovative policy approaches and links to be made, and positive initiatives in a range of land management to be supported. Would welcome the Proposed Plan recognising, supporting and safeguarding from inappropriate development such measures as:
 - Management of land to retain and capture carbon in soils and vegetation
 - Maintaining the resilience of ecosystems
 - Allowing for natural processes in freshwater systems through catchment management
 - Coastal management and the strategic location of future development that allows for rising sea level and increased storm surges
 - Use of greenspace in urban areas for multiple benefits to adapt to climate change
 - Maintaining and enhancing ecological connectivity, especially green networks at both local and regional scales.
- Development along the A96 should include provision of commercial and micro renewable energy development as part of the project.
- There is no undertaking that there will be energy supplied from renewable resources at Tornagrain.
- There is a significant potential to exploit renewable energy at Westercraigs within the context of a sustainable suburb/ eco village. A masterplan is being prepared, setting out aspirations.
- Agrees with preferred option. Must take account of temperature rise or rise in resource prices.
- Agrees with preferred option. Lots of opportunities to minimise loss of energy, building specification/ community energy/ all new builds.
- The Plan should include significantly greater provision for addressing climate change and 'peak oil' than is suggested in the MIR. Note the requirements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 in respect of LDP preparation and the reference in SPP6 with regard to on-site zero and low carbon equipment in development. Recognising the crucial role which the Council has to play in delivering Government policies for sustainability, the development plan's provisions should drawn on clear, prescriptive guidelines for sustainable development (these are set out as suggestion). Development plans should be based on principle of accessibility, not mobility and should require sustainable design statements for all new developments. A number of planning outcomes are exemplified.
- Despite talking about 'sustainable Highland communities', aside from protecting and developing renewable resources and reducing private travel, the vision does not address the important factors which will increase sustainability. If Highland population is to grow, it will have to work towards self-sufficiency in basic food and

necessary resources. Some amendments to the 'vision' are suggested.

- Solar thermal panels for both domestic heating and any commercial building requiring hot water are very efficient and should be a requirement for all new builds and major refurbishments where there is a suitable south facing roof.
- Do not agree with the preferred option as it completely ignores the very challenging and important issue of climate change and sustainable development. An 80% reduction in emissions will not, as the plan suggests, be achieved through encouraging new developments to be built using resources more efficiently. Development itself uses up valuable resources and its occupants use energy and resources, which produce emissions. A much more positive approach and firm policy must be put in place to achieve the reduction in emissions. New development should actively contribute to the reduction in emissions. It is not possible for development to achieve a negative effect, therefore should we allow any more development at all? Should it only be allowed on brownfield sites? SPP refers to new duties regarding climate change. The issue of peak oil is also ignored in the MIR, but is a very real concept.
- No new building development without an acceptable percentage of renewable capability.
- Local sustainability should be investigated with local incentives to encourage existing houses, private offices and public building to use localised (smaller) renewable sources.
- The pylons/ undersea cables must be put in place as soon as possible. Also every new house built must have photo-voltaic cells fitted and wired into the National Grid. It must not be left to the householder to retro-fit these devices.
- It will be crucial for the LDP to take into account the requirements of the new SPP and the Climate Change Act legislation. This in our view means that significant weight should be given to establishing a positive and enabling policy framework to plan for renewable energy development and supporting infrastructure.
- Reference to Scottish Government's interim greenhouse gas emission's reduction target (i.e. 42% by 2020) should also be stated in the Plan.
- Sustainable design should be more firmly written into policy for all new building developments and be set in the context of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009. Both small and large new build need to be climate change proofed. Highland Council will also have to consider and encourage retrofitting energy efficient technology to bring existing buildings up to the new required standards.
- Concerned that the Plan does not address the impact that sea level rise will have on vital infrastructure. It is now recognised that the most recent IPCC report seriously understated the predicted sea level rise. By the very nature of its mountainous terrain a significant part of this Region's infrastructure is at low level around the coast. Consider that any Local Plan must consider the implications of sea level rise and put in place measures that minimise the risk of losing new build to inundation by the sea. There must be a presumption against development in all areas that are at risk from sea level rise.
- Renewables need to be prioritised, on a utility scale, as part of new developments

and where appropriate retro-fitted to existing homes. SPP6 suggests that all developments greater than 500m² should incorporate low or zero-carbon technology to reduce energy requirements by at least 15% compared with building regulations. Given the anticipation of population increase and the additional stresses this will place on resources, the Council should require that all developments, of any size, should either demonstrate clear progress towards a localised, low carbon economy, or should incorporate higher levels of energy savings than 15%. The Council should consider using developer contributions to fund improved insulation and airtightness in existing houses, and ongoing energy costs for schools, refuse collection, street lighting and other Council services arising from the development. Also, as a matter of urgency, constraints on energy-efficiency improvements and micro-generation to listed buildings and in conservation areas need to be relaxed.

Setting of Targets

- Agree with updated targets for energy development and suggest these should be consistent with targets of other agencies eg Crown Estate target for 700MW of tidal energy.
- Concerned about Renewable Energy targets given the variable nature of wind resource.
- If Highland targets are to be set they should be referred to as installed capacity.
- Any targets that are set should be very ambitious, to avoid them being regarded by some people as a ceiling, met. Furthermore it should be understood that including targets within policy is not advocated within national policy.
- The preferred option proposes that targets be established for different technologies; however, market forces (albeit influenced by banded ROCs) should prevail.
- In arriving at any particular targets it should be recognised that the Highland Council has the greatest potential for renewable energy development out of all Scottish Council areas to contribute to national targets and to benefit economically.
- Targets should be minima and should not be capped.
- Concerned about the use of regional targets for renewable energy, and urge caution on developing such policies to avoid unintended consequences which may unfairly jeopardise some projects.
- The Plan should reflect Scottish Government's 25% cap on Energy from Waste.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Positive policy for renewables, given climate change.
- Should provide for conventional and nuclear energy as well as renewables.
- Policy which enables development to be considered within local/regionally important designations.
- Support for micro-renewables, caveated regarding impact on the environment.
- Contribution to economic development priorities included as a material

consideration.

- Policy retaining flexibility for proposals to be brought forward for consideration on their merits even if not identified in the development plan.
- Provision for small scale and community developments.
- Provision for associated infrastructure.
- Supportive policy for all technologies and more detail on planning requirements.
- Policy that does not rule out development outwith the areas of search.
- Policy that protects a wide range of environmental interests.
- Policy that is free of unjustified constraints on renewable energy developments.

Grid and Other Supporting Infrastructure

- Supportive and promotional approach to appropriate provision and upgrading of onshore and offshore electricity infrastructure.
- Approach that is consistent with delivery of the National Developments.
- Policy opposing overhead lines and requiring undergrounding.
- Policy considerations including availability and capacity of the grid.
- Policy whereby grid constraints are not used to preclude development where renewable energy potential exists.
- Promotion of local developments for energy use locally, independent of the grid.
- Areas of search and support locations, informed by existing and on-going work by other agencies on infrastructure requirements.

Community Benefit and Community Renewables

- Planning policy requiring profit from a proportion of each renewable energy scheme to go automatically to the community.
- Community benefit required as a condition of planning permission.
- Community benefit only taken into account when assessing any proposal where the benefit is material in planning terms.
- Provision for community renewables.

Technologies

- Policy framework for each technology and for associated infrastructure provision.
- Policy support for biomass plants located next to gas transportation infrastructure and significant heat users.
- Policy support for micro-renewables.
- Policy for energy from waste as part of a renewable energy approach.
- Supportive policy framework for upgrades to the gas network.

Climate Change, Peak Oil and Sustainable Development

- The Plan should be based on, and contain policies to support, a move to a carbon-free economy.
- The Plan should be based on reducing population to sustainable levels.
- The Plan's policies should have sustainable development as the key underlying principle.
- Policy requiring low and zero carbon technologies in developments.

- Policy requirement for all new developments to avoid a specified and rising proportion of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Policy taking a pragmatic approach to development plans with regard to developments avoiding a specified and rising proportion of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Policy requiring developments to demonstrate progress towards a localised, low carbon economy or to incorporate high levels of energy savings.
- Provision for developer contributions to fund energy efficiency improvements to existing houses and increased energy costs for delivering services.
- Relaxation of listed building and conservation area requirements to enable incorporation of energy efficiency measures and micro-generation.
- Plan to minimise risk of losing new build to inundation from the sea.

Setting of Targets

- Include ambitious, uncapped targets that are consistent with Government and agency targets and Government's energy from waste cap.
- Market forces should prevail rather than having a target-driven approach.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Policy Options

Seeking the further development of renewable energy is an important component of the strategy for renewable energy regionally and nationally, as well as an important component of national strategy for energy production from all sources. It is acknowledged that other technologies continue to have a role feeding the grid at a national level.

It is agreed that the application of particular constraints in the consideration of renewables proposals must be justifiable. Consultation on the Plan and Supplementary Guidance will provide opportunity for the proposed policy framework to be considered further. There will be a weighing up to be undertaken of the consideration and weight given to individual constraints. In terms of developing spatial frameworks e.g. for wind energy, if a particular application of constraints results in broad areas of search that are too tightly defined then it may be necessary to reassess which constraints are included and how. This is particularly the case with local and regionally important constraints.

The Renewable Energy Developments policy, together with a number of other policies in the Plan, identifies a range of considerations. The policy provides for the consideration of any positive or negative effects that proposals are likely to have on the local and national economy and text in the Plan indicates the Council's expectation that developments will benefit local communities and contribute to the wellbeing of the Highlands. It also requires arrangements to be in place for site restoration. The supporting text refers to the increasing interest in small scale developments; the policy applies to these as well.

All types of renewable energy development are covered by the policy; HRES provides non-statutory guidance to assist planning and consideration. Further advice on certain specific technologies is available from other sources, such as SEPA. The policy will be relevant as a basis for considering proposals anywhere in the

Highlands, irrespective of whether or not search areas for particular technologies are identified. The part of HRES dealing with onshore wind energy is being updated via the production of the new Supplementary Guidance, whilst other parts of HRES dealing with other technologies may be updated or replaced in the future.

Inclusion of the “Community” Renewable Energy Developments policy in the Plan together with supporting textual reference to opportunity for such development in Highland help to flag up this type of development and provides a basis for their consideration, which may enable them to be permitted in certain locations where a non-community scheme would not be supported. The SG will be able to provide and signpost further advice on community renewables.

The Electricity Transmission Infrastructure policy is supportive in principle of proposals for the grid and is discussed further below.

Grid and Other Supporting Infrastructure

The Council acknowledges the realities of how grid connection and grid development occurs. There may be potential for off-grid renewable energy developments, as well as major upgrades of the grid to cater for demand. Renewable energy developments can help to create demand and achieve upgrade, for example in more outlying areas. Grid constraints will not be used as a development constraint where renewable energy potential exists, although proximity to the grid and available grid capacity can clearly provide opportunities and advantages. The vision and spatial strategy maps in the Plan will depict the National Developments from NPF2 which are within Highland.

The Electricity Transmission Infrastructure policy to be included in the Plan therefore provides support in principle for infrastructure proposals, subject to environmental considerations. The Council is consulted on proposals for electricity lines under provision of the Electricity Act 1989. Natural heritage will be taken into account during establishment or replacement of electricity lines, just as it would be for any other development proposal. There is though no blanket policy of restriction preventing the location of lines within designated sites, and when assessing the likely impact of a proposal regard can be had, as part of the baseline, to the presence of any existing infrastructure which is to be upgraded or replaced.

The National Renewables Infrastructure Plan work is informing the Plan about other supporting infrastructure needs, such as ports and sites, and will inform other, future plans and potentially planning decisions. Work undertaken by HITRANS into transport needs for renewables is feeding into the ongoing NRIP work. Furthermore, the marine spatial planning work for the Pentland Firth & Orkney Waters is also providing information on potential needs and opportunities for support infrastructure. The Plan needs to take a broadly supportive approach.

The NRIP, HITRANS work and development of spatial planning for renewables (such as the Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance) may help to identify opportunities for coordinated approaches to matters such as road improvements, between multiple renewable energy schemes.

Community Benefit and Community Renewables

As indicated above, text in the Plan makes it clear that the Council expects developments to benefit local communities and contribute to the wellbeing of the

Highlands. The discussion of Community Benefit is correctly kept separate from the consideration of the planning merits of a proposal and in reaching a planning decision. As indicated in the supporting text to the Plan, the planning consideration can though be informed by information about the local economic benefits anticipated.

The scope of developer contributions which may be sought and agreed as part of the planning process are limited and are essentially concerned with offsetting the impact of the development in order that it is acceptable in planning terms. For that reason the Council is not able to require, through planning condition, that a developer provide the community with a proportion of profit from a development in the way suggested. Rather, that is a matter for community benefit discussions. The Council's Chief Executive's office is able to advise on community benefit matters. The Council is currently undertaking a review of community benefit arrangements in the Highlands.

As discussed above, Community Renewables schemes are to be provided for and encouraged through policy and text in the Plan.

Technologies

As explained above, the Renewable Energy Developments policy will cover all technologies and is supplemented by guidance in HRES and elsewhere. Supporting text highlights the opportunity for greater use of micro-generation. The Highland Heat Map will help to identify opportunities for renewable heat to be developed and could provide a basis for seeking this to be included in certain developments, for example through the development of district heating schemes. Energy from Waste is referred to in the supporting text, highlighting waste clearly as a potential resource, although proposals will be assessed primarily under the Waste Management Facilities policy of the Plan. Infrastructure requirements for renewables are also referred to above. A specific policy to support upgrades to the gas network is not necessary; the general policy framework of the Plan will be sufficient to address relevant issues.

Climate Change, Peak Oil and Sustainable Development

The Local Development Plan is prepared in the context of the National Planning Framework. The National Planning Framework is informed by a range of matters such as climate change, energy sourcing and economic forecasts. As is explained elsewhere in response to issues raised on the Population and Housing topic of the MIR the Scottish Government, through the National Planning Framework and Planning Policy has stressed the principle that population growth is essential for economic growth. The Plan therefore needs to help deliver this in a sustainable way for the Highlands.

The Highland Council was one of the first of Scotland's 32 Local Authorities to sign Scotland's Climate Change Declaration in January 2007. The Council then reaffirmed its commitment to delivering greener and more efficient services in the Highlands by re-signing the Declaration in May 2008.

As a signatory, the Council is committed to producing an annual statement on local progress towards mitigating climate change and identifying how the local Authority should adapt to its likely effects.

Highland Council recognise that it has an important role to play as a manager of its

own estate, as an employer, as a service provide, a community leader and a signatory of the declaration. A Member led Climate Change Working Group has been set up to deliver the commitments outlined in the Declaration and oversee the production and implementation of a climate change strategy for Highland. The Working Group will make recommendations to the Council on the following aspects of climate change:

- How the Council can mitigate against climate change through the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from its own estate and practices.
- How the Council can mitigate against climate change through the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the Highlands through the range of services provided by the Council and in partnership with other statutory, voluntary and private sector organisations.
- How the Council will adapt its services to deal with the impact of global warming and extreme weather events (considering both threats and opportunities) and in particular regarding impacts of large-scale flooding and community level.

The Council therefore has a clear commitment to addressing Climate Change, including the requirements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009. Progress on specific actions is tracked against the Work Plan for the Climate Change Working Group. In particular, under Action to Reduce the Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the Highlands, there are actions identified for:

- Promoting renewable energy;
- Promoting sustainable and low carbon design;
- Providing energy advice and reducing fuel poverty;
- Municipal Waste Management; and
- Biodiversity.

Many of the policy provisions to be included in the Plan will contribute directly to achieving sustainable development, to addressing climate change issues and in some cases specifically to new buildings avoiding greenhouse gas emissions. Some examples include:

- Sustainable Design – promotes accessibility by alternatives to the car, maximisation of energy efficiency including utilisation of renewable energy and heat, waste minimisation, low impacts on resources, etc.
- Travel – promotes sustainable modes of travel and modal shift.
- Flood Risk – promotes the avoidance of areas susceptible to flooding by development and promotes sustainable flood management.
- Surface Water Drainage – requires the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).
- Renewable Energy Developments – sets a framework for the consideration of proposals for all types of renewable energy proposal in all parts of Highland.
- Waste Management Facilities – promotes a move away from landfilling and towards more sustainable waste management solutions.
- Green Networks – promoting the protection and enhancement of Green Networks.

The spatial strategy and the framework of plan policies provide for sustainability in terms of location, pattern and amount of development. The Plan and selection of any sites for development to be identified in it are the subject of Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Development proposals must demonstrate compatibility with the Supplementary Guidance on Sustainable Design through submission of a Sustainable Design Statement. The Council is preparing a Heat Map which will bring together information

on demand for heat and potential sources of supply for renewable heat and from there will identify opportunities for the development and use of renewable heat. Heat Mapping Guidelines will be published. The additional cross-references sought in the Plan to other plans, strategies and targets may be better placed where relevant in these guidance documents.

On 1 October 2010 further stretching changes to Building Regulations and Guidance come into force. The intention in respect of the section on Energy is to ensure that effective measures for the conservation of fuel and power are incorporated in domestic and non-domestic buildings. In addition to limiting energy demand, by addressing the performance of the building fabric and fixed building services, a carbon dioxide emissions standard obliges a designer of new domestic and non-domestic buildings to consider building design in a holistic way. Improvements set out within the section on Energy will result in a greater need to consider the benefits which localised or building-integrated low carbon equipment (LCE) (e.g. photovoltaics, solar water heating, combined heat and power and heat pumps) can make towards meeting standards. Although the focus is primarily on lowering carbon dioxide emissions from domestic and non-domestic buildings in use, the measures within the Energy section also reduce energy demand and continue to ensure that, for new domestic and non-domestic buildings and new building work, use of energy and fuel costs arising from this are both minimised. Guidance also recognises issues relevant to requirements within Article 5 of the EU Directive 2002/91/EC on the Energy Performance of Buildings (EPBD) and Article 13 of the EU Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources. The standards and guidance given in the Energy section are intended to achieve an improvement, reducing emissions by approximately 30% compared to the 2007 standards. However nothing in the Building Regulations and Guidance prevents a domestic or non-domestic building from being designed and constructed to be even more energy efficient and make greater use of low carbon equipment (LCE). Developers may consider the economics and practicalities of doing so. Scotland's Housing Expo currently underway in Inverness provides some examples of energy-efficient buildings.

Historic Scotland provides guidance on energy efficiency and the use of low carbon equipment for Listed Buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas.

The Council takes seriously the risk from flooding and the potential impacts arising from sea level rise. This is discussed in the response to issues raised on the topic of Flooding in the MIR. The policy to be included in the Plan on Flood Risk seeks to address these concerns.

As discussed above, the seeking and use of developer contributions must be legitimate, related to the development proposed. For that reason developer contributions can not be used in the way that has been suggested i.e. to fund improvement of other, existing homes or to off-set the costs of service delivery generally in the area. In any case the new build will be to high energy efficiency/ low emission standards and should have sustainability credentials if it has followed Building Regulations and the Plan. Planning for new development cannot resolve all problems with existing building stock, service delivery, etc.

Setting of Targets

Renewable energy targets will be useful. They will provide a basis for monitoring progress, they could inform action planning and national policies and priorities and

flag areas or technologies where potential is or is not being realised, helping to inform further consideration and possibly policy review. The Council's intention therefore is to update the current targets in HRES within a new version of or supplement to HRES, that they will be informed by the targets of other agencies and development programmes and will not be capped (other than reflecting the Scottish Government's cap on energy from waste).

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy – Renewable Energy Developments
Policy – “Community” Renewable Energy Developments
Policy – Electricity Transmission Infrastructure

Also a wide range of other relevant policies in the Plan cover considerations relevant to renewable energy development, development of related infrastructure and planning for climate change.

Text – Reference to: targets, climate change, energy security, contribution to local and regional economies, smaller scale schemes, micro-generation, onshore and offshore infrastructure, HRES, RERA, new Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance, energy and heat production from waste, Highland Heat Map and cross-reference to Sustainable Design policy. Position Statement on Renewable Energy Developments and ‘Community Benefit’.

Links to Supplementary Guidance – HRES, new Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance and (via Sustainable Design policy) to Designing for Sustainability in the Highlands and to the Highland Heat Map.

Vision and Spatial Strategy support in text and highlighting known opportunities and needs in relation to marine renewables and supporting infrastructure on the spatial strategy mapping. Policy on Business and Industrial Land providing support in principle for marine renewables and other emergent industries with at present uncertain locational requirements.

See Committee Draft papers for wording

Issue (heading):	Renewable Energy – 3 - Marine
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Renewable Energy – Q.23
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Coriolis Energy (1), Gills Harbour (30), HITRANS (33), International Power Marine Developments (40), Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (42), The Crown Estate (100), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Westhill Community Council (147), Mrs E Holland (153), Highlands and Islands Enterprise (West Highlands and Islands) (190), Highland Council - Lochaber (241), Roger Piercy (257), Jones Lang LaSalle – Scottish and Southern Energy (268), Scottish Renewables (270), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Ward 12 (332)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies:	Replace Structure Plan Policies E1, E2, E4, E7, E8, U1, G4 Drop E3, U2
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Planning Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keen to understand how the HwLDP is likely to integrate with Marine Plans at a regional level given the National Marine Plan and possibly the Regional Marine Plans will likely be created within the lifetime of HwLDP. • Location of marine renewables should take place as part of the marine planning system to be introduced by the Marine (Scotland) Act in 2010, as these can give full regard to marine constraints and can complement potential development areas with identification of areas for significant protection. • Good tidal potential is only found in certain locations so it is important the development plan accounts for this and once Crown Estate leasing is settled in 2010, developers will not be permitted to develop outwith designated leased areas. • Supplementary guidance should take explicit account of regional Locational Guidelines for marine renewables. • Marine spatial planning activities need to fit with aims of HwLDP and ensure that shore based and littoral zone development is in step with offshore development. • The Council should consult closely with the potential developers for offshore renewables as and when licences are granted, so that a suitable planning policy framework and Coastal Development Strategy can be provided to facilitate the required developments, including any onshore requirements. <p><u>Policy Options and Further Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly agree with preferred option for marine renewables but wonder how the Council would add to the targets in place, would the targets be spatially explicit and how can targets be made where detailed information on resource availability is not known. 	

- Wonder about the need for identifying areas requiring specific protection from marine renewables and how we could consider for all possible technology types at detail required. Instead consider we could rely on specific protection afforded to natural heritage sites.
- Support the proposal for positive policies to support the growth of marine renewables in the Pentland Firth, and ask for this to be extended to encompass all offshore and marine renewables opportunities around the Highland coastline.
- Need to highlight wave resource potential on the north coast.
- With regard to marine energy potential areas should allow for exclusion zone around Cape Wrath SPA (marine extension likely to be required), Rum SPA, Canna and Sanday SPA, and Moray Firth SAC, and nearby SPA/Ramsars. In current format this section will require inclusion within Habitats Regulations Appraisal.
- Marine Renewables – concerned that the Council is spatially indicating areas when sites were removed from WHILP due to lack of evidence base.
- With regard to tidal power, it is disappointing to note that potential schemes at Corran Narrows, Annat and Ballachulish have been omitted, (as have several other west coast schemes), despite being identified in HRES and these should be included in HwLDP.
- There is a need to consult on the identification of wild land and the policy.
- Marine renewables - sensitivity required over impact to sea life.
- The impression in the MIR is very much one of protection rather than development. This includes an area in the Inner Moray Firth which may breach those being considered under STW or Round 3.
- Whilst supporting action to mitigate climate change through marine renewable development, support for marine renewables must not be allowed to compromise the health of the coastal and marine environment and the other important services they provide.
- Key principles set out for a sustainable Scottish marine renewables industry are:
 - Marine renewable energy production should not reduce current or future natural capacity for carbon storage and sequestration nor should it result in a net increase in carbon emissions;
 - Best use should be made of marine renewables technology to minimise ecological footprint;
 - Marine renewable energy developments should, both at individual development scale and in combination with other prevailing factors, maintain ecosystem integrity and allow ecological processes to operate on a landscape-scale;
 - Marine renewable energy developments should comply fully with the EU Habitats Directive and should not, either at individual development scale or in combination with other prevailing factors, damage or destroy existing wildlife sites of local, national or international importance;
 - Marine renewable energy developments should, where possible, enhance existing natural habitats and improve ecosystem connectivity.
- Off shore wind energy still not proven off the HC coast line.

- Research into tidal energy should be brought forward as soon as possible, not only in the Pentland Firth but along the West Coast. There could be linkage with planned grid interconnectors. These would only give large-scale employment in the short term, but they could provide quality long-term jobs.
- All effort must be put into offshore methods of generating electricity.
- Tidal and wave technology should be pushed.
- Disappointed by the visual representation of tide-stream devices in the MIR, because the devices illustrated are depicted in a location with the cliffs of Hoy in the background which would be inappropriate given the clearance depth for super tankers. This development would be much more possible for the Inner Sound between Gills Harbour and Stroma which is classified as a secondary through channel.

Support Bases and Infrastructure

- Gills Harbour is the closest little port to the area in the narrowest Eastern end of the Pentland Firth, it lies well inside the Firths Inner Sound tide-streams and clear of swells originating in the North Sea, while the breakwater/berth provides protection from the prevailing Atlantic origin westerly swells. The harbour provides clear advantages over all other Scottish mainland ports and further works being undertaken will improve its offer. A main potential rival is Lyness in Hoy, owned and operated by Orkney Council who committed a £3 million upgrade. The Plan should designate and recognise the potential role of Gills Harbour to service marine renewables in the Pentland Firth and appropriately zone land for marine related activities.
- Concern about the SPA on Stroma impeding development prospects.
- There is an opportunity to be more specific regarding development opportunities in response to renewable energy, such as the facilities at Scrabster and Kishorn.
- Agree with MIR but emphasise the urgency in identifying onshore locations for marine energy facilities (cross-referencing with the Coastal Development Strategy) so that proximity of smaller ports and harbours to the Pentland Firth is recognised.
- Road and transport links to ferry routes at Scrabster and Gills Bay should be identified as main issues.
- HITRANS is undertaking work on the transport requirements for renewable development and wishes to work with the Council in identifying areas of search and support locations for land based support for marine renewables. Need to work to maximise community benefits for renewables.
- Ask for more meaningful recognition of the massive economic potential afforded not just by the Pentland Firth project but also the West of Shetland oil and gas exploration. The importance of the Far North rail link in this context cannot be overstated and is increasingly seen as too slow and inadequate to meet the needs. Proposed text to be added, "to make sure that transport links, particularly the Inverness to Wick rail line, are substantially improved by means of the Dornoch rail

link and other upgrades, commensurate with the nationally strategically significant priorities identified above”.

- Caithness and North Sutherland - Preferred option should include supporting onshore grid connections required to support offshore renewables, and to working in partnership with Orkney Islands Council, and the CDS being consulted alongside the HwLDP. Also the Council should identify opportunities and potential locations for any operational need (likely to include grid connection options and port facilities).
- There is support in the Plan for a sub-sea electricity network (as per NPF2) but no mention of onshore upgrades which are essential and a precursor. Equally there will need to be account taken of onshore landing points for grid connections related to the developments in the Pentland Firth.
- It should be noted that offshore development, particularly wind, may have more than one developer and could develop incrementally. This could result in different timescales for components, as well as multiple onshore connections. Furthermore, it will be particularly important to include an appropriate supportive policy framework for the likely port developments that may be required to support the transportation and fabrication of components. This would require the LDP to be reconciled with an appropriate port growth strategy and the National Renewables Infrastructure Plan.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Policy directly informed by the marine planning system.
- Policy directly informed by and development set by the Crown Estate leasing.
- Rely on existing protection to natural heritage sites rather than developing spatial strategy.
- Extend positive support in policy, beyond the Pentland Firth to the rest of the Highland coastline.
- Apply exclusion zones around SPA/SAC/Ramsar sites if identifying marine energy potential areas.
- Site identification to reflect HRES.
- Supportive policy which ensures that the health of the coastal and marine environment and other important services they provide are not compromised.
- Identify onshore locations for marine energy related infrastructure and facilities and have supportive policy framework for port developments – including Gills Harbour.
- Commit to transport link improvements - including Dornoch Rail Link.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

On Marine Renewables the vision, spatial strategy and policies of the Plan have been informed by NPF2, by the emerging Pentland Firth & Orkney Waters Marine Spatial Plan Framework & Regional Locational Guidance for Marine Energy, by the Crown Estates seabed leasing announcements for commercial developments, by the ongoing National Renewables Infrastructure Plan, by HRES and by other work. As some of this work remains on-going, and as only limited information is known at this stage about the support requirements for marine renewables, the Council is not in a position to identify all the requirements specifically. Furthermore, as the marine spatial planning system is only emerging, it is necessary to provide some framework now to enable the emergent marine renewables industry to be accommodated. The policy framework therefore requires some flexibility.

The Council is engaging in these other planning processes with agencies and with potential developers as they come forward. Some known locations of activity or other particular opportunity for marine renewables or supporting infrastructure are indicated on the vision and spatial strategy mapping of the Plan, the latter as either offshore renewable/natural resource bases or employment bases. This identification of certain sites for marine renewables or supporting development in the Plan acknowledges likely areas of change through development and helps to highlight the advantageous locations of these support opportunities. It is not intended to preclude such developments from being brought forward elsewhere. The Plan's approach is generally supportive, subject to the consideration of any planning constraints such as those indicated in the Renewable Energy Developments policy and other relevant policies of the Plan. The Business and Industrial Land policy provides support in principle for proposals for emerging industries such as marine renewables for which the locational requirements are at present uncertain. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to include in the Plan any limitation of marine renewables development to that subject of Crown Estate leasing.

As more becomes known about locations and support needs there may be potential for sites to be identified in more detail within the Area Local Development Plans with specific sites and developer requirements set out. The Council will also consider supplementing the Plan with Masterplans for those sites where there is a clear need, though in some cases the preparation of these may be developer-led.

Highland Council's preparation of a Coastal Development Strategy helps to lay the ground for the future plans for marine regions and clarify some of the main issues before the process of marine region planning starts in earnest. It can also act as a buffer or interface between the terrestrial and marine planning systems. The Coastal Development Strategy has been adopted as non-statutory Supplementary Guidance in the interim, pending consultation on and progression of the Proposed Plan.

The Council acknowledges the economic benefit potential of marine renewables development, and is actively engaged with partners to seek retention of economic benefit locally. There is a growing industry around marine renewables and opportunity for research, education and support.

The Areas for Significant Protection shown in the MIR related to onshore windfarm development. They are not therefore directly relevant to offshore wind. Nevertheless, the map in question was showing existing sites designated for their international or national landscape or natural heritage value. Proposals for offshore wind or other marine renewables will need to have regard to such constraints.

The Plan will not attempt to pre-empt marine spatial planning which will be better placed to prepare any detailed spatial framework for marine renewable and other activities in marine areas. Therefore it is not necessary at this time to consider applying exclusion zones around designated sites. In any case it may not be necessary or appropriate to apply buffers to such sites; to afford the sites significant protection may suffice.

The Renewable Energy Developments policy provides for consideration of potential impact on a number of environmental and other planning constraints and, in combination with other policies of the Plan, provides appropriate safeguarding. A number of specific constraints form individual topics for the Plan and the consideration of policy options is discussed under the relevant issues in this response document.

The Electricity Transmission Infrastructure policy provides general support in principle for grid enhancement (be it on or off shore) and identifies key considerations. The Council recognises that there will be need for connections between offshore and onshore and hence landing points for connectors and sites for associated infrastructure.

The transport requirements to support renewables development in the Highlands and Islands has been subject of study by HITRANS and is informing the National Renewables Infrastructure Plan work. No requirement has been identified or priority or commitment given to a Dornoch rail link, therefore it is not referred to in the Plan.

The setting of targets for marine renewables will be informed by a consideration of existing targets in HRES, the targets of others such as the Crown Estate and development programmes. It is acknowledged that base information limits and uncertainties will caveat such targets.

The comments about the tidal device illustration in the MIR are noted; the picture was intended for general effect rather than as an accurate and detailed representation of what device type may be likely in a given location.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy – Renewable Energy Developments
 Policy – “Community” Renewable Energy Developments
 Policy – Electricity Transmission Infrastructure

Also a wide range of other relevant policies in the Plan cover considerations relevant to renewable energy development, development of related infrastructure and planning for climate change.

Text – Reference to: targets, climate change, energy security, contribution to local and regional economies, smaller scale schemes, micro-generation, onshore and offshore infrastructure, HRES, RERA, new Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance, energy and heat production from waste, Highland Heat Map and cross-reference to Sustainable Design policy. Position Statement on Renewable Energy Developments and ‘Community Benefit’.

Links to Supplementary Guidance – HRES, new Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance and (via Sustainable Design policy) to Designing for Sustainability in the Highlands and to the Highland Heat Map.

Vision and Spatial Strategy support in text and highlighting known opportunities and needs in relation to marine renewables and supporting infrastructure on the spatial strategy mapping. Policy on Business and Industrial Land providing support in principle for marine renewables and other emergent industries with at present uncertain locational requirements.

See Committee Draft papers for wording

Issue (heading):	Retail
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Sustainable Highland Communities
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Duncan MacDonald (17), Gordon Mooney (71), Mary Harrison (73), Jane Arnold (77), John Mackie (86), L Mackintosh (90), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), James Barr Ltd. (98), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), N Wilkinson (104), Nairn River Community Council (109), The Highland Council (TECS) (114), Julian Walford (155), GVA Grimley Ltd.-ASDA Stores (165), Highlands and Islands Green Party (168), CB Richard Ellis Limited-Grosvenor (Eastgate Centre) (193), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), CB Richard Ellis Limited (228). Drivers Jonas LLP-ASDA Store Limited (242), Muir Smith Evans-Inverness Estates Ltd (249), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Colliers CRE-Whiteness Property Company (260), GVA Grimley Ltd._Wm Morrison Supermarkets (263), J. Bingham (283), Jeff Baker (284), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Scottish Property Federation (291), Brenda Steele (319)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	<p>Replace Structure Plan R1, R2, R4, R5, R6, R7</p> <p>Drop Structure Plan R3</p>
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail sites must have good and sufficient and easy parking • Need to reduce reliance on car borne out of town supermarkets. Branding seems to be ruling the planning process. • Proposals should be directed to the town and city centres. • Multi-national shops produce a sameness to all cities. • Town centres need not remain in the same place as new ones could be developed. • Town centres become old and weary. Area retail centres could help build communities. • Retail approach needs to be more flexible. • Retail development should not be exclusively linked to masterplans, other sites may serve settlements better in terms of SPP8. • Each development should be assessed on its merits. • Sustainability of new proposals should be assessed – do they encourage people to drive long distances. • Retail development should be in the context of mixed developments to give integration between larger and smaller retail stores and other community facilities to enable a reduction in car journeys. • Provision of free parking is key to support retail centres. • Policy should continue to support the role of Class 1 retail together with a wider mix of uses. Should include approved retail floorspace to be used as a baseline to determine future retail requirements. • Combine the alternatives to support retail facilities and town centres. • Inverness city centre should remain focus for retail and business. • Proposals in East Inverness should not be to detriment of city centre. • Retail development in Nairn should be for convenience only. Inverness should 	

- remain top of the Hierarchy of settlements in terms of retail provision.
- Retail developments should be assessed in line with government guidance.
- Retail impact assessments should be heavily scrutinised to ensure no detriment on city centre.
- Strict controls need to be enforced to protect the vitality and viability of the city centre.
- Should support existing town centre not just town centres, point 1 may be contradicted by point 2 if not carefully monitored.
- Should identify need for very localised needs in residential areas.
- Potential for masterplanning and creation of urban realm at Longman Road, Inverness through comprehensive masterplanning.
- Retail development at East Inverness should not be to the detriment of City Centre.
- Agree with preferred option as it is in line with national policy.
- A flexible approach is needed in areas which are in need of regeneration.
- Identification of retail facilities to support expansion areas and recognition of retail capacity in the area is needed to ensure modern retailing needs are catered for.
- Needs to be protection of local facilities
- Development of retail at East Inverness will compliment Inverness City Centre rather than compete with it.
- The approach would indicate that certain sites are inappropriate on grounds of accessibility. (Respondent refers to site in Tain.)
- Level of retailing at Whiteness could expand in time to serve the expanding location reducing the development pressure elsewhere.
- Application of the sequential approach should be realistic.
- Town centres not always most appropriate site for retail uses and where they are identified the type and scale appropriate at that location needs to be considered.
- Should recognise the need for both larger and smaller scale retail developments to satisfy needs.
- Should acknowledge retail requirements and accord with national planning policy.
- Policy should be based on up to date information and to have an assessment of all extant and approved retail consents.
- Approach sounds commendable.
- Large retailers are entirely driven by profit.
- Prefer a strategic approach to retailing rather than developer led competition.
- SPP strikes the right balance for retail policy.
- Enhancing town centres is a priority but also need to have a flexible attitude to consider needs, requirements and proposals on their own merits.
- New development can mean edge of centre development retail is more suitable.
- The LDP should be able to facilitate retail development to plan for future settlements.
- Consider tax on turnover rather than property to aid town centres.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Policy which protects the town centres.
- A policy supporting the provisions of the SPP
- A flexible policy approach to retailing.
- Combination of approaches.
- Policy should promote a wider mix of retail uses
- Identify the very local retail needs i.e. corner shops

- Include current retail floor space in the proposed plan which can be used as a baseline for assessing planning applications.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Policy which protects the town centres

In accordance with national planning policy any retailing policies in the HwLDP will direct retail growth toward the town and city centres. Any application for development outwith a designated district, town or city centre will need to be accompanied by a suitable retail impact assessment. If through the retail impact assessment the development is likely to have significant impact on the settlement's centre then there is likelihood the application will be refused.

A policy supporting the provisions of the SPP

The Council will be carrying forward an approach which is inline with SPP and will support the provisions of the SPP.

A flexible policy approach to retailing.

The approach of The Highland Council will be to encourage development within the centres and any development outwith existing centres will need to be accompanied by a retail impact assessment. While this is the case the Council recognise the differing needs of retailers and therefore each case will be assessed on its merits.

Policy should promote a wider mix of retail uses

The HwLDP will promote the existing retail centres and area Local Development Plans may identify where there is a deficiency in a particular type of retail however, it is for the market to dictate the mix of retail uses on sites which are allocated for retail use.

Identify the very local retail needs i.e. corner shops

The HwLDP will not identify the local retail needs this will be part of the role of the area Local development plan. In the HwLDP the Council will support the development of smaller scale retailing outwith the main centres. Within settlements identified in the hierarchy shopping facilities to serve a local scale should be located within district centres where applicable. There will be a presumption against redevelopment of existing retail facilities such as local shops in fragile areas unless it can be adequately demonstrated that it is no longer viable.

Include current retail floor space in the proposed plan which can be used as a baseline for assessing planning applications.

While desirable to have this type of information included in the Plan, this type of information is constantly changing and therefore it is not best suited to be contained within a Local Development Plan. At present the Council publish data on Retail within Inverness City Centre in the form of a Briefing note. Information on retail development throughout the rest of the Highlands can be sought through contact with other organisations.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Retail Development

Reference to retail uses within larger Inverness City and A96 Corridor development areas

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Smaller Settlements in the A96
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
J. Dolan (173), V. Springett (179), M. Hutcheson & A. Lowe (226), D. Mitchell (287), Scotia Homes (314), Scottish Government (324), SEPA (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Policies which we intend to replace / amend Elements of the Spatial strategy of Inverness and Nairnshire Local Plans
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should not be rapid expansion of smaller settlements in A96 if Tornagrain does not get go ahead. • Infrastructure should come before development. • Organic growth is a sustainable option • Expansion of villages in A96 corridor would need infrastructure provision adequate to sustain village life. • Support for the growth of smaller settlements in A96 Corridor (seeking land allocation in Croy) • The Council should satisfy itself that the community have had early and effective chance to engage on issues in smaller settlements which may have significant planning or environmental issues. • the finalised HwLDP incorporates a clear policy statement that requires that all new development which is part of the expansion of existing settlements should be connected to a public sewer and Waste Water Treatment Plant from the outset. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited expansion of smaller settlements • Improved infrastructure provision prior to development • Land allocation in Croy. • HwLDP to include a policy on connection to public sewer from the outset. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>1. There should not be rapid expansion of smaller settlements in A96 if Tornagrain does not get go ahead. Tornagrain is a longer term development part of the overall spatial strategy for the Highlands as a whole. The expansion of smaller settlements is planned to ensure that these smaller settlements can be strengthened providing more residents to support services within the settlement.</p> <p>2. Infrastructure should come before development. In these smaller settlements there is capacity in the majority of the infrastructure which is needed for a new development however it may be necessary for new infrastructure to be provided. There will be a requirement of all infrastructure to be improved where necessary through developer requirements which will be set out where appropriate. Detailed developer requirements will be set out for development in Cawdor as it is a new allocation. Expansion sites in Croy, Culloden Moor and Ardersier will need to follow the requirements set out in the Inverness Local Plan.</p> <p>3. Organic growth is a sustainable option Organic growth is an option and where there are opportunities for this proposals must</p>	

meet the criteria set out in the general policies of the Highland wide Local Development Plan. We have identified a number of sites which are already allocated in the adopted Local Plan to ensure that this organic growth can be accompanied by planned growth in order to achieve stronger communities and where necessary improved infrastructure.

4. Expansion of villages in A96 corridor would need infrastructure provision adequate to sustain village life.

See comment 2.

5. Support for the growth of smaller settlements in A96 Corridor (seeking land allocation in Croy)

This representation seeks an allocation on land which is already allocated for the long term expansion of the village and it is the intention to re-affirm this, and other expansion areas of smaller settlements, identified in the existing local plans.

The Council should satisfy itself that the community have had early and effective chance to engage on issues in smaller settlements which may have significant planning or environmental issues.

The Council are satisfied that there has been sufficient opportunity both through the previous Local Plans for the area and through the Highland wide Local Development Plan that the community have had early chance to engage on this issue. Members of the public will have further opportunities to engage on these proposals through the Statutory Pre-Application Consultation when a development on these sites are brought forward.

The finalised HwLDP incorporates a clear policy statement that requires that all new development which is part of the expansion of existing settlements should be connected to a public sewer and Waste Water Treatment Plant from the outset.

This shall be included in the Highland wide Local Development Plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy
 Policy - Smaller Settlements in the A96 Corridor
 Policy - Croy Expansion
 Policy - Culloden Moor Expansion
 Policy - Ardersier Expansion
 Policy - Cawdor Expansion
 Policy - Waste Water Treatment

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Sustainable Development and Climate Change
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Sustainable Design
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Bob Bull (12), Lucille Shadforth (15), John Wood (16), Irene Brandt (18), Auchengill & Nybster Grazings Committee (21), Juliet Robinson (34), J Mayhew (50), I Wade (85), Paul Maden (88), L Mackintosh (90), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), Nairn River Community Council (109), The Highland Council [TECS] (114), Forestry Commission Scotland (116), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), A Manson (143), Westhill Community Council (147), Elizabeth Budge (148), Julian Walford (155), Strathnairn Community Council (157), Philips Aitchison Limited (162), David Fraser, Glenurquhart Community Council (174), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Ian Cowan (185), Maria de la Torre (196), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Bryden Associates - Strathdearn Community Council (205), Kincaig & Vicinity Community Council (225), Strutt & Parker LLP-Balnagowan Estate (229), Ardross Community Council (236), Patricia Roberts (247), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Dorothy Clark (279), Scottish Water (281), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Architecture & Design Scotland (286), Homes For Scotland (293), Thomas Munro & Co - Chartered Architects (296), Reynolds Architecture Ltd - Miss Joyce Hendry (302), Dennis Watt, Scotia Homes Limited (314), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), Scottish Government (324), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (326), EMAC Planning – Barratt Homes and Robertson Homes (333).</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace SP (G2, G3 & G8)
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new builds should be sustainable and have low carbon footprint • Need for supplementary guidance requiring sustainable design provision • Inclusion of renewable technologies should be mainstream and not an add-on • More emphasis to be given to energy conservation – efficiency, transport etc • Sullivan report concluded that building standards offer a more effective regulatory route to achieve energy efficiency and carbon reduction than planning - needs appropriate balance in planning advice • Improvements to listed buildings and in conservation areas need relaxed to increase energy saving and use of micro-renewables • More efforts to improve sustainability in existing properties • Sustainability must be balanced with acceptable layout and design • Should make reference to construction materials • Develop an assessment framework to help consider how settlements can grow in a sustainable manner utilising existing and expandable infrastructure and inform the phasing and location of development 	

- Grant support for sustainably developing previously used land and properties
- Should cover landscape and ecology
- Scottish Water can influence sustainable development; applied to “grey water” harvesting in HC school proposal is welcomed
- Should be reference to Scottish Government’s Greenhouse gas reduction targets (i.e. 42% by 2020)
- The Council should take account of Section 72 of Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009
- Need to adopt a pragmatic approach to adopting policies relating to climate change bill encouraging innovation
- The Council should demonstrate progress to a low carbon economy or use developer contributions to fund improvements to insulation and energy use

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Policy approach should be strengthened to incentivise the development of sustainable buildings and bring practises into the mainstream.
- Emphasis of policy should be on the reduction of resource usage, particularly energy.
- Promote low carbon developments and take better account of climate change

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

The Highland Council will require all development to be designed in the context of sustainable development in line with Scottish Planning Policy, including the extent to which they account for the impacts of Climate Change [also see Renewable Energy policies] and contribute to carbon reduction. The Council will assess developments in terms of their compatibility with key services, accessibility [particularly in relation to public transport] and energy efficiency, as well as the development’s potential impact on the environmental, social and economic resources of an area.

In addition to the above, the Council will expect developers to demonstrate compatibility with the Council’s Supplementary Guidance on Sustainable Design. This document provides comprehensive guidance on what designing for sustainability means in the Highland context, and deals extensively with sustainability in relation to: siting, design, materials, energy, water, sewage, waste and transport issues.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Sustainable Design
Other part relevant Policies - for example - Flooding, Travel, Peat and Soils, Surface Water Drainage etc

[Link to Council’s Supplementary Guidance on Sustainable Design](#)

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Tornagrain
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy: Tornagrain
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
M. Cruickshank (14), D. MacDonald (17), I. Brandt (18), A. Moore (23), J. Mayhew (50), Nairn River Community Council (51), B. Stewart (55), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), A. Stewart (58), J. Warwick (60), G. Mooney (71), Rose-Miller Farms (80), A. Owens (84), I. Wade (85), J. Mackie (86), I. Mackintosh (90), D. Matthews (91), H. Rask (92), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), N. Wilkinson (104), Inverness South Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), SNH (118), Crown Community Council (122), GH Johnson (134-137), GH Johnson (139-140), D. Rose Miller (141), B. Macgregor (145), Westhill Community Council (147), E. Holland (153), J. Walford (155), M. Meehan (158), Turnberry Consulting (171), A. Stewart (172), J. Dolan (173), SCDI (180), M. De La Torre (196), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Bryden Associates (Strathdearn Community Council) (205) D. & J. Piggot (208), Croy & Culloden Community Council (218), Railfuture Scotland (227), Ardrross Community Council (236), W. Main (238), J. Waring (250), E. Waring (253), I. Wilson (255), R. Piercy (257), Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council (258), Colliers CRE (260), D. Buchanan (265), Mr & Mrs C Stafford (272), D. Scholes (273), J. Baker (284), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Scottish Property Federation (291), JG Walford (300), S. Melville (313), Inverlochry & Torlundy Community Council (318), SEPA (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	N/A
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support especially for early phases (2011-2016) • Support specifically for the location • Support for option of beginning early phases of development before the completion of major infrastructure. • The notion of phasing agreements with the development industry is welcome. May also be helpful to examine with the industry how this could work in practice, particularly from the perspective of potential lenders and investors of the project. • Agree reluctantly – it will be important to ensure firm dates are in place for when commitments in principle become commitments in fact and legally binding. • Development of existing brownfield sites and consolidation of existing settlements should be a priority however accept that the preferred option may be the only feasible strategy that can be pursued. • Agree with preferred option but this must consider the wider impact of Tornagrain on surrounding communities e.g. Strathdearn <p>Relationship with Nairn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will swallow up Nairn • Concern the A96/Inverness will become one large conurbation • Too much emphasis on Inverness to Nairn • Over development could lead to a negative impact on the tourism industry in Nairn by damaging its ‘quaint-ness’ 	

Lack of jobs

- May become a dormitory town

Proximity to airport

- Health and safety issues will occur given the proximity with Dalcross Airport
- Noise pollution (will increase with airport expansion) and light pollution will also be problematic

Unsustainable

- The proposals make no provision for a local low carbon economy
- The proposals make no provision for low energy or use of renewables
- The Tornagrain site is inaccessible by rail
- The proposals are lacking in services

Prime agricultural land

- The proposals are situated on prime agricultural land – this must not be built on and should be safeguarded

Too much emphasis on A96 Corridor

- This is at the expense of more fragile communities which will suffer
- Town centres in particular will be left to decline/decay
- This cannot be called balanced growth
- Priority should be given to brownfield development first and consolidation of existing settlements

Outstanding issues

- A number of issues remain including access to the A96 and the potential impact on its performance
- The proposed plan must incorporate a clear policy statement that requires all new phases of development at Tornagrain to be connected to a public sewer and waste water treatment plant from the outset.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Dispersed growth option should be brought forward instead
- More emphasis on developing brownfield land (including policies to refuse planning permission for certain Greenfield developments)
- Expansion regarding commitments in principle- dates must be firmed up
- Scaling back of proposals or complete omission of proposal
- Policies to specify jobs location etc
- Clear policy statement to be included that requires all new phases of development at Tornagrain to be connected to a public sewer and waste water treatment plant from the outset.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**Need/Overall**

The proposed Tornagrain development is part of a wider strategy for the A96 Corridor which will provide a range of growth options across four key development areas – East Inverness, Dalcross (incl. Tornagrain), Whiteness and Nairn all set within the context of a green infrastructure strategy.

The Housing Need and Demand Analysis undertaken by the Council shows a strong requirement for the first phases of development at Tornagrain and East Inverness to meet demand for housing within the A96 Corridor and clear the affordable housing backlog. In terms of affordable housing, the Council will secure a quarter of all

housing as affordable, this means over 1,000 houses.

The sustainability principles that underpin the masterplanning process for the Tornagrain proposals mean that the development must be viewed in its entirety, and so the level of housing proposed will be required to sustain the level of commercial and retail facilities proposed.

Agricultural Land Loss:

In terms of the loss of agricultural land, the approach taken by the Council in preparing the HwLDP will mirror that outlined in the consolidated Scottish Planning Policy document – this states that development on prime agricultural land will be acceptable where it is an essential component of the settlement strategy. As noted above Tornagrain is an essential component of the A96 Corridor Growth Strategy and required to meet the housing demand within the Inner Moray Firth area. By developing Tornagrain, a greater choice location and type of housing will be provided and development pressures on other areas such as Nairn will be significantly reduced.

Relationship with Nairn

The inclusion of Tornagrain (and other allocations in East Inverness) in the HwLDP will work towards meeting housing need and demand within the A96 Corridor. As a result, this has allowed for land allocations in Nairn to be scaled back to a more appropriate level. The development of Tornagrain will also provide greater rationale to dual the A96 which will provide a benefit to Nairn in the longer term.

Proximity to Airport

The flight path of air traffic to and from Dalcross Airport runs from east to west. Noise pollution is therefore limited to areas located to the east and west of the Airport and therefore will be minimal in Tornagrain. This was investigated in some detail as part of the A96 Corridor Growth Framework document.

Employment

A proportion of the proposed development at Tornagrain is commercial and retail facilities, allowing residents to live and work within close proximity. The masterplanning process has also ensured that any proposed development will be closely integrated with Dalcross Airport and forthcoming development at the Airport Business Park which is anticipated to create 5,000 jobs. In the HwLDP the Council will ensure that each phase of development delivers adequate employment opportunities.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Vision and Spatial Strategy

Policy - Tornagrain including phasing and developer requirements for the first phase

Policy - New Settlements

Policy - Agricultural Land

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Tourism
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Not directly covered by the Main Issues Report
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Marie Cruickshank (14), Visit Nairn Tourism Association (79), Portee Community Council (110), Staffin Community Council (111), Raasay Community Council (115), Kyleakin & Kylerhea Community Council (119), Elizabeth Budge (148), Broadford & Strath Community Council (159), Philips Aitchison Limited (162), Halcrow Group Limited-Loch Ness Centre (169), Bernard Goodwin (195), Lyn Forbes (211), Sleat Community Council (304)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace Structure Plan T2, T3, T4 Drop Structure Plan T1, T5, T6
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should make better places to visit while making more efficient places to live • Greater consideration of tourism is needed. Impact of development on tourism should be assessed. • Tourism facilities should be enhanced to provide a year round tourism destination. Better connections to other areas may facilitate this. • Need to plan for more visitor facilities in local centres. • Need to work closely with tourist groups to promote outdoor access. • Seeking land allocation for tourism development in Inverness-shire. • Need to promote tourism better in the Easter Ross area. • Tourism should have a greater emphasis in the plan. • Need to improve visitor experiences. • Should match the aspirations of visitors with people living/working in Highland and those aspirations of the Council. • HwLDP essential document to take lead on tourism issues. 	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Approach on Tourism be included in the proposed plan. • Co-ordinated approach to tourism with highland wide Local Development Plan taking the lead. • Connections into the area need to be improved to facilitate growth in Tourism. 	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
Policy Approach for Tourism needed in Highland wide Local Development Plan We agree that there should be a policy approach to tourism given its importance to the Highland Economy. We will include this in the Proposed Highland wide Local Development Plan. The supporting text of the policy will have a clear link to the Highland Area Tourism Partnership Plan and any policy will support the aims of this. The policy will support the development of high quality tourist developments which support and enhance the Highlands tourism industry. It may be appropriate to also safeguard some of the most important tourism assets such as view points, long distance footpaths, others including the National Scenic Areas and elements of the Historic Environment are protected through national and international legislation and through the policy approach to the natural, built and cultural heritage.	

Co-ordinated approach to tourism with Highland wide Local Development Plan taking the lead.

We agree that there needs to be a co-ordinated approach to tourism in Highland and that is why through the Highland wide Local Development Plan we will be supporting the Highland Area Tourism Partnership Plan. This plan sets out a vision, aims and priorities for tourism in the area. We believe that the Highland Area Tourism Partnership is the most appropriate way in which to continue to take forward a co-ordinated approach to tourism. Through this partnership there is potential for Tourism facilities to be enhanced to provide a year round tourism destination and to better promote tourism throughout the area.

Connections into the area need to be improved to facilitate growth in Tourism.

Connections are in place which facilitates tourism growth through a range of transportation methods. However we recognise the need for improvement or expansion of some of these and the approach to Transport and Accessibility will aim to promote better connections both in the Highlands and to the wider area.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy – Tourism

Policy – Tourist Accommodation

See Committee Draft papers for wording

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport	
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
HITRANS (33), Inverness South CC (107), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), Fortrose & Rosemarkie CC (203), Scottish Government (324)		
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace TC3 with a more comprehensive approach to Transport Policy Integration through explicit link to LTS and thus to RTS, STPR, NPF2 etc.	
Council’s summary of the representation(s):		
Plan should be consistent with NTS, RTS, LTS, STPR, Scottish Ferries Review & HITRANS Studies, and identify key transport links to other Council areas for support.		
Policy sought by those submitting representations:		
Policy integration with key transport policy documents.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p>STPR and LTS already referenced in A&T section, but haven’t explicitly listed all the relevant documents there or in Appendix. Some major STPR & LTS projects used as examples, but not exhaustive.</p> <p>The land-based links have been identified at high level within the NPF2 section and the ferry links within the A&T Section. The RTS (HITRANS) has identified the key transport links, and these have all been referenced within the policy section of the draft LTS, which should be consistent with the higher-level transport policies. The contents of the LTS will also help guide the development of the A&T section of the proposed plan.</p>		
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content		
<p>Policy - Travel</p> <p>Link to Local Transport Strategy</p> <p>See Committee Draft papers for wording.</p>		

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
P & H Jenkins (74), Turnberry Moray Estates (171)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	None.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
What infrastructure improvements are envisaged and how will they be funded? Greater clarity and commitment on delivery of infrastructure upgrades.	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
More detail required re: improving rail, air & ferry routes, and delivery of transport infrastructure upgrades, including funding.	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
General support for improving routes and upgrading infrastructure via the Council’s draft Local Transport Strategy (LTS). Identifying priority rail, air and ferry routes is Preferred Option and will refer to projects identified within LTS (taking cue from STPR, and Scottish Ferries Review etc). Delivery and funding of priority transport infrastructure projects are often reliant (regarding timescale & finance) on Transport Scotland or Network Rail and/or tied into Development Projects/Developer Contributions as per LTS, which the HwLDP will explicitly link to.	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
Policy - Travel Link to Local Transport Strategy Site-specific developer requirements and phasing See Committee Draft papers for wording.	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Holm Community Council (25), Pritchett Planning Consultancy – Kilmartin Property Group (204), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	None.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
SDR canal/river crossing should be a priority ahead/instead of A9/A96 upgrades	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
SDR canal/river crossing should be a priority ahead/instead of A9/A96 upgrades	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
The SDR canal/river crossing was not included within the Government’s 20 year transport investment programme. The Council intends to work with the private sector and others to look at alternative funding mechanisms and development opportunities.	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
Policy - Ness-side and Charleston	
See Committee Draft papers for wording.	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy/Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Alan Findley (20), HITRANS (33), Cromarty Arts (150), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), Ian Cowan (185), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Julian Paren (252), Kirkhill & Bunchrew CC (256), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Transition Black Isle (330)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	TC1, TC2 and TC10 plus LTS policies
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Reference should be made to RTS policies and themes and how the Government’s carbon reduction targets will be met.</p> <p>Reduce emissions.</p> <p>More ambitious approach to reducing transport emissions, including new target for reduction.</p> <p>Improving rail, air and ferry routes and improving access to Inverness are incompatible with reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>Spatial strategy should recognise that all developments should be designed to meet sustainable transport principles.</p> <p>Little reference to National Policy on transport such as reducing need to travel.</p> <p>Greater emphasis on reducing demand for travel and reliance on the private car.</p> <p>New developments should be required to “not contribute towards increasing the need for travel and encourage people to use private transport” or there should be a presumption against development which “do not contribute towards reducing the need for travel and do not encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport”.</p> <p>Encourage economic development outwith Inverness to reduce travel to work.</p> <p>Plan should take account of need for localisation of services/food as transport costs increase.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
Spatial Strategy should recognise all developments should be on sustainable transport principles and should encourage live/work not commute & services should be provided locally, for example by encouraging dispersed economic development	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>Requirement for sustainable transport briefly set out within A&T Section (para 1). New and amended transport-related policies within the Local Transport Strategy have emissions reduction and modal shift at their core.</p> <p>The preferred option for Business and Industrial Land is for a policy which encourages developers to bring forward mixed use proposals which allow for appropriate small scale business and commercial developments to be co-located with major housing developments. This could be made a requirement of large scale masterplanning proposals for over 100 houses. The intention being to offer residents</p>	

the opportunity to live/work in the same immediate area, thus reducing the need to travel, particularly by private car.

In addition, Active Travel Masterplans are to be prepared for a number of the larger settlements with a view to reducing private car usage, and will be brought forward through the Council's Local Transport Strategy.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content
Vision and Spatial Strategy Policy - Travel Link to Local Transport Strategy See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Marie Cruickshank (14), HITRANS (33), Mary Harrison (73), P & H Jenkins (74), Rose-Miller Farms (80), Ms Janetta Christie (81), Alastair Owens (84), Mr Paul Maden (88), Mrs L M Mackintosh (90), Nairn Suburban Community Council (94), Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Nairn West CC (101), N Wilkinson (104), Kirkton Farms (106), Inverness South CC (107), Nairn River CC (109), Crown CC (122), Westhill CC (147), Mrs E Holland (153), Julian Walford (155), Phillips Aitchison (162), Cromarty Firth Port Authority (170), John Dolan (173), Glenurquhart CC (174), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), Pritchett Planning-Kilmartin (204), Strathdearn CC (205), Caithness Partnership (224), Strutt & Parker LLP - Balnagowan Estate (229), Ardrross CC (236), Highland Council - Lochaber (241), Robertson Homes (246), Patricia Roberts (247), Inverness BID (251), Kirkhill Bunchrew CC (256), Roger Piercy (257), Diana Buchanan (265), Mr Alistair Christie (295), William Mowat (297), JG Walford (300), Helen Campbell (301), Inverlochy and Torlundy CC (318), Scottish Government (324)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Amend & add to TC6 Road Network Improvements, modified TC3 Integrated Transport Strategy (effectively replaced by LTS policy)
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>More effective transport/roads infrastructure across the Highlands.</p> <p>Audit HC-maintained roads to see where improvements are required (as opposed to trunk roads which HC doesn’t control).</p> <p>Even with no population increase, the area suffers from inadequate road provision and maintenance.</p> <p>Has to be tangible support for road usage in rural areas where active travel routes and public transport are scarce.</p> <p>Development in the Ness Castle and Charleston areas should not go ahead without this link because of the pressure that this would put on the city centre road system creating additional congestion.</p> <p>Existing Clachnaharry Bridge should be replaced with a new bridge to remove constraint.</p> <p>Muirtown canal crossing and Clachnaharry bridge would require upgrades to support developments to W of Inverness.</p> <p>Existing congestion within Inverness indicate that other settlements should be considered for growth; bottlenecks like Inshes/Raigmore need addressing before allowing further development/growth.</p> <p>Road transport should be a priority for investment - need new roads for Inverness outwith the Trunk Road network.</p> <p>Permitting limited expansion prior to any road improvement is a mistake. A96 developments will increase pressure on Raigmore Interchange.</p> <p>Improvements required at Inshes roundabout as catalyst for A9/A96 link & A96</p>	

corridor developments as well as at Inshes retail centre. Plan should include mechanism & timescale for implementation of TLR improvements at Inshes.

Far-reaching network of roads should be constructed to support developments in E Inverness.

There should be no large-scale development within A96C until appropriate A96 improvements are put in place.

A96 developments will increase pressure on Raigmore Interchange & A9N developments on Kessock Bridge. No further development should take place within the A96 corridor until transport infrastructure upgrades have been completed, including congestion issues at Inshes/Raigmore interchange & Longman roundabout.

Upgrades to A9, including dualling, are required to increase accessibility and support economic development of the Highland area as a whole.

Proposed developments will adversely impact existing A9 infrastructure, particularly Longman junction, which is considered by some to be the existing bottleneck rather than Kessock Bridge per se. A9 Raigmore and Longman roundabouts will require appropriate mitigation measures in light of such developments.

Delays in A96 widening & TLR will adversely impact Barn Church Rd and Westhill in general. A96 is main link between Cromarty Firth Port and oil centre in Aberdeen so needs significant improvements. Capacity studies should be undertaken at key junctions and transport modelling/masterplanning of key development sites should be progressed, particularly A96 dualling and junctions for E Inverness, Nairn & Tornagrain. Roads are first priority: A96 should be upgraded to high standard. Generally improve A96 to support economy.

A by-pass linking A82, A9 and A96 is a priority before the A96 dualling. The Longman roundabout is a big issue. Suggestion that a new road across the old dump to join the A96 might be one solution.

The balance of the Westercraigs development should be able to be brought forward in advance of A82/A9 link road being completed, as the A82 portion of the link does not feature in current Gov't Strategic review.

To promote growth and provide for more safety improvements, the A82 should be upgraded to dual carriageway from Inverness to Ft William (West End Car Park). Would consider paying a toll road fee.

The A82 is the only commercial transport corridor between the South and the West Highlands and is thus crucial to economy of this whole area. A82 is poor quality and journey time confidence is low. STPR supports improvements to A82 south of Ft William and so should be incorporated into HwLDP. A Route Action Plan for northern section required. Aspiration to link An Aird with The Kennels to ease congestion. Link road to A830 to ease congestion caused by 'through traffic' also sought.

A relief road between An Aird and the A830 Mallaig road has been in the Local Plan and the route safeguarded for some years. Around 1/3 of traffic is 'passing through' and so any improvements to ease the flow of traffic would help relieve congestion and allow further economic expansion of the greater Ft William area and the wider W Highlands. Also risk in terms of emergency services when trunk road is completely congested.

Nairn bypass should be put in place before major developments. A96 by-pass for Nairn should be a priority regardless of developments to relieve congestion and facilitate main-route journeys. Line of by-pass should be defined and protected from development. Nairn developments should relate to route & timescale of by-pass. No

inner ring road should be considered as it may prejudice/delay by-pass.

Concerns re: Nairn bypass route through eastern end of Kildrummie Kames SSSI and will cross areas prone to flooding.

Nairn should not be held to ransom over A96 by-pass – consider A96 relief road to South of Nairn.

Not enough emphasis on improving transport links between Caithness and the South.

The poor road network will hamper developments in Caithness/N Sutherland. Good transport links to South are needed to support exploration of Pentland Firth.

Transport links to Caithness badly need upgrading. Berriedale Braes are a big problem. A838 needs urgent attention. The A99 needs straightening.

The A99 (along with the A9) are currently amongst the most dangerous roads in Scotland, and needs straightening.

The Thurso by-pass outlined in the Caithness Local Plan should be incorporated into the HWLDP to link into Scrabster in support of likely offshore renewables activity in the Pentland Firth.

The A838 road along the west side of Loch Eriboll is shocking and needs urgent attention.

Join up the single-track roads in the main west/north coast road, very locally significant Orkney-Ullapool road.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

General improvements to road transport infrastructure, potentially directed by audit of existing infrastructure.

No development at Ness Castle, Charleston until river/canal crossing in place.

Replace Clachnaharry & Muirtown Bridges to facilitate development to West of Inverness.

Road congestion in Inverness needs resolved.

Inverness needs local roads separate from trunk roads.

No developments in E Inverness until A9-A96 linked.

E Inverness should be deleted until land capacity at Raigmore/Inshes has been assessed.

No development in E Inverness until road network improved.

A96 improvements before large-scale A96C developments.

No development in A96C until relevant road infrastructure upgraded, including Inshes & Longman roundabouts.

Upgrade/dual A9 from Perth to Thurso.

Junction improvements at A9 Longman and Raigmore.

Improve/dual A96 including junctions at E Inverness, Tornagrain & Nairn.

Progress A82-A9-A96 link road.

Balance of approved development at Westercraigs should be brought forward in advance of the completion of the A9/A82 link.

Dual A82 from Inverness to Ft William.

Support Route Action Plan for Ft William-Inverness section of A82 & A82 extension from An Aird to The Kennels + relief link road linking A82 and A830.

Nairn by-pass required & protect line of by-pass from development.

Nairn developments should relate to route & timescale of by-pass.

Nairn by-pass should avoid areas prone to flooding & Kildrummie Kames SSSI.

No inner ring road for Nairn as may prejudice by-pass.

Consider inner relief road in advance to allow development at Nairn.

More emphasis on improving transport links between Caithness, Sutherland & South.

Upgrade A99 for safety reasons.

Include a by-pass for Thurso.

A838 requires urgent maintenance.

Improve Ullapool – Orkney road.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Improvements to the Road Network will be sought in line with the draft LTS Core Policy 3 and funded by developers where appropriate.

The STPR does not incorporate the river/canal crossing, although the LTS has identified the A9-A82 link as a trunk road priority in line with the current Highland Council Administration's Programme: "We will work with the Scottish Government, Transport Scotland and British Waterways to examine and agree solutions for completing the link road between A9/A96 and the A82 trunk roads, including crossing the River Ness and the Caledonian Canal". However, lack of funding and national support means that such a crossing is highly unlikely within the period of the plan.

The replacement of bridges to the west of Inverness is not proposed within the STPR or LTS, and would also require the support of British Waterways and Network Rail. Lack of funding and clarity over the effectiveness of simply replacing these bridges means that such projects would be highly unlikely within the period of this plan.

Inverness congestion is a headline issue for the LTS, and supports the use of Developer Contributions to fund schemes likely to reduce congestion. The Council will provide support for P&R schemes, pedestrian/cycle (Active Travel) routes and parking controls will be considered to help reduce private car traffic in line with the LTS.

New local roads for Inverness have not been identified in the STPR or LTS as investment priorities, and thus would not be feasible within the period of the plan, although there is general support for upgrading the existing non trunk road network in and around Inverness.

Early developments in E. Inverness predicated on agreement with Transport Scotland that road capacity issues generated by developments will be addressed when required.

Improved A96C road and rail infrastructure and services are supported at national level with STPR, and at local level within LTS as a raft of Core Policies. The funds and timetabling of improvements to both the trunk roads and rail infrastructure are controlled at a national level, and thus outwith the control of the Council. Early phases of development within the A96C can be supported within the constraints of the existing transport infrastructure, supplemented by developer contributions to improvements in public transport, P&R and other traffic management schemes.

Improvements to the Trunk Roads are the remit of Transport Scotland. The STPR

supports some improvements to A9 between Dunblane to Inverness, and this is reflected in LTS. Other A9 improvements are dependent on the next STPR review.

Improvements to the A96 between Inverness and Nairn and the A96-A9 portion of the link road are currently supported by the STPR, but are reliant on Transport Scotland for funding/timing. Transport Scotland are currently undertaking a traffic modelling exercise on the A96 Corridor, the results of which will be used to inform the requirements for improvements and seek developer contributions where appropriate to help fund such improvements.

A maximum number of dwellings was set in granting planning permission for the Westercraigs development prior to the completion of the link road. More information would be required before the remaining units could be released regarding the capacity of, and impact on, the existing transport infrastructure.

Upgrading/dualling the A82 from Inverness to Ft William is not currently supported by the STPR and so would not attract the required funding or support from the Scottish Government.

Upgrades to the A82 South of Ft William are supported by the STPR, but the remaining aspirations are not within the current iteration of the STPR, and thus would not attract the required funding or support from the Scottish Government. The Council has a long-term aspirational aim to realign the A82 from An Aird to The Kennels and to link the A82 with the A830, and the potential routes of these improvements have been protected within the West Highland and Islands Local Plan. Implementation is subject to funds being forthcoming from the STPR programme and the Council's capital programme.

The Council is currently working with Transport Scotland on the delivery of the Nairn by-pass, but it has not been included in the current STPR programme and thus may be some years away, beyond the period of this plan. The Council will identify transportation constraints on development within the existing Framework Plan for Nairn in light of both the route and timeframe for Nairn by-pass. However, A96 by-pass is a separate issue from any inner relief road that might be required to service developments in S Nairn for example.

The proposed route of the Nairn by-pass is *indicative only* and also is not shown to scale. The route will be subject to further assessment, including flood risk and with respect to Kildrummie Kames SSSI, before any route could be finalised.

The current STPR contains only minor safety improvements to the A9 north of Inverness. Any proposals beyond the committed safety improvements to the A9, such as a by-pass for Berriedale, would not attract the support or funding from the Scottish Government during the period of the plan. Note that Transport Scotland have recently commissioned a geotechnical study to look at alignment changes at Berriedale, which may appear in the next iteration of the STPR. Fragile areas like the Caithness and Sutherland will likely be weighted positively regarding (non-trunk) road maintenance budgets in line with the draft LTS.

The principal section of the A99 from Latheron to Wick is part of the trunk road network and thus under the auspices of Transport Scotland. There are no plans in the current STPR to upgrade the A99, and so there would likely be no support or funding from the Scottish Government.

A by-pass for Thurso would be an extension of the A9 and, as was the case for the current Caithness Local Plan, it is not currently supported by the Scottish Government under the existing STPR, and so would not attract the necessary funding.

Improvements to the Ullapool-Orkney route have not been specifically identified

within the LTS and nor are they referenced within the Regional Transport Strategy. The draft LTS will use fragile area status to assist with prioritising road maintenance.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Travel

Sub-Highland Vision & Spatial Strategies refer to transport improvement aspirations

Link to Local Transport Strategy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
P & H Jenkins (74), N Wilkinson (104), Westhill CC (147), Croy & Culloden CC (218)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	New Policies for Road Network Improvements.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Transport infrastructure provision must precede development.</p> <p>Complete transport improvements prior to considering any future developments. No developments should be permitted before required infrastructure is put in place.</p> <p>No development without infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>No further development in smaller communities within A96 Corridor until roads upgraded.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
Where improvements to transport infrastructure will be required to support developments, then there should be a requirement for improvements to be implemented before these developments take place.	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
This may be feasible where infrastructure improvements are required to enable developments and thus funding is available either from the private sector (through Developer Contributions) or the public sector (where supported by the STPR), as per the Council’s Local Transport Strategy.	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
<p>Policy - Travel</p> <p>Link to Local Transport Strategy</p> <p>Site-specific developer requirements</p> <p>See Committee Draft papers for wording.</p>	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport	
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Ian Cowan (185)		
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	None.	
Council’s summary of the representation(s):		
Improvements are required to encourage active travel, such as utilising speed reduction methods in the design of new developments along Southern Distributor Road.		
Policy sought by those submitting representations:		
Home Zones or equivalent measures should be required for new residential developments		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
Best accommodated within the proposed Residential Layout Supplementary Guidance (SG) which will be provided in due course in support of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan.		
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content		
Policy - Travel Link to Local Transport Strategy See Committee Draft papers for wording.		

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), Highlands and Islands Enterprise [West Highlands and Islands] (190), Philip Hodges (210), Nigg & Shandwick CC (254)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	None
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>How can we accommodate electric vehicles and hydrogen filling stations?</p> <p>Support provision for low carbon tech when available, e.g. electric charging points & hydrogen.</p> <p>If relying on electric/hydrogen for private cars, should accommodate charging/refuelling stations in plan.</p> <p>Support for rural filling stations should include alt fuels: gas, hydrogen.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
Support/infrastructure for low-carbon technologies when available e.g. electric/hydrogen	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>Feasibility of electric charging points that normally require several hours to charge vehicles is unlikely to fit in with the traditional form of (particularly rural) ‘refuelling station’. Although hydrogen may lend itself to such an approach, there are concerns that hydrogen is inefficient to produce and expensive to transport. Within the period of this plan, the Highlands would be unlikely to be able to avail itself of such approaches given the diseconomies of scale and geography, except perhaps within Inverness, where an electric vehicle charging project similar to that operating in Brighton (the only such scheme in UK outside of London) might be investigated further for the forthcoming Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.</p> <p>See: http://www.journeyon.co.uk/car_98.asp</p>	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
<p>Policy - Travel</p> <p>Link to Local Transport Strategy</p> <p>See Committee Draft papers for wording.</p>	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Highlands and Islands Enterprise [West Highlands and Islands] (190), Highland Council [Lochaber Area] (241), Nigg and Shandwick CC (254)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replacement policy for Recommendation TC19
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Support provision of petrol/diesel in rural areas.</p> <p>‘Lifeline’ rural petrol stations should be protected.</p> <p>Support for rural petrol stations.</p> <p>In essence, the loss of rural petrol stations will adversely impact on rural communities</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
Support rural petrol stations to ensure their future and thus help preserve rural communities.	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
The Council, along with its partners Highlands and Islands Enterprise and HITRANS have been working together to ensure that the Highland area retains an extensive network of fuel stations. This commitment will be articulated with the Council’s Corporate Plan.	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
<p>Link to Council’s Corporate Plan which addresses the issue.</p> <p>Policy - Wider Countryside addresses wider issue of loss of rural lifeline facilities</p> <p>See Committee Draft papers for wording.</p>	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Spatial Strategy
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Patricia Roberts (247), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	None.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Dispersed development rather than A96 Corridor dev’ts would distribute traffic infrastructure requirements & lower local densities of transport needs.</p> <p>Dispersed growth is favoured because it provides sustainable transport (rail, park & ride).</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
Support for dispersed development option rather than focussing on A96 corridor & Inverness.	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>Residential and business/industrial developments are largely market-led. To constrain development in an area of high demand like Inverness and the A96 Corridor does not necessarily mean that the same level of development would relocate elsewhere within the Inner Moray Firth. The importance of Inverness and the A96 Corridor to the economy of the Highlands could thus be adversely impacted should the supply of land be restricted, thereby ignoring the market pressures, in an attempt to stimulate demand elsewhere in pursuit of dispersed development.</p> <p>There is also no guarantee that dispersed development would result in less commuter traffic on existing roads or thus would not necessarily be a more sustainable solution. Indeed, the concentration of business/industry and residential developments within a small area brings economies of scale with regard to mass transit systems, whereas dispersed development is more likely to rely on the private car.</p>	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
<p>Policy - Travel</p> <p>Link to Local Transport Strategy</p> <p>See Committee Draft papers for wording.</p>	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Glachbeg Croft (12), John Wood (16), Irene Brandt (18), Alan Findley (20), Network Rail (32), HITRANS (33), A Magson (72), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Westhill Community Council (147), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Ian Cowan (185), Croy and Culloden Community Council (218), Eleanor and Philip Hodges (219), Kinraig & Vicinity Community Council (225), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Dingwall Community Council (235), Patricia Roberts (247), Julian Paren (252), Kirkhill Bunchrew Community Council (256), Colliers CRE - Whiteness Property Company (260), Diana Buchanan (265), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), JG Walford (300), Transition Black Isle (330)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Modified TC1 Modal shift and additional new policies which incorporate PT within LTS
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Developments should reduce need to travel, utilise existing or support new public transport provision, and public transport links should have priority.</p> <p>Support for local initiatives e.g. North West Community Buses. Improve public transport on Black Isle, e.g. post-bus.</p> <p>Support for Park & Ride schemes, but routes need to support business as well as retail traffic.</p> <p>Arterial road-works are expensive, and given economic conditions, could be better deployed in support of public transport and active travel initiatives.</p> <p>Plan should recognise that all developments should be designed to meet sustainable transport principles. At E. Inverness, sustainable transport system should be in place before major phases of development. Bus priority, park & ride and active travel links between E Inverness and city centre are very important if development is to proceed in advance of A96 dualling.</p> <p>Peak Oil will have marked effect on need for localization of services/food production.</p> <p>Need to identify quick wins within A96C to improve public transport with airport and proposed large-scale developments.</p> <p>Early development in the corridor should be subject to prior implementation of public transport improvements and traffic management measures including park and ride and bus priority to reduce peak time congestion. Infrastructure improvements could be delivered on phased basis commensurate with development and in line with economic & population growth within A96 Corridor.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<p>Improve public transport strategy/infrastructure/links, including targets for increased use & wider utilisation of traffic management system, and support for community transport initiatives.</p> <p>Availability/possibility of good public transport links should help guide allocations of land for development.</p>	

Park & Rides at Tore, Aviemore, with links through business parks and not just city/town centres.

Developer Contributions should fund Active Travel & Public Transport rather than road infrastructure.

Sustainable transport, bus priority, P&R and AT for E Inverness.

Wider study to determine if city size of Inverness is sustainable without cheap transport.

Improve public transport links to Tornagrain & Dalcross, including Station.

Development within A96C subject to prior, phased implementation of public transport improvements, traffic management & P&R.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

The HwLDP references the requirement to facilitate travel by public transport and the LTS will identify the main public transport improvements required, including bus lanes and other traffic management approaches. The LTS also supports the increased provision of community transport and other 'unconventional transport' initiatives, and thus will be supported by the HwLDP which will reference the LTS Core Policies. P&R at Tore already identified. Links between P&R at Aviemore and commuter trains worth investigating, although within CNPA Local Development Plan area.

The HwLDP will be guided by the STPR/LTS in terms of transport priorities, and thus where Developer Contributions should be directed. LTS states that "Contributions shall be used to provide improvements to public transport, the road network, traffic management, pedestrian and cycle facilities, accessibility infrastructure or any other such improvements required as a result of the development."

The LTS supports improvements to the public transport network as a means of reducing vehicle miles (amongst other benefits). Concentrating development in Inverness is most efficient means of driving down the cost of public transport and improving the frequency and capacity of services.

The STPR supports a new station at Dalcross to service the airport and Tornagrain, and will thus find support within the new plan and the LTS.

Improved A96C road and rail infrastructure and services are supported at national level with STPR, and at local level within LTS as a raft of Core Policies. The funds and timetabling of improvements to both the trunk roads and rail infrastructure are controlled at a national level, and thus outwith the control of the Council. Early phases of development within the A96C can be supported within the constraints of the existing transport infrastructure, supplemented by developer contributions to improvements in public transport, P&R and other traffic management schemes.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Travel

Link to Local Transport Strategy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Glachbeg Croft (12), Duncan MacDonald (17), Alan Findley (20), HITRANS (33), Kingairloch Estate (95), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Elizabeth Budge (148), Cromarty Arts (150), Julian Walford (155), Glenurquhart CC (174), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), Ian Cowan (185), Highlands and Islands Enterprise [West Highlands and Islands] (190), Strathdearn CC (205), Diana Buchanan (265), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), JG Walford (300), Transition Black Isle (330)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	New policies to promote Active Travel within LTS
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Insufficient emphasis on Active Travel/routes, and potential use of Green Networks to support AT routes.</p> <p>More cycle paths, new cycle routes around Beauly Firth & N of Inverness, & secure cycle parking at public transport hubs.</p> <p>Address traffic separation/speed within settlements.</p> <p>Spatial strategy should recognise that all developments should be designed to meet sustainable transport principles. At E. Inverness, sustainable transport system should be in place before major phases of development. Bus priority, park & ride and active travel links between E Inverness and city centre are very important if development is to proceed in advance of A96 dualling.</p> <p>A public transport interchange should be provided at the station with improved parking, cycle and pedestrian access and cycle storage.</p> <p>Better connection is required from central Nairn to the expansion areas to deliver the vision of encouraging active travel and reducing CO2.</p> <p>Develop bus & active travel routes between Nairn town centre, railway station and new retail developments.</p> <p>Tactful expansion of road & public transport infrastructure around Nairn is sensible.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<p>More emphasis on/improvements to Active Travel/routes, including opportunities afforded by Green Networks.</p> <p>Sustainable transport, bus priority, P&R and AT for E Inverness.</p> <p>Public transport interchange for Nairn.</p> <p>Develop active travel and bus routes between Nairn town centre, railway station and new developments.</p>	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
Active Travel (AT) plans for a number of settlements are a key element of the LTS, along with P&R and bus priority measures. Developer contributions will be sought in support of these priorities. The potential use of Green Networks as strategic	

corridors for AT routes will also be identified in the forthcoming Green Networks Supplementary Planning Guidance.

With regard to Nairn, the proposed approach is to identify the infrastructure improvements required, and the Nairn Framework Plan seeks to ensure that the new developments link with the town centre, for example by improving active travel links and along the riverside. Active Travel and modal shift are also key themes within the LTS, including the creation of an Active Travel Masterplan for Nairn through which many of these issues can be taken forward.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Travel

Vision and Spatial Strategy contains aspirational priority improvements

Link to Local Transport Strategy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Lucille Shadforth (15), Irene Brandt (18), Alan Findley (20), Gills Harbour (Bill Mowat) (30), HITRANS (33), International Power Marine Development (40), A Magson (72), Ms Janetta Christie (81), Elizabeth Budge (148), Mrs E Holland (153), Phillips Aitchison (162), Cromarty Firth Port Authority (170), British Waterways (177), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), Ken Nicol (215), Ardross Community Council (236), Highland Council - Lochaber Area (241), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Carry forward TC1, TC2, TC16, TC17 plus new policy on Transport Assessments within LTS
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Need to move freight off road and onto seaborne/canal-based transport, and provide onshore support at ports which are key transport links for off-shore renewables projects.</p> <p>Better timetable/capacity for Nigg Ferry would reduce road traffic.</p> <p>Make more effective use of Cromarty Firth port for European transport links to help remove traffic from road network.</p> <p>Plan does not explicitly identify Gills Bay as key port for both transport and off-shore renewables and improve road links to the existing ferry terminal.</p> <p>Scrabster and Wick ports freight handling facilities not identified. Scope for rail/sea interchanges also missing.</p> <p>Upgrade to Scrabster could support ferry links to Aberdeen & Leith. Thurso by-pass could support improved link to Scrabster.</p> <p>The existence of the rail, road and sea transport hub at Corpach gives Lochaber an economic advantage shared by very few towns in Highland and so should be maximised whilst minimising any negative social or environmental impact. Better infrastructure is required for servicing larger boats and ferries if the benefit of sea/canal travel is to be maximised.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<p>General investment in sea & waterways for freight, e.g. Caledonian Canal, & in support of off-shore renewables.</p> <p>Encourage short and long-haul sea shipping links to reduce road traffic.</p> <p>Direct ferry/freight routes from Invergordon/Cromarty Firth to mainland Europe, including for fuel imports.</p> <p>Include Gills Harbour in plan and improve access.</p> <p>Plan should reference development of Scrabster & Wick for freight sea/rail interchange.</p> <p>Improve access to Scrabster (as part of Thurso by-pass) and identify new passenger links to Aberdeen & Leith.</p>	

Maximise use of road/rail/sea freight hub at Corpach.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Where possible encouragement will be given to improving ports and transporting freight by canal and sea in line with Local Transport Strategy (LTS). Cross-cutting issues regarding transportation links to key ports in support of new off-shore renewable developments needs to be taken account of at the planning application stage through the standard transport assessment methodology.

Nigg Ferry identified and supported as part of the key ferry network. Ferry, although operated under tender from HC, is a private operation and so likely to be demand-led. Note, however, that a new 4-car, 50-passenger ferry is expected in 2010 and will thus increase the daily carrying capacity.

Direct ferry/freight routes from Invergordon/Cromarty Firth reliant on market/demand for such services & Cromarty Firth Port Authority for support of such services.

Gills Bay is incorporated into Air, Rail & Ferry Links map but is not identified in the same way as the Nigg ferry. Gills Bay is accessed from one of the Highland's Strategic Routes along the north coast identified in the A&T section. Potential contribution to support for off-shore renewables is acknowledged, although not identified as a Major Base/Port within Renewables section. However, Gills Bay within zone identified as a Marine Energy Potential Development Area.

Network Rail and the relevant Port Authorities are the key agencies in the development of new rail/sea interchanges, for example at Scrabster & Wick. The movement of freight via the key port of Scrabster is acknowledged within the LTS, and the modal shift of freight from road to seaborne transport is articulated as a general policy.

Demand for Thurso by-pass has not been established, but Scrabster has been identified as a key port within LTS, and is along priority transport routes where investment opportunities are likely to be focussed. New ferry links to destinations such as Aberdeen will be demand led.

The LTS will support and encourage the transport of goods by rail into Fort William where possible. However, neither the STPR nor the LTS identify any specific policies or projects for Corpach, but support for improvements and increased use of the inter-modal facilities at Corpach will be articulated within the vision for the West Highland area, although there will also be general support for the modal shift articulated in the representations.

WHILP supports the redevelopment of the Corpach Paper Mill and includes the need for improvements to the road and rail network in the immediate vicinity within the requirement for a supporting masterplan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Travel

Link to Local Transport Strategy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Alan Findley (20), Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (42), Ms Janetta Christie (81), Mrs M Moore (96), Mr John D Moore (97), Friend of the Far North Line (152), Phillips Aitchison (162), Caithness Partnership (224), National Union of Rail, Maritime & Transport Workers (276), Dornoch Area CC (280), Mr Alistair Christie (295)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Carry forward TC1 plus new policy coverage on modal shift for passenger traffic .
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>There were mixed responses to the long-standing concept of a rail crossing over the Dornoch Firth:</p> <p>Dornoch Rail crossing missing from Air, Rail & Ferry links and potential route not protected from development. Would reduce rail journey times between North and Inverness and encourage more freight/passenger traffic from road to rail.</p> <p>Dornoch Firth rail link is unsustainable as the line would contravene government guidance on flood risk, damage RAMSAR and Natura 2000 sites, Littleferry NNR and be detrimental to the economy of W and NW Sutherland.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<p>Include/protect Dornoch Firth rail crossing.</p> <p>Dornoch Firth rail link is unsustainable and should not be supported.</p>	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>A Dornoch Rail crossing is not supported within STPR projects (to 2022) or the Highland Council’s Local Transport Strategy (LTS) and therefore its construction within the period of this plan (and potentially the next two iterations) would not attract the required funding. Protection of the proposed route from development over the next 10+ years would thus not be a realistic option without any support at least in principle from the Scottish Government.</p> <p>However, a modal shift of freight from road to rail (or water) and passenger traffic onto public transport (including rail) will be supported Highland-wide through the Council’s LTS.</p>	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
<p>Policy - Travel</p> <p>Link to Local Transport Strategy</p> <p>See Committee Draft papers for wording.</p>	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Marie Cruickshank (14), Irene Brandt (18), Alan Findley (20), Tanya Favus (29), HITRANS (33), Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (42), A Magson (72), Mary Harrison (73), Rose-Miller Farms (80), Ms Janetta Christie (81), Mrs L M Mackintosh (90), Mrs M Moore (96), Mr John D Moore (97), Kirkton Farms (106), Nairn River CC (109), Mr A Manson (143), Conon Brae Farms (146), Friends of the Far North Line (152), Mrs E Holland (153), Phillips Aitchison (162), Ian Cowan (185), Highlands and Islands Enterprise [West Highlands and Islands] (190), Strathdearn CC (205), Philip Hodges (210), Eleanor and Philip Hodges (219), Caithness Partnership (224), Ardross CC (236), Highland Council - Lochaber (241) Kirkhill Bunchrew CC (256), Roger Piercy (257), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274), Mr Alistair Christie (295), William Mowat (297), Reynolds Architecture (302), Scottish Government (324), Highland Council Ward 12 - Caol and Mallaig (332)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Adaptation of Policy TC1 Modal shift, Policy TC2 Multi-modal interchanges, removal of Policy TC13 Tain - Golspie rail link plus new policies for LTS.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>In light of need to reduce carbon emissions and forecasted ‘peak-oil’ the plan should have high-level support for modal shift from private road to public rail transport. Investment in rail will have higher rate of return than roads.</p> <p>Rail is more sustainable mode of transport and so measures need to be taken to encourage greater usage, such as upgrading links and improving frequency of services.</p> <p>Need to move freight off road and onto rail where possible and make appropriate connections into road/sea routes.</p> <p>Commuter traffic should be moved from road to rail with help of new stations along existing lines and to support new developments, for example within A96 corridor.</p> <p>Better rail links required to benefit economy of Highlands and to take freight/passenger traffic off roads.</p> <p>New rail link required between Inverness and Airport to improvement connectivity and facilitate travel between Inverness City Centre and destinations served by the airport.</p> <p>Future economic growth of settlements north of Inverness, particularly Caithness/Sutherland, is reliant on efficient and effective rail link. Benefits of moving freight (and passengers) from road to rail on route north.</p> <p>Kyle line requirements improvements as part of an integrated sustainable transport network for freight & passenger traffic.</p> <p>Ft William to Mallaig line requires improvements as part of an integrated sustainable transport network for freight & passenger traffic.</p> <p>Greater use of the railway is more sustainable and should include a link between Alness and the Nigg Yard.</p>	

Need to ease road congestion around Inverness and move to a more sustainable mode of transport by encouraging a modal shift by commuters from road to rail.

The potential for a marine/rail/road interchange should be identified. Improved rail freight capacity and rail access to Nigg should be included.

Not enough emphasis on improving transport links between Caithness and the South. Far north line deserves upgrading, including crossing for Dornoch Firth to cut journey times and encourage people to leave their cars & reduce pollution. Dornoch rail crossing would bring great benefit.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

Should be overarching policy to encourage rail use/plan for modal shift to rail.

Improvements to rail links/frequency.

Investment in railways for freight, including rail/freight interchanges with road (Evanton, Invergordon & Georgemas suggested)

Open new rail stations/stops on existing lines.

Improve rail links Inverness to Perth (and beyond).

Improve rail links Inverness to Nairn and onwards to Aberdeen.

Railway link, passing loop & station at Dalcross.

Improve rail links Inverness to Far North.

Improve rail link to Kyle for freight/passenger.

Improve rail link from Ft William to Mallaig for freight/passenger.

Rail link from Alness to Nigg.

Greater capacity/better timetabling of commuter rail links, with adequate parking/P&R.

New Metro Service (rail or tram) for Culloden, Balloch & beyond in longer term.

Potential for marine/rail/road interchange at Nigg.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

The Council's Local Transport Strategy (LTS) supports a move from road to rail for freight and passenger traffic (as does National planning policy) and so will be acknowledged in the plan's policies. The plan will also support measures to optimise use of the existing rail network. Rail network and service improvements are dependent on decisions of Network Rail and operating companies, but Highland Council and HITRANS will continue to promote improvements with these organisations.

The STPR & LTS have both identified need to improve links to/from Inverness and the frequency of services, although Network Rail and the operating companies are responsible for decisions affecting the frequency of services. The Council's LTS states that HC will seek improvements where they provide optimum benefits.

The STPR supports a new station at Dalcross Airport, but otherwise new stations would likely have to be integrated into new development projects or through demand-led pressure at existing settlements not currently served by a station.

The STPR supports an increase in service frequency and a reduction in journey times between Inverness and Perth through the provision of minor infrastructure improvements such as line-speed improvements, additional loops or lengthening double track sections and the removal of speed limits for freight trains. These

improvements are, however, within the remit of Network Rail and the relevant train operators.

The STPR supports an increase in frequency of services, reduction in journey times, extra rail services between Nairn and Inverness and a new station at Dalcross Airport.

The STPR supports a generic target to “enhance public transport accessibility and reduce public transport journey time to and from Inverness”, but there are no specific rail-based projects for the Far North, Kyle or FW-Mallaig Lines. The LTS reflects this in that there is a general support for improvements across the Highland Rail Network, but nothing specifically targeted at the Far North, Kyle or FW-Mallaig Lines. Network Rail and operators are thus key stakeholders in any move to improve services within their respective remits.

The STPR contains no specific rail-based projects to link Alness to the Nigg Yard. The LTS reflects this in that there is a general support for improvements across the Highland Rail Network, but nothing specifically targeted at creating the Alness-Nigg link. Such a link is likely to be demand-led and dependent on economic developments at the Nigg Yard. There is, however, support for the movement of freight from road to rail and marine transport modes, and so the principle of an interchange at Nigg is supported within the STPR and LTS.

A new Metro Service for settlements to the east of Inverness city is not recognised within the STPR or LTS, and is thus a more aspirational and longer term aim outwith the period of this plan. However, general improvements to the service frequency and a new station at Dalcross are supported.

The current STPR does not propose any improvements to the Far North Rail Link. Thus any proposals for the improvements, such as the Dornoch Rail Crossing (see #14) would not attract the support or funding from the Scottish Government during the period of the plan.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Travel

Vision and Spatial Strategy contains aspirational priority improvements

Link to Local Transport Strategy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Network Rail (32)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	New Developer Requirements
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
Network Rail concerned about safety at level crossings due to potential increased volume of traffic as a result of developments.	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
Consult Network Rail where increase of traffic over level crossings due to development	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
The request is reasonable since there may be potential road/rail safety implications. However, the matter is largely one of consultation practice rather than policy. Area local development plans will incorporate specific developer requirements to assess level crossing capacity and consult with Network Rail where larger allocations are likely to have an impact. The Plan’s Physical Constraints Policy also offers an opportunity to list level crossings as a constraint in related guidance that should be assessed in considering any development proposal.	
Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content	
Policy - Physical Constraints See Committee Draft papers for wording.	

Issue (heading):	Accessibility & Transport
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Accessibility & Transport
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
HITRANS (33), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), Highland Council - Lochaber (241), Patricia Roberts (247), Caithness Chamber of Commerce (274)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	None.
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Technical enhancements at Wick Airport are required to maintain national connectivity.</p> <p>Broadford Airport should be identified as a potential key air link.</p> <p>Reference HITRANS review of H&I Air Services – include Broadford airport as potential key air link.</p> <p>The benefits of air transport in support of tourism business and commercial opportunities needs to be recognised, including facilities for seaplanes and the aspiration for a small airstrip near Ft William.</p> <p>Air-links from Inverness don’t facilitate efficient air travel, particularly for business.</p>	
Policy sought by those submitting representations:	
<p>Technical improvements to Wick Airport.</p> <p>Broadford Airport should be identified as potential key air link.</p> <p>Facilities for seaplanes and small air strip near Ft William.</p> <p>Flights from Inverness Airport should link into hubs in other UK Cities to enable overseas business travel and inward tourism.</p>	
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority	
<p>The Local Transport Strategy (LTS) has identified Wick Airport as a key node in the Highland Council’s core network for air links. The LTS commits The Council to lobbying for improvements to the network with its regional partners. HIAL receives subsidies for improvements from the Scottish Ministers in accordance with Section 34 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982, and so technical improvements are outwith the control of The Council.</p> <p>The STPR and LTS have not identified Broadford airport as a potential key air link, and although mention has been made of HITRANS support, Broadford does not feature in their Regional Transport Strategy. Broadford airport would also likely operate under the auspices of HIAL, and thus projects and funding would be controlled by the Scottish Government. However, land has been allocated within the West Highland and Islands Local Plan for future development and will be incorporated into the Spatial Strategy for the West Highland area.</p> <p>Neither the sea-plane project nor the small airstrip near Ft William have been identified within the STPR, RTS or LTS and thus would not attract public sector funding. However the aspirational sea-plane project will be highlighted within the Spatial Strategy for the West Highland area.</p>	

Flights from Inverness Airport into hubs in other UK Cities is outwith the Council's remit, and an issue for HIAL and UK hub airports to resolve

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Travel

Vision and Spatial Strategy contains aspirational improvements

Link to Local Transport Strategy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Waste Management
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Waste Management
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
D. MacDonald (17), HITRANS (33), J. Robinson (34), L. Johnson (41), Lochardil & Drummond Community Council (56), I. Wade (85), L.M. Mackintosh (90), Avoch & Killen Community Council (103), Nairn River Community Council (109), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Westhill Community Council (147), J. Walford (155), R. Mardon (156), Philips Aitchison Ltd (162), Glenurquhart Community Council (174), Scottish Council for Development & Industry (180), I. Cowan (185), B. Goodwin (195), A. Thomas (197), Ross-shire Waste Action Network (200), M. Goodwin (202), Bryden Associates (Strathdearn Community Council) (205), Nairn Residents Concern Group (209), Croy & Culloden Community Council (218), Kincaig & Vicinity Community Council (225), M. Hutcheson (226), R. Goodwin (234), Ardress Community Council (236), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), D. Buchanan (265), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Inverloch & Torlundy Community Council (318), B. Steele (319), Scottish Government (324), SEPA (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace SP policies W1 to W7 Update WHILP & SU Policy: Waste Management
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste of all kinds should be seen as a resource • A more flexible approach is needed towards the number and type of facilities and would enable work to be done on alternatives. To decide on 3 EfW plants now is premature and might discourage people from recycling • Waste management must be managed in an efficient and environmentally friendly way, in line with the ‘waste hierarchy’ and taking the ‘proximity principle’ into account • Waste facilities should be specific to each locality • Government, both local and national, must produce a firm policy to coerce industry and retailers to reduce packaging and actively demand that users and producers produce far less waste. • Need to encourage industry to use recycled goods to produce other goods • Should consider measures for reducing the level of waste from households and industrial locations <p>Role of recycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must increase kerbside recycling collection including more provision of collection for glass and plastics/ other recyclates • The role of recycling is grossly understated • Need to encourage local businesses that can use recycled waste • Punitive health and safety requirements mean that it is not economical for businesses to re-use • Domestic composting should be encouraged <p>Relationship with travel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for long distance road transport should be minimised with consideration given to potential of rail or waterborne transport. • There should be an appraisal of the carbon impacts of the options for the 	

management of transport of waste.

- Transporting of waste to other landfill sites is ridiculous

Energy from Waste (EfW) facilities

- EfW is not efficient & causes untold health problems to humans – must not embark on this until proved safe
- Should be no incineration of household refuse
- EfW is totally unacceptable anywhere
- EfW facilities are likely to discourage the public from recycling/ reducing waste.
- EfW proposals must have a market for the heat energy before any planning application is submitted.
- Incinerators should be designed to meet local needs (appropriate size) and the latest technologies
- EfW is not sustainable, and a waste of vital resources

Role of Waste Management in New developments

- Support for provision of local recycling points and community composting.
- New developments of 300 houses + should only be granted planning permission if they have capabilities of dealing with their own waste within the development.

Stated alternative – Allocation of sites

- In line with SPP, should consider identifying locations or specific sites for the sustainable treatment of municipal and other wastes either in the proposed plan or future area LDP's.
- The proposed plan should give more detail on how more EfW, local facilities and site waste management plans will be facilitated.
- The HwLDP should allocate specific sites for waste management facilities to provide certainty to residents and developments in line with PAN 63.
- Flexibility to accommodate change is important, the stated alternative may not provide this.
- This issue has been delayed for too long and it is time we bit the bullet, stopped exporting our waste, and made strategic decisions across the whole Highland area, rather than deferring the decision for the 3 area wide LDPs.
- The former Longman landfill site should be allocated for such a facility – would be supportive of an imaginatively designed EfW plant subject to prior segregation of waste streams and strict emission controls.
- Should be no further delay in identifying sites – the obvious site is the Longman former landfill. Recommend a modern type incinerator like the one in Vienna that is also a tourist feature, the excess heat should be used for power and heating.

Alternatives/ Suggestions put forward

- Plasma incineration instead of landfill – no health risk
- More emphasis should be put on IVC's and Mechanical Biological Treatment options
- The GREAN franchise should be rolled out across N.W Sutherland
- Paper should be recycled at least 10 times.
- More compulsion for business recycling.
- EfW may have some place but methane from anaerobic digestion would be a better option than burning.
- Would like to see a stronger emphasis on IVC and AD. Significant research has compared the environmental impact of incineration, landfill and

Mechanical Biological Treatment and MBT was found to be by far the best option.

- There is a need for provision of more accessible and affordable alternatives to commercial waste disposal in the form of recycling and waste treatment centres.
- A stronger emphasis needs to be put on waste prevention
- More emphasis should be educating the public on the 3 RE's and add a fourth re-educate
- Need to think outside the box and communicate upwards to the sources of manufacture of much of the material that could be recycled if there were fewer variations to deal with.
- In addition to encouraging bio-degradable packaging, restricting manufacture of non-bio-degradable packaging to 3 types of plastic would simplify sorting and increase volumes to more commercial quantities
- Need to identify the sources of waste e.g. supermarkets produce more than local shops
- Consideration needs to be given to the cost of collection to deter fly tipping & abandonment of vehicles
- Assurances must be given that independent Waste Management companies are strictly controlled and monitored by Highland Council. Residents of Nairn should be consulted on any future Waste Management plans which will affect this locality
- Could consider requiring major stores to have their own waste disposal e.g. recycling of white goods packaging.
- There should be no imported waste from other parts of Scotland, UK or any other country.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- Inclusion of a more flexibly worded approach to EfW
- Inclusion of policy to emphasise waste prevention
- Inclusion of firmer policies for the commercial and industrial sectors to reduce packing and all users to reduce waste production
- Inclusion of provision for increased kerbside collection (i.e. more provision for of collection for glass, plastics & other recyclates)
- Inclusion of policy for waste to be transported by rail or water wherever possible/ within the Highland Council Local Authority area
- Inclusion of policies to ensure EfW proposals have a market for heating energy
- Inclusion of policies to ensure EfW facilities are designed to meet local needs
- Inclusion of policies to ensure that new developments will only be granted planning permission if they have the capability to deal with their own waste within the development
- Inclusion of policies to ensure recycling points in new developments
- Inclusion of allocated sites in line with Scottish Planning Policy & PAN 63
- Sites should be allocated to prevent waste being exported outwith Highland
- Inclusion of former Longman landfill as potential site for EfW facility, with an innovative design
- Policies to include other forms of waste management including IVC and Mechanical Biological Treatment, Anaerobic Digestion and plasma incineration
- Identification of the source of waste to inform the strategy

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Approach/ Strategy/ Background

- Scottish Government Zero Waste targets introduced in January 2008 require that 25% of municipal waste must go to EfW facilities by 2025. Currently less than 1% of municipal waste produced in the Highland area goes to EfW (a facility in Dundee)
- The Highland Council Waste Strategy has been informed by a joint study undertaken for Highland and Moray Councils. The initial modelling identified that recycling alone would not meet Scottish Government Zero Waste targets and that from as early as 2013, residual waste treatment would also be required. The study examined a number of scenarios, all of which had a mix of kerbside recycling, In Vessel Composting and EfW facilities. To reach the Landfill Directive targets by 2013 onwards new waste infrastructure is clearly necessary. If the maximum EfW capacity (25% or 40,000 tonnes per annum) is provided as soon as possible then the risk of failing to meet the Landfill Allowance Scheme thereafter significantly mitigated.
- Modelling also indicated that the provision of waste treatment capacity is likely to divert biodegradable waste from landfill at a lower cost per tonne than the introduction of additional kerbside recycling in rural areas.
- The strategy examined localised solutions vs. one centralised solution. Localised solutions ensure that transportation of waste is kept to a minimum and that waste can be treated as close to the source as possible, in line with the Proximity Principle

Regulation of Energy from Waste (EfW) facilities

- Energy from Waste describes the process in which energy (in the form of heat) is recovered from the incineration of waste, and used to generate electricity which is then fed back into the national grid, or provide both electricity and heat (combined heat and power) to nearby communities or other users.
- EfW facilities are heavily regulated on a number of levels. In 2000 the EU introduced tight emissions standards for waste incinerators (The EU Waste Incineration Directive 2000). The Directive aims to minimise the impact of negative effects on the environment and human health resulting from emissions to air, soil, surface and ground water from the incineration and co-incineration of waste.
- SEPA also control EfW facilities under the Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2000 – referred to as the PPC Regulations – and the Waste Incineration (Scotland) Regulations 2003. SEPA's Thermal Treatment of Waste Guidelines 2009 apply to all municipal solid waste and commercial and industrial waste that are treated at installations licensed under Part A of the PPC Regulations. The regulations are designed to ensure that thermal treatment facilities handling waste should:
 - Only treat residual waste (i.e. waste remaining after all efforts have been made to extract recyclable materials in order not to impede recycling and waste prevention efforts)
 - Be part of an integrated network of recycling and composting and other waste management facilities

- Recover and use the energy derived from waste efficiently
 - Should facilities adhere with the above, SEPA believe that, in principle, this will prevent EfW impeding on recycling efforts.
 - All potential EfW facilities will be considered major developments and subject to the full planning process which includes a statutory 12 week pre-application consultation period
 - EfW also reduces emissions of greenhouse gases through diversion of waste from landfill which would otherwise generate the powerful greenhouse gas methane during waste composition.
 - In terms of a source for heat generation, work is already underway with Scottish Government to 'map' users of heat to identify areas of demand and supply for renewable heat

Recycling/ new developments

- TECS Review of Waste Collection Strategy commenced in January 2010 – this includes a trial fortnightly 3 bin collection in Skye and Lochalsh. This is likely to be rolled out across the Highlands and will help to reduce the amount of waste produced and also recycled
- Supplementary Planning Guidance has also been prepared with the aim of streamlining recycling in new developments in order to ensure it is as important as other necessary infrastructure e.g. waste water infrastructure etc. This SPG will be consulted on alongside the HwLDP Proposed Plan and when implemented will provide a more consistent approach to providing recycling points and bin storage within new developments, including a reducing the requirement for recycling points from 1 to 500 houses to 1 to 100 houses.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Waste Management Facilities
Policy - Safeguarding of Waste Management Sites
Policy - Site Waste Management Plans

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Water Environment
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Water Environment
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Mrs L M MackIntosh (90), Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Avoch Community Council (103), Inverness Community Council (107), Nairn River Community Council (109), Julian Walford (155), Strathnairn Community Council (155), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Kincaig and vicinity Community Council (225), Michael Hutchison and Alison Lowe (226), Strutt and Parker – Balnagowan Estate (229), Patricia Roberts (247), Nigg and Shandwick Community Council (254), Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Scottish and Southern energy PLC (Jones Lang LaSalle) (268), Scottish Renewable (270), Mr and Mrs Stafford (272), Scottish Water (281), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), Scottish Property Federation (291), JG Walford (300), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), SportScotland (320), Scottish Government (324), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (326)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	Replace SP U3, FA11
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scottish Water should be retained in public ownership and should have elected members on board. • Eliminate all designations as they hinder development • Presume that SEPA advise • SEPA designation is very odd, Ness is poor because it is canalised • Plea for a realistic/pragmatic approach for planning, water, and disposal • Map boundaries of RBMP’s • SEPA should remain the statutory consultee on this issue, any additional involvement by the council will further confuse things and potentially cause delay in the process. • Ensure effective joint working between the bodies responsible for this. There are examples when this has not happened with SEPA starting a register for septic tanks when THC and SW had almost complete records on this. • SSE fully supports the importance given to protecting the water environment but feels that there is potential to confuse the planning process and result in a dual consenting process between planning permission and CAR licensing. They feel that consulting SEPA on a planning application is sufficient for them to highlight any material planning consideration. • Scottish Renewables: SEPA’s consideration under their license extends to hydrological, hydrology and ecological matters as well as extending to those of a social economic nature. Their experience from projects is that conflicts can occur between the planning authority’s consideration and SEPA’s consideration of impact on the water environment. • Confused as to whether the preferred option means we would not consult SEPA in the future. • The North Highland RBMP highlights the cost of substantial infrastructure, its potential cost to the public purse, and the competing priorities across the country for this money. It also states that SEPA will seek to ensure that future development plans consider the need for adequate sewage treatment. The 	

North Highland Area Management Plan recognises that the Inner Moray Firth has an increasing population which discharges into coastal waters that are also an SAC for bottlenose dolphins. It is pointed out that although the A96 corridor is mentioned as a case study, only one of the water supplies (Loch Ashie) is mentioned. In section 4 they would like to see the water bodies likely to be affected by abstraction and disposal with their current status given and then an assessment of the impact with reference to the scale of development proposed. This matter has been raised during consultation on the North Highland Area Management Plan.

- The most significant piece of legislation affecting SW management of our water resource is the Water Framework Directive. These resources are vast and our responsibility for these valuable resources cannot be underestimated. SW supports the principle of maintaining strong partnerships between all the parties involved in the protection and monitoring and are a member of the Area Advisory groups for River Basin Planning.
- Points made here relate to flood risk. They feel the councils approach is practical recognising that the siting of existing settlements makes avoiding all potential water damage difficult to achieve.
- The water environment also affects flooding so what is being done to coordinate these needs?
- Suggest that the council in partnership with others should identify opportunities for appropriate actions to improve water bodies that have been identified as less than good status.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- The Council should not have a policy which precludes development on the basis of adverse impact on the water environment, SEPA holds the relevant expertise and licenses and there should be no duplication with the Controlled Activities Regulations for the water environment.
- Restrictions on housing not connected to the mains sewerage will give further protection to the countryside. Increasing the area of a SSSI would give greater protection to water systems flowing into the lochs.
- Should be remove impact not reduce impact
- When assessing development proposals the council should take account of the RBMP for the Scotland River Basin District, relevant Area management Plans and supporting information on opportunities for improvements and constraints.
- Strategic policy is required to protect the water environment which refers to the Water Framework Directive (Section 2(2) Water Environment and Water services (Scotland) Act 2003) and to River Basin Management Plans.
- Scottish Government: You should consider whether the plan should identify the quality and status of water bodies as these will change over time and be influenced by much more than planning applications. It may be preferable just to provide a reference as to where this information can be obtained.
- The Council should take the opportunity to highlight the benefits that successful implementation of the Water Framework directive can bring in terms of ecological interest, recreation and amenity, tourism and other regeneration opportunities.
- It is important that the health and recreation benefits are acknowledged and that any policy ensures that development proposals are considered against the impact they may have on the sports and recreation interests in the water environment.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**On the councils relationship with SEPA on consideration of the water environment and on the new policy for the water environment**

A significant benefit of taking into account all relevant issues at the planning application stage is that weighing up these together allows us to more fully consider any proposal, and its suitability. For example the impact of any subsequent amendments to a proposal to improve impact on the water environment or to improve the design needs to be conscious of the other planning considerations which it may affect. This process also ensures upfront consideration of the issue rather than offering a planning permission which could be of no value with potential for the Controlled Activities Regulations to become a stumbling block thereafter.

Also whilst CAR regulates engineering activities directly associated with the water environment other aspects of a development may also have indirect impacts but not be directly controlled through CAR, For example, the construction of upland tracks have the potential in some circumstances to cause peat slide which could cause water pollution or where crossings are proposed they may have adverse impacts on minor water courses which whilst individually below the threshold for regulation may have the potential to create cumulative adverse impacts on the water environment if not avoided or designed and managed adequately through the planning process

For clarification this policy does not affect the way the Council consults with SEPA over planning applications. The Council will maintain the close working relationship with SEPA to benefit from their expertise and understanding of the water environment.

The Council does want to have the ability to do more than just consult SEPA, because we want to ensure we have the a policy framework so we can consistently consider impact on the water environment and can use this policy if necessary to influence amendment of or refusal of any unsuitable application.

On the North Highland Area Management Plan, concerns regarding the A96 corridor and its impact on the water environment

Public consultation responses are currently being considered as part of the production of a North Highland Area Management Plan and after this process is complete the finalised plan will be available. This will be available by end of August 2010.

However to allay concerns about sewerage treatment and impact on water bodies this issue was at the forefront of our early work and has continued as we have progressed. In 2005, the Council considered the first phase of the A96 Corridor Masterplan and commissioned the following Stage 2 work: Infrastructure studies covering electricity supplies, water and sewerage network and transport assessments. It should be noted that the A96 corridor work has also involved close consultation with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and overall proposals have been subject to Strategic Environment Assessment to test there adequacy in this regard. The preferred options have consistently recognised the numerous protected sites within the study area and these sites have been given priority in developing proposals that avoid the likliehood of negatively impacting on their integrity.

Scottish Water continues to work closely with the Council through the delivery of appropriate treatment capacity and will align its investment programme with development programmes. Substantial investment in both capital and investment, in both capital and operational terms, has been committed to support development on a

technical level before commencement of actual infrastructure.

The Councils recommended policy for the water environment also provides an appropriate test for proposals as they come through as planning applications. Planning authorities are legally designated responsible authorities in respect of Water Framework Directive interests and as such must exercise their designated functions so as to secure compliance with the requirements of the Directive. There is also further safeguard through SEPA as the Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) Act 2003 (WEWS Act) gave Scottish ministers powers to introduce regulatory controls over water activities, in order to protect, improve and promote sustainable use of Scotland's water environment. Discharges, disposal to land, abstractions, impoundments and engineering works are all regulated by SEPA through Controlled Activities License.

On effective joint working between the bodies regarding the register of septic tanks

Whilst SEPA supports and actively encourages staff to work together with stakeholders and other agencies it has to be appreciated that whilst we do not seek to create double regulation we must ensure that our statutory duties are upheld. For example with regard to septic tank installation a developer has to satisfy both Building Control and SEPA (Building Regulations and CAR) which in themselves are designed to achieve different but equally important objectives. With regard to the specific example given by yourselves it is apparent that the historical records did not cover all the existing septic tank installations and this was demonstrated when we received in excess of 33,000 registrations in the Dingwall office for the North of Scotland when fees were waived.

On the comment - SEPA designation is very odd, Ness is poor because it is canalised

This statement is not correct according to the 2008 classification. The Ness catchment contains 73 water bodies, three of which are artificial water bodies as they form part of the Caledonian Canal and all three are at good ecological potential. The River Ness Inverness Firth to Loch Ness is at good ecological status.

On considering development proposals in terms of their sport and recreation benefits, and on highlighting the many benefits from a good quality water environment

This point is important; however through direct reference to the RBMP's and relevant Area Management Plans we have covered this aspect. There is also text in the plan to state, 'It is important that the health and recreation benefits are acknowledged and that any policy ensures that development proposals are considered against the impact they may have on the sports and recreation interests in the water environment.' There is also text to refer to the many benefits from a good quality water environment.

On identifying opportunities for appropriate actions to improve water bodies that have been identified as less than good status, and on flooding and water environment concerns

This is achieved through the supplementary Area Management Plans, setting targets and actions, and looking at key issues for the area and how partnership organisations are working to resolve these through local and national action. This is delivered through the Area Advisory groups.

On increasing the area of a SSSI or restrictions on houses which cannot connect to the mains sewer

The review of SSSI's is the remit of Scottish Natural Heritage. However there is no need to increase the area of a SSSI as development proposals will be assessed for

the impact they may have on this designation not on whether they lie within the designated area. It is necessary to allow other private sewage treatment options in certain circumstances, in particular, where settlements are smaller, more dispersed in pattern and often not served by adequate existing or programmed existing public sewage systems. Then the proposal will be assessed for compliance with SEPA's policy on SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Settlements. http://www.sepa.org.uk/planning/waste_water_drainage.aspx . In every instance this ensures that the proposal is not likely to result in or add to significant environmental or health problems.

On eliminating all designations

There is a need to encourage sustainable development which balances social, economic and environmental considerations. This means that there is an important role for environmental designations which will ensure that our best environmental assets have a suitable level of protection.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Water Environment

Links to related guidance and legislation

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Lack of Emphasis on West Highland
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	None
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Portree Community Council (110), Staffin Community Council (111), Raasay Community Council (115), Kyleakin & Kylerhea Community Council (119), Lochbroom Community Council (120), Broadford & Strath Community Council (159), P. Bulloch (167), Theatres Trust (187), Fort William Waterfront Ltd (198), Eilean a' Cheò Ward (233), Lochaber Organisations (241), G. MacKenzie (278), Sleat Community Council (304), A. Henderson (332)	
Intended impact on approved development plan "general" policies	Replace West Highland element of Structure Plan Spatial Strategy. The proposed vision and spatial strategy below is complementary to the more detailed vision and strategy within the soon to be adopted West Highland & Islands Local Plan. Wester Ross issues have also been addressed.
Council's summary of the representation(s):	
<p>Most representors on this issue feel that the Main Issues Report gave insufficient emphasis to the particular circumstances, challenges and priorities of West Highland. Circumstances are generally very different to those experienced within the Inner Moray Firth particularly in terms of a greater dependency on effective transport links, an outstanding natural environment, a fragile economy, and a sparse and often remote population.</p> <p>Fear that too much emphasis on the east coast will encourage private and public expenditure to be directed there which in turn will accelerate the loss of young people and growth from the west thereby increasing fragility. A separate, positive vision and spatial strategy for West Highland would help re-balance priorities and lead to a fairer distribution of public investment and more balanced age profiles within all Highland communities. The spatial strategy should also follow the location of Highland's natural resources. For example, renewable energy resources such as wind, wave and tidal are plentiful in the west. West Highland also possesses an outstanding natural environment. The unique identity of West Highland should be recognised and nurtured as a social and heritage asset - for example Gaelic and crofting culture should be safeguarded and enhanced.</p> <p>Improved travel connections are vital to the social and economic prosperity of West Highland. Enhanced services and facilities could help expand tourism, trade in general and support lifeline communities. They could also allow expansion of event and national trail based tourism. Many communities only have one or two, often unreliable, connections with the outside world. Better connections are vital including: the trunk roads especially the A82; link roads within Fort William and Portree; the Corran, Minch and Small Isles ferry routes; along and to the Caledonian Canal, the West Highland rail line; air services to Skye and Fort William; national cycle routes along the Great Glen and to Skye, and between modes of travel especially for freight.</p> <p>One representor believes the term fragility should only apply to the environment not to the economic or social health of an area.</p>	

One representor believes the Council gives undue weight to the views of Plockton Community Council in making planning decisions.

The Theatres Trust requests more reference to, consultation on, and proposals for, events spaces within Fort William town centre.

Fort William Waterfront Ltd requests a reference to the Waterfront project and site because of its regional significance and National Planning Framework reference.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- A separate West Highland chapter within the Plan to reflect the aspirations and priorities of West Highland communities as detailed above.
- The use of the term fragility only applying to the environment.
- Support and developer contributions for arts events spaces within town centres.
- A reference to Fort William waterfront as a strategic development site.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

That the Plan should recognise West Highland's particular, peripheral and fragile nature by incorporating a tailored and positive Vision and Spatial Strategy for the area.

The word fragility is not exclusive to the natural environment but where the term is used the Plan will clarify what is fragile.

The Council does not give undue weight to any particular community or other interest group. The weight given to any representation relates more to whether it was lodged timeously, whether it contains valid and material reasons for support or objection and whether any robust evidence is supplied to justify those reasons.

Theatres are commercial or semi-commercial enterprises and do not relate directly to the impact of development in the same way that new children must be educated, safe road access must be provided and foul water must be disposed of. Therefore to seek developer contributions for these facilities would be seen by many as unreasonable. Measures related to improving the physical environment would be more justifiable for example enhancing civic squares and these spaces may provide events spaces and places for public art - for example Falcon Square in Inverness.

The relevant area local (development) plan - the West Highland & Islands Local Plan - contains an allocation for the Fort William Waterfront Project but the recent Council and developer decision not to pursue the proposal removes the need for an additional, regional policy commitment to the project.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Separate West Highland and Islands Vision and Spatial Strategy

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Wider Countryside
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Wider Countryside
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Auchengill & Nybster Grazings Committee (21), Laid Grazings Committee (83), Emac Planning - Castletown North East, Scotia Homes (335), Bowlts Chartered Surveyors (309), Inverlochy and Torlundy Community Council (318), Kirkton Farms (106), Nairn River Community Council (109), Kinlochbervie Community Council (112), Bryden Associates - Strathdearn Community Council (205), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Killearnan Community Council (144), Conon Brae Farms (146), Westhill Community Council (147), Philips Aitchison Limited (162), Mr Per Bullough (167), Highlands and Islands Green Party (168), Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council (203), Annie Stewart (172), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), Ian Cowan (185), Lynn Macdonald (188), Peter Roberts (194), Patricia Roberts (247), Maria De La Torre (196), Stop Highland Windfarms Campaign (213), Joyce Wilkinson (216), Michael Hutcheson & Alison Lowe (226), Strutt & Parker LLP (229), Ardross Community Council (236), Nigg & Shandwick Community Council (254), Ian Wilson (255), Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Diana Buchanan (265), Mr and Mrs Stafford (272), SportScotland (320), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (326)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	<p>There is no relevant general policy to replace within the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Replace non area-specific part of WHILP & Sutherland LP general policy on Wider Countryside</p>
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the second bullet point is it to protect “for” or “from” development ▪ Would encourage use of term “actively promote and support development” ▪ The policy needs clarification with the second and third bullet points are ambiguous and need clarification ▪ There are distinctions between areas, especially fragile areas ▪ The Council should use planning constraints as a method for protecting wider countryside and fragile areas as the Cairngorm National Park use. ▪ SEPA expects its preferred policy approach to waste water drainage to be incorporated to development in countryside and fragile areas There is a need to protect undeveloped important areas including agricultural land ▪ Need a holistic approach to Highland environment within the HwLDP ▪ Consistent approach welcomed, identification of areas for protection is important and support for development for fragile areas <p>Housing in wider countryside areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support potential to build houses in the wider countryside but not in groups ▪ Spacing requirements for housing development in the wider countryside should be consistent ▪ Seek clarification of the relationship between the Housing in the Countryside policy and the approach to the wider countryside and fragile 	

<p>areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Levels of growth should relate to local need ▪ Consistent approach required towards considering development proposals in the wider countryside ▪ In-migration will put pressure on countryside from desire for more housing development ▪ Would like added “support small scale development around existing house clusters” ▪ In crofting areas it is beneficial to be able to build houses to aid income streams <p>Infrastructure, Services and Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy needs linked to other related policies, need for other related green infrastructure ▪ There is a need to improve services in fragile areas to assist in retaining population support development of small settlements to this end ▪ Support role of smaller communities such as Conon Bridge and Alcaig in providing development land ▪ Does not contain suggestions for the development of sustainable communities ▪ All areas outwith A9 are fragile, not just those on map, Should support population increase, road development and support for business start-ups in these areas ▪ Cuillins of Skye and south and west of Fort William should be fragile areas ▪ New development should consider use of public transport or potential to walk or cycle, Encourage people to live and work in the countryside reducing need to travel
<p>Policy sought by those submitting representations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer to see the expansion of smaller sustainable settlements and creation of new settlements reducing the need for travel • Wish policy to presume against development where public transport is not available • Positive discrimination for development providing sustainable house design.
<p>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</p> <p>General</p> <p>The Main Issues Report sought views on particular topic issues and has developed a policy to guide development within the wider countryside area. This policy will also be assessed alongside other policies within the Proposed Plan. These policies deal with the consideration of development proposals and the protection of various interests including the natural, built and cultural heritage, species and habitats, landscape, the water environment and crofting and agriculture. These will be assessed alongside the wider countryside policy indicated below.</p> <p>The identified Fragile Areas are sourced from Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) and the indicators used to assess the fragility of an area. The indicators used by HIE are; population decline; population density; drive time to a mid-sized service centre and income per household. These areas have been agreed between HIE and the Scottish Government for targeting investment in remote and fragile communities.</p> <p>Housing in wider countryside areas</p> <p>The approach to housing in the countryside is indicated within the Housing in the</p>

Countryside Supplementary Guidance and also the Housing in the Countryside Siting and Design Guidance. The general approach differs between wider countryside and within the hinterland areas, with the wider countryside areas having a more permissive approach to the potential for housing development. The policy does guide potential development to seek sites that relate to existing housing groups with infill opportunities and also developing existing dispersed groupings and crofting townships.

The policy approach supports the development of housing proposals where these will assist in maintaining population and services in an area and also meeting local housing needs; this is most pertinent in fragile areas where the loss of these is particularly felt.

The Siting and Design guidance gives advice on how to identify sites where development can be accommodated and integrated in the landscape, further guidance is to be prepared offering advice on Sustainable Design.

Infrastructure, Services and Employment

The development of infrastructure in wider countryside and fragile areas is reliant to a greater extent on public sector investment. Where these services are not readily accessible the development of more sustainable development is key to maintaining many rural areas. Through the provision of better communication infrastructure the potential for employment opportunities that have a lesser requirement for the need to travel. The aim of the Highland Council and other key agencies is to deliver initiatives, investment and policy in order to assist in developing the viability of rural communities while taking full consideration of social, environmental and landscape issues.

The Council continues to support the development of rural areas, which comprise much of Highland because this will help maintain population, infrastructure and services. There are in particular many crofting and other 'townships' in the Plan area, not defined by Settlement Development Areas but where there is significant settlement within a locality and which is identifiable loosely as an established rural community.

However, development can have a significant impact upon the character of the landscape. Proposals should be sympathetic to this and landscape is a key consideration. A policy in respect of all these considerations will assist in delivering the potential for development while also taking into account impacts on the environment.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy - Wider Countryside

See Committee Draft papers for wording

Issue (heading):	Wild Land
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Wild Land
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
<p>Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2) Staffin Community Council (13), Lucy Shadforth (15), Irene Brandt (18), Juliet Robinson (34), Save our Dava (68), Gordon Mooney (71) Mr David Mathews (91) Kingairloch Estate LLP (95), Crown Estate (100), Kirkton Farms (106), Nairn River Community Council (109), Wind Energy Glencalvie Ltd (113), SNH (118), Conon Brae Farms (146), Westhill Community Council (147), Elizabeth Budge (148), Cromarty Arts (150), Julian Walford (155) Roland Mardon (156), Per Bullough (167), Scottish Council for Development and Industry (180), West Coast Energy (184), Ian Cowan (185), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Ann MacLeod (206), Stop Highland Windfarms Campaign (213), Kincaig and vicinity Community Council (225), Michael Hutcheson and Alison Lowe (226), Strutt and Parker LLP (229), Ardross Community Council (236), Patricia Roberts (247), Nigg and Shandwick Community Council (254), Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Council (256), Roger Piercy (257), Diana Buchanan (265), Scottish and Southern energy PLC (268), Scottish Renewables (270), European Forestry Resources (275), Scottish Wildlife Trust (285), JG Walford (300), Bowlts Chartered Surveyors (308), Inverloch and Torlundy Community Council (318), Brenda Steele (319), Sport Scotland (320), Scottish Government (324)</p>	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies	No current policies
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>On Defining Wild land</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPG 14 makes it clear that wild land is not just of local importance but of higher significance in some areas. Recognise that it is difficult to integrate this concept when there are no designations and suggest it may be better just to state their high importance. It would be useful to include the definition from NGG14 of wild land. • Definition is important and it should only be where there are no signs of previous occupation. • Feels these are well monitored by RSPB and National Trust etc. • Interested in how we define wild areas. • Very subjective concept and open to interpretation, likely to remain undeveloped. • Introduction should have said that Highland region contains the largest area which qualifies for this description in Great Britain. • Believes it is equally important to take account of the cultural landscape. • Much wild land was occupied historically. • All wild land areas are important regardless of whether they are designated. One large windfarm will impact greatly on many surrounding areas. There is a need for a holistic approach to landscape. • Depends on the areas identified. • Answer is to get this designation into legislation. • Feels that it isn’t viable to protect it all • Wild land is important for recreational purposes, and agree with the SPP loose definition of remoter mountain and coastal areas. • They also feel that there are areas of land which would not be defined as wild but where it is a feature. They feel this feature needs to be part of assessment of proposals. 	

Reasons we should we protect Wild land?

- This restriction cannot be dealt with through other designations as wildness is not a feature on which they have been selected.
- Respect the precautionary principle, wildness is a resource that has only recently begun to be researched. These areas should be protected whilst further work is done into the public's perception of its value.
- Some settlements should be protected from further development to stop these areas being ruined forever.
- Although this is emotive to locals, the national and international public expect to find areas of wildness.
- This should have been done decades ago.
- SNH: feel the alternative option is misleading as there is clear national policy to identify and protect wild land areas.
- Strict constraints must be applied to ensure that it remains wild.
- Agree but would not wish other local designations in addition to this, they feel it should get protection of grade 1 agricultural land (should not be lost unless justification is provided)
- Locally this has been eroded and would like to see this better protected. Where they are close to centres of population they are particularly valuable. HC has continually neglected the importance of wild land in favour of development and promise of jobs.
- All open areas/woodland are important for species links, at the moment loss of habitat is accepted and for biodiversity reasons this should now no longer be accepted.
- Feels the word mitigation never seems to carry weight and any controls are never 100% effective.

How Wild Land should influence renewable energy and other development opportunities

- All green energy projects should balance need for this against biodiversity.
- Where is the restraint with regard to powerlines and windfarms.
- Green energy should be considered wherever possible.
- Some areas might be ok
- As it may be needed for renewable energy which has clear local, national, and European benefits. Each application should be considered on its merits.
- Consider that the alternative option should apply for renewable energy proposals since SPP6 intention is that wind energy proposals should be accommodated where environmental and cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily addressed.
- Proposals which have economic development element such as renewable energy and aquaculture are vitally important to communities at the edge.
- What is meant by 'take into account' there needs to be a stronger standard protection.
- Feel that wild land could be a significant constraint to development.
- Urge caution on wild land policy to avoid precluding the infrastructure in relation to renewable energy projects which are often best suited to remote, isolated areas where the resource tends to be strongest.
- Uncomfortable with the idea that renewable energy developments would be unsuitable on wild land as they experience has shown they do harmoniously co-exist.
- Needs to be cross referenced with fragile areas/wider countryside as these are linked policies, there is a potential conflict between supporting fragile areas and protecting wild land.

On public consultation

- Take more account of the local community in relation to this option

- More local consultation would be good.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

On Defining Wild land

- A larger area than SNH would promote for designation should be protected if the public demands this. Many proposals are being considered in areas which do not meet the limiting government criteria but which we consider are sensitive to this issue.
- Wildness value is based on landscape perception as much as tangible feature and therefore perception must be included instead of over reliance on number of potential observers (beneficiaries) or designated areas. Development outwith could impact on wild land.

On how we should protect wild land?

- Scottish Government: Support our intention to protect wild land from inappropriate development and we should consider integrating it with the natural and cultural heritage policy and aim to avoid an overly complex policy approach.
- SNH: important to see the wording of the SPP to gauge whether wild land should be included as a locally/regionally important feature or as a nationally important feature. The current NPPG talks of being valued internationally and nationally for their quality. The Highland Council need to highlight that these designations would only affect developments which would have significant impacts upon the special qualities otherwise it may be misconstrued that they will result in widespread restrictions. The policy should cover impacts on wild areas so that development outwith the designated areas are considered.
- SNH: are not in position to identify areas further than the Search Areas for Wild Land (SAWL). However they would welcome a project which could identify these areas further and can be added as Supplementary Guidance. In the meantime they would be happy to assist in work to develop a criteria based policy by which wild land can be identified and potential impacts assessed.
- Concerns are less about the wild land itself but that policies do not result in a buffer effect which would sterilise a disproportionate area.
- Policy should refer to acceptability of various levels of impact it should also refer to character change – whether a landscape change relates to its special qualities of wildness.

How wild land should influence renewable energy and other development opportunities

- The implication of the second bullet is that some development may be appropriate on wild land. If truly wild land is identified which may be quite limited in extent then suggest that no development over than overriding national interest should be allowed. Once there is development on wild land then it becomes more difficult to define as wild land (but this may be an unrealistic approach). The glossary definition, 'relative lack of human activity or change may be key to protection of wild land, where it maintains the character of relative lack of human activity or change.
- Policy should weigh in favour of renewable energy schemes.
- Wild land should be made a constraint to inappropriate development.
- Wild land should not be constraint on development.
- Considers that wild land could represent a serious constraint for renewable energy developments feeling that there are sufficient natural heritage designations in place. SPP6 does not identify wild land as a constraint so the preferred option would be in conflict. There are significant international and national obligations to increase renewable energy development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

- Contradicts the supportive approach of SPP6 which does not identify wild land as a policy constraint. In striking a balance it is also important to consider the ecological impacts on the status and ecology of wild land if we fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change.

On consultation

- The preferred option should set out to consult on the identification of wild land and the policy against which it will be assessed – they believe there is a need for balance the need for strategic environmental long term protection (such as renewable energy production to mitigate climate change).

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Wild land is an important natural heritage resource for the Highlands which also has economic significance to our tourism and film industry. Therefore it is important that it receives appropriate policy protection. Identifying wild land and having policy protection would be supportive of the position within SPP (2010) which says, 'The most sensitive landscapes may have little or no capacity to accept new development. Areas of wild land character in some of Scotland's remoter upland, mountain and coastal areas are very sensitive to any form of development or intrusive human activity and planning authorities should safeguard the character of these areas in the development plan.'

Whilst Scottish Government support the protection of wild land there is no imminent likelihood of a wild land designation. The Council therefore intends to produce a piece of Supplementary Guidance for the protection of Wild Land; this will include mapping of Wild Land, alongside some additional policy guidance. This Supplementary Guidance will be subject to wider public consultation, and we will ensure that everyone who makes a representation on this topic within the HwLDP or who otherwise express interest in being consulted on this Supplementary Guidance, is consulted when this is prepared.

In the meantime it is recommended that a criteria based approach should apply to determine whether the proposed development is within wild land (this assessment includes both physical attributes and perceptual response) and then to determine whether the impact is unacceptable. The approach can be read in the appendix 6.3 definitions of Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage features. To produce this assessment developers would refer to Scottish Natural Heritage: Assessing the Impacts on Wild land interim guidance note.

It is recognised that it is modern signs of use rather than historic use that impinges on the qualities of wild land. For instance there may be signs of previous occupation from an abandoned crofting community and this would not detract from its qualities of wildness. As mentioned in one response there is a need to take account of the cultural landscape.

In response to those who feel we need to weigh in favour of renewable energy projects, and for those who are interested in how the protection for wild land should be applied, our Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage policy will allow for developments where they can be shown not to compromise the amenity and heritage resource of the wild land. However this consideration must be balanced with any social or economic benefits, but will not be interpreted as support to all renewable energy projects regardless of their impact on the wild land. The planner's assessment will need to consider issues such as whether there are: suitable alternative opportunities within less sensitive locations for this type of development; what the proposals relative contribution is towards renewable energy targets and any other social or economic benefits, and weigh these up with the proposals impact on the isolated coast. To do

this the developer will need to submit any relevant assessments including Environmental Impact Assessment where appropriate, along with the specifics of the proposal including any mitigation and restoration arrangements proposed. From this type of assessment the planner will be able to judge whether the impact is outweighed by social or economic benefits.

Concern is raised that there is potential conflict between supporting developments which will assist fragile communities, and protecting wild land. There could be development proposals which in some respects may help support fragile communities but which may not be considered appropriate because of their detrimental impact on wild land resource. However this impact could have significance to our tourism and film economy, and to our natural heritage. Therefore there needs to be an appropriate level of protection provided and our policy seeks to strike an appropriate balance requiring consideration of whether social or economic benefits would outweigh any negative impacts.

There is concern about a 'buffer' type effect resulting from protection of wild land. However it is considered that a development from outwith the wild land can still impact on the wild land - from noise, impact on views and light pollution. The impact of policy that does not acknowledge this would allow development which compromises the wild land and reduces the extent of the wild land. We cannot protect wild land without also providing some measure of protection from development on land nearby (if this would have an unacceptable impact on the wild land) and therefore the policy is framed to protect wild land in this way.

Wild land and onshore wind energy

The Council is preparing new planning policy and guidance for onshore wind energy, following the approach set out in Scottish Planning Policy (2010) and in PAN45 Annex 2. Whilst Scottish Government in setting out that approach does not specifically refer to Wild Land, it could potentially be included amongst the "other constraints and policy criteria" that we identify (Stage 2 as described in PAN45 Annex 2). Scottish Planning Policy (paragraph 190) makes it clear however that development plans should recognise that the existence of these constraints on wind farm development but does not impose a blanket restriction on development. Furthermore, PAN45 Annex 2 (paragraph 61) indicates that it may be necessary to reconsider the approach taken in stages 2 and 3 in the PAN if the areas of search for wind energy development that result are not sufficiently broad.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Better definition of Wild Land and criteria for its delineation and protection in Appendix - Definition of Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Features.
Appendix also contains commitment to future Supplementary Guidance on topic including mapping of areas.

Policy - Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage

See Committee Draft papers for wording.

Issue (heading):	Renewable Energy – 2- Onshore Wind
Relevant Main Issues Report heading:	Renewable Energy – Q.23
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):	
Coriolis Energy (1), Mountaineering Council of Scotland (2), David Craig (4), Irene Brandt (18), Roderick MacLean Ass. (27), E.ON UK (31), Nigg Awareness Group (43), Save our Dava (68), Jones Lang LaSalle - Wind Energy Glencalvie Ltd (113), Scottish Natural Heritage (118), Elizabeth Budge (148), Hugh Murray (149), Cromarty Arts (150), Per Bullough (167), Highlands & Islands Green Party (168), Tain Community Council (175), West Coast Energy Ltd (184), Grantown Community Council (192), Anne Thomas (197), Strathdearn Community Council (205), Doug Kippen (212), Stop Highland Windfarms (213), Ken Nicol (215), Ian Parsons (217), Ardross Community Council (236), John Waring (250), Eveline Waring (253), Nigg and Shandwick Community Council (254), Roger Piercy (257), Caithness Windfarm Information Forum (261), Spittal Windfarm Opposition Group (262), Jones Lang LaSalle – Scottish and Southern Energy (268), Scottish Renewables (270), Pete Campbell (290), Scottish Government (324)	
Intended impact on approved development plan “general” policies:	Replace Structure Plan Policies E1, E2, E4, E7, E8, U1, G4 Drop E3, U2
Council’s summary of the representation(s):	
<p><u>Planning Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support intended strategic spatial planning for renewables in either the LDP or SG with reference to Annex A SPP6. • Concern that the Council do not yet have SPP6 compliant policy in place for renewables and that until it does it affects competency in dealing with applications. • Scottish Government welcomes the commitment to the production of supplementary guidance on renewable energy in line with the requirements of SPP. It is Scottish Government’s intention that, in time, spatial frameworks for windfarms will be incorporated fully into development plans, and the Council should consider whether this can be done in the Proposed Plan. This should show search areas in addition to areas of significant protection, and make clear that this does not lead to a sequential approach which rules out proposals outwith the search areas. • The broad areas of search to be identified will have a bearing on the spatial strategy of the Plan, for renewables and infrastructure. It would be appropriate for this to be in the Plan as well as the Supplementary Guidance. This would be consistent with the Development Plan Regulations and associated advice regarding the scope of LDPs and SG. Identification of broad areas of search should be informed by consultation with SSE and other renewable energy developers, to take account of technical considerations of development as well as constraints. • Concern that the MIR wind energy section does not say enough about what the spatial policy will be and on alternatives to that, and feel there should be 	

reasonable alternatives given when we produce supplementary guidance, or there will be insufficient opportunity to engage. This section may require inclusion in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal.

Policy Options

- Onshore windfarm development should be supported in advance of grid issue resolution. The areas for significant protection map should replace the old renewables strategy map.
- Onshore windfarms should be limited to current extent and resources concentrated in offshore developments. Also renewable energy should be generated closer to users so as to minimise the upgrade of pylons.
- It is incorrect to claim that “onshore wind is making a huge contribution to renewable energy production”. Such a statement perpetuates the “greenwash” of windfarm developers. Highland Council must distance itself from this spin and seriously consider the ethical issues of promoting developments which will destroy the internationally famous Highland landscape and wildlife, increase fuel poverty and do nothing to reduce carbon emissions.
- Oppose the further development of onshore windfarms on basis of impact on scenery, operation over only a narrow range of wind speeds which frequently requires other forms of energy which operate below their optimum efficiency, and as a waste of money. The rational long-term main source of electricity should be nuclear.
- Onshore windfarms should be actively discouraged. The technology is not good enough and the Community Benefit that is supposed to be a reward for having a windfarm in a community’s locality is a minefield (cites difficulties particularly where multiple community council areas are involved).
- Whilst the LDP is welcomed, some of the preferred options may restrict rather than encourage the commercial development of wind energy in the Highlands. It should be understood that renewable energy not only contributes to carbon reduction but also to the vision for the economy.
- Reduce wind developments in favour of developing marine (marine can meet Scotland’s needs). Look at local wind developments closer to new business developments to meet their needs e.g. at Schools, Swimming Pools, THC offices, etc.
- Do not agree with the preferred option. The stated alternative is surely a prerequisite of the preferred option, i.e. windfarm developments will need the grid to be present and have capacity in order that they can produce and output energy.

Spatial Framework

- The Plan needs to be clear that, in accordance with PAN45 Annex 2, there is to be no sequential approach to wind energy development policy and no blanket restrictions and rather that the Council should set out the areas of constraint and each application should be assessed on its merits.

- Against the idea of broad areas for search, but there is need to identify the presumption against areas. The development industry plus the national grid are working to overcome constraints and there is development of new technology to consider therefore policy guidance must remain flexible enough to accommodate changes. Most of the suitable major sites have been developed so against continuation of spatial approach as there is a need for assessment on their individual merit. Wants to see criteria policy based on the principles and requirements of EIA. Must provide that developers must address to prove that sites outwith these search areas are suitable for development.
- GIS accumulation of constraints does not in itself suggest the best locations, merely the least constrained, without assessing these constraints against the proposals. The only effective way to assess suitability is through EA, backed by careful design informed by initial results of that assessment. An alternative wind energy policy is required to allow proposals outwith search areas to be considered on their merits. Strategic policy does not take onboard and therefore elements of suitability remain uncertain until detailed site assessment is completed (access, grid connection/cost, geo technical issues, hydrology and protected species). SG should remove the need to comply with search areas.
- Identification of National and Major preferred areas for wind farm development has been of limited success and with operators moving towards larger but fewer turbines this approach needs to be reevaluated.
- The map showing preferred areas is not detailed enough to examine properly and provide detailed comment. Also it seems to be at odds with HRES which was widely consulted on.
- Concerned that the detailed diagram from HRES is not included.
- There have to be well-evidenced reasons for protecting areas. National and international natural heritage value has to be set against the need for local communities to develop self sufficiency in energy provision. The people living in the Areas for Significant Protection should have the final say on whether renewable energy should be developed in their area.
- Consider that generating capacity and its impact are not highly emphasised when considering planning applications. Environmental acceptability should be considered and should be tested on a case by case basis, in line with paragraph 3 of Annex A SPP6: "Development plan policies should be based on the principle that windfarms should be accommodated where the technology can operate efficiently and environmental and cumulative impacts can be addressed satisfactorily". A criteria based approach for the rest of the Highland area is appropriate.
- Additional matter to be considered is available wind resource because a better wind resource would enable less turbines and less impact for same production.
- Necessary to add for significant protection those areas where cumulative limit has been reached. Cumulative impact has become an important issue within the Highlands.
- Experience elsewhere suggests that capacity of Search Areas can be reduced

significantly by certain individual development unless they follow common design objectives for the whole search area. Guidance on this issue is soon to be published as part of SNH's updated siting and design guidance for windfarms.

- 20MW equates to a cluster of 10 giant turbines – this is too high a threshold for protected areas. Even a single 2MW turbine will be a dominant feature of the landscape over many miles. The threshold should be less than a few kW i.e. no bigger than a domestic turbine.
- The protected areas shown on the map are not extensive enough and do not coincide with the fragile areas delineated on another map in the MIR.
- There should be additional extensive buffer zones (at least 20 miles) around fragile and wild land areas. Even if turbines lie outwith designated wild land areas, they can severely diminish the wild land experience even from distance of 20 miles away.
- The areas for significant protection from windfarms over 20MW seem to have been made without reference to where would generate the maximum energy and be easiest to connect to the grid. The area round Dounreay would be an obvious place which is windy and already has high voltage lines. Windfarms would bring welcome capital to the area.
- The Creich area already has 2 major windfarms, with a third waiting for grid connection. Yet the area is zoned on the map in the MIR as one designated for significant protection. This does not make sense. The map appears to have been drawn without sufficient reference to what is happening on the ground.
- Concerned that the area between Thurso and Reay (and south of it) appears to be indicated as acceptable for windfarm development. This is against HRES and also against some proposals already rejected by the Council.
- Ardross should be included in the area of significant protection because of the issue of cumulative impact of windfarms in line with PAN45, given the existing and planned windfarm and hydroelectric schemes in the area.
- The map in the MIR showing operational and approved windfarms is incorrect, as the Nigg windfarm has not yet been approved.
- The Nigg Hill area should be protected from windfarm development as it is unsuitable for that and other visually intrusive development. There is a need to protect the pictish landscape of the eastern seaboard and the Nigg/Cromarty suitors.
- Failure to tackle climate change will have a much worse effect on the environment than the visual impact of a few windmills. Lack of power and income will have a catastrophic effect on the whole of the Highland economy and consequently on the ability to care for the environment.
- Many in rural communities remain unconvinced of the merits of large (export) scale renewable options – especially onshore wind. Installations and associated infrastructure are considered to have a detrimental impact on landscape, environmental, cultural and economic issues. Also approval for an initial on-shore windfarm development with associated infrastructure is seen to favour further

development in that area as the capital costs have already been met.

- Rural communities in selected areas experience the problems of large scale renewable generation with few of the benefits as there is little in the way of ongoing employment and a concern that, as technology moves on, rural communities will be left with the legacy of decommissioning redundant structures. With this in mind, would wish to see an emphasis on a hierarchy of policies to minimise impacts through:
 - Reduce energy demand;
 - Clarity on the real and cumulative impacts;
 - Timely, open and accountable consultation with local communities.
- Areas shown on the map which may be subject to 'significant protection' are inadequate and leave large areas of wildland around Strathdearn open to large-scale windfarm development proposals and generate uncertainty in local communities.
- The MIR should acknowledge the direct and cumulative impact of further large-scale onshore windfarm developments in the Highlands (including the Strathdearn area). Such developments do not place the interests of Highland residents or visitors to the fore. The Highland Council should champion the NPF2 policy which refers to the important role that the natural heritage of the area plays in tourism, leisure and sustainability.
- Greater clarity regarding areas to be protected from large-scale onshore windfarms is required in the Plan (as well as the Supplementary Guidance) taking account of the direct and cumulative impacts on areas with a wildland setting but not with national or international designations but often part of the same ecosystem. The natural heritage of the Highlands is a defining Scottish icon in both the national psyche and worldwide markets from tourism to whisky and should be safeguarded.
- Policies to address cumulative impact and capacity are a priority.
- There appear to be little or no plans to control windfarms of lower than 20MW capacity. This is a serious concern as all wind turbines, regardless of group size, are significant in a landscape and environment. The cumulative effect of multiple small scale (under 20MW) windfarms would be disastrous, and an appropriate policy is required.
- Visual impact and environmental impact are paramount considerations in the Highlands.
- It should be noted that it would be quite possible for wind farms to be located in locations distant to existing high voltage grid infrastructure, as electricity network connections could potentially be provided. In addition, considering the long lead-in time for additional high voltage infrastructure, the Plan should contain a positive planning policy for assessing proposed extensions to existing wind farms, where there is existing infrastructure and existing tested environmental information.
- Windfarms can generate large amounts of income for local communities.
- The use of the phrase 'protection from windfarms' is problematic. There is no evidence that windfarms are damaging to anything. They certainly have an impact

(especially visual) but this is a subjective view and that fact should be recognised in any planning guidelines.

- All planning for windfarms should be considered on a basis of individual merit rather than on a broad brush or arbitrary map line. Merit should include community benefit.

Further Considerations

- The draft LDP and forthcoming SG should recognise that supporting infrastructure may require to be located in the areas for significant protection and addresses this through policy.
- Reference to SPP6 about impact of likely new grid infrastructure and need for this to be reflected in SG.
- Need to take recreational interests into account more – this means minimising disruption to access. Benefit in the LDP recognising areas where recreation is important – engage interest groups to inform this.
- Concern about impact on adjacent areas such as hydrology impact on peatlands.
- The bodies of water and lochs that make up the Caithness Lochs SPA support internationally important numbers of migratory geese and swans. It may well state in planning policy that buffer zones are not allowed but this would appear to go against the spirit of Natura 2000; protection should be not only for the surface water area but also the feeding grounds in between.
- HRES was reasonable; concerned that new approach is an open house for development, to accord with ad hoc decisions of government. Would like to see Cairngorm National Park have complete protection and nearby including Dava.
- The MIR should have indicated that the Highlands has the largest area of land fitting the wild land description in Great Britain. The Council should broaden the SNH areas for wild land to far broader areas if the public demands this. Too many windfarm proposals are sensitive to this issue but do not qualify under the strict government criteria. Intangible qualities are picked up by the public in their objections and require the fullest formal consideration.
- Believe that it is important to wider public that relative wild land is protected. Concerned about sacrificing habitat for climate change agenda.
- In order to avoid further major and onerous constraints on renewable energy development, wild land should not be designated. SPP6 does not identify wild land as a policy constraint. It is also important to consider the direct climate change impacts on the status and ecology of 'wild land' which may be considerable if there is a failure to mitigate climate emissions.
- SNH is assisting the Council in the landscape study being undertaken but realise there are various scenarios that may be acceptable to the Council, accommodating only where renewable energy would not change the intrinsic pattern and distribution of landscape types and valued views, or may selectively protect some views or character types. To establish thresholds needs strategic

design aims for example clustering of developments, or dispersal, and in relation to sequential effects along key routes. This highlights the need for alternatives to be discussed as part of supplementary guidance.

- Revenue from windfarms is taken by the company owning the turbines and is lost to the area, limiting the amount of benefit gained from the development by the local area. The Plan should say that favourable consideration should be given to any planning application for the erection of wind turbines by local people, and planning rules reasonably relaxed in these instances.
- Significant protection required for landscapes of cultural value.
- Windfarms should not be sited in close proximity to settlements and housing. Plan policy should protect residential amenity so that, in accordance with SPP6 and the clarification provided by the Minister's office, it is not detrimentally affected in the long term by wind farm developments and should make it clear that this protection is afforded to single dwellings, as well as towns and villages, both within and without a separation distance of 2 kilometres.
- There is a need for information on how the Council takes into consideration capacity for windfarms.
- The Plan needs to quantify what constitutes an unacceptable cumulative impact, so that it is clear to all involved where wind farms would or would not be acceptable.

Policy sought by those submitting representations:

- SPP-compliant policy framework, including areas of cumulative limit and policies to address cumulative impact and capacity.
- Continuing the approach in HRES.
- Supportive policy for onshore windfarm developments to be considered on their merits, including community benefit.
- Non-supportive policy for further onshore windfarm development anywhere in Highland.
- Policy identifying areas of presumption against development but generally consideration of proposals on their merits, following criteria policy based on EIA and without steer to search areas.
- Clear policy framework to control wind energy developments under 20MW, including consideration of cumulative impacts.
- Less restrictive approach to development, minimising identification of constraints.
- More restrictive approach to development, identifying additional constraints and through higher levels of protection to environment, amenity, etc.
- Positive policy for assessing proposed extensions to windfarms.
- Policy acceptance of potential need for infrastructure to be located in areas for significant protection.
- Relaxed planning policy for erection of wind turbines by local people.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Planning Process

The spatial planning framework which the Council is preparing for onshore wind energy will comply with Scottish Planning Policy (2010), which consolidated earlier national policy in SPP6 with other SPPs. The Council is following the approach set out in Scottish Planning Policy and in PAN45 Annex 2. Whilst parts of HRES will remain relevant, the Council has previously noted and accepted criticism of certain other parts of it. Specifically, following a windfarm public inquiry in summer 2007 where HRES was tested the Reporter concluded that HRES did not conform to the more recent SPP6. HRES was faulted in that it set out a sequential approach; did not reflect the 'presumption in favour' of wind energy development in the Highland Structure Plan and in SPP6; and did not take account of landscape character, sensitivity or capacity. Therefore, whilst the approach set out in HRES has support from some interested parties, the Council must prepare new guidance.

The policies proposed for inclusion in the Highland wide Local Development Plan provide an overarching policy framework for the consideration of wind energy proposals. The spatial framework will provide an evidence-based spatial expression of these considerations in order to help steer development. The Council therefore maintains that it will be competent for the spatial framework and associated advice to be expressed in and brought forward through Supplementary Guidance, and there will remain the option of incorporating elements of it into future Local Development Plans if that were considered to be advantageous. The Supplementary Guidance is being developed through engagement and will be developed further through more formal consultation.

The range of issues currently to be considered in respect of wind energy developments is clear from the development plan, supplementary planning guidance, national policy and advice and other material considerations. EIA provides valuable information about proposals. Applications can therefore be competently assessed and determined in advance of the new spatial framework being in place.

Policy Options

The Council's position in HRES is that it is supportive in principle of the development of a range of renewable energy technologies, including further development of onshore wind and this fits with national policy. Whilst there are parts of Highland which are experiencing significant amounts of windfarm development, which needs to be carefully planned for in terms of individual and cumulative impacts, there is no evidence indicating to the Council that all of Highland's potential to accommodate windfarms has been taken up. Therefore there is no basis for a blanket policy resisting further windfarms.

Onshore wind energy in the Highlands is making a substantial contribution to renewable energy production. Progress against the HRES targets is provided in the Monitoring Statement which was published alongside the MIR. The further development of onshore wind energy is an important component of a wider strategy for renewable energy regionally and nationally, as well as an important component of national strategy for energy production from all sources. It is acknowledged that onshore wind will not provide for all of our energy needs.

Spatial Framework

In developing the Council's Supplementary Guidance (SG) for On-Shore Wind, the approach set out in national policy is being followed:

- identifying areas which will be afforded significant protection;
- identifying other constraints and policy criteria;
- refining remaining areas of no significant constraints, to identify broad areas of search (providing a stronger steer to developers); and
- setting out other guidance indicating the considerations that will be taken into account, information required as part of applications and how it will be assessed.

Scottish Planning Policy sets out a number of parameters, including the following:

- Spatial frameworks should not be used to put in place a sequential approach to determining applications which requires applicants proposing development outwith an area of search to show that there is no capacity within areas of search.
- Development plans should recognise that the existence of constraints on wind farm development does not impose a blanket restriction on development.
- Planning authorities should not impose additional zones of protection around areas designated for their landscape or natural heritage value.
- Grid constraints should not be used as a development constraint where renewable energy potential exists.

The Council intends its new Supplementary Guidance to fit within these parameters.

The spatial framework will be strategic in its nature, giving direction by flagging areas that are most constrained, areas that are subject to other particular constraints and generally encouraging windfarm developers towards the least constrained areas (and those offering particular opportunity).

Whilst much of the methodology for the spatial framework is effectively prescribed by Scottish Government, there is significant scope for the Council to choose how to manage development with regard to landscape and cumulative considerations and certain local/ regional constraints. In doing so the Council must be careful not to overly restrict the broad areas of search for windfarms. Certain of the constraints included and how they might be used in the spatial framework will be subject of the consultation on the Supplementary Guidance. There is also some scope for the Council to consider how it wishes to manage developments of 20MW or under. Certainly the intention is that the Supplementary Guidance will cover these smaller developments as well; it is anticipated that there will be growing interest in developing such smaller schemes, be it development by communities or by commercial operators.

However, it should be noted that the Areas for Significant Protection are largely determined by the presence of areas designated for their national or international natural heritage value, which are subject to specific protection in law and national policy which will be very important considerations in the assessment of proposals.

Whilst the spatial framework will provide a locational steer to development, it will also provide a basis for the consideration of proposals that are located in any part of Highland on their merits and, as indicated above, this will avoid a sequential approach and blanket restrictive policies.

The intention is that mapping of wind resource and distance from grid will not be used to determine planning constraints to development but rather will provide

additional information which will help to identify areas of greater potential opportunity for development, where the wind resource is good and the grid at hand.

The Supplementary Guidance will provide opportunity to provide further advice about how we will be looking for developments to be designed and located to reflect the scale and character of the landscape and to seek to minimise landscape and visual impact, subject to any other considerations. The principle is included in the proposed Renewable Energy Developments policy. The SG will provide opportunity to explain how this will enable best use to be made of capacity for wind energy developments.

The mapping of Fragile Areas in the MIR is not directly relevant to windfarm development and will not be used as a planning constraint in the spatial framework in the SG. Fragile areas are areas which are in decline or in danger of becoming so as a consequence of remoteness and socio-economic factors. It is not mapping of fragility in terms of the environment. In some cases, appropriate renewable energy development may actually help to support fragile communities.

Exclusion of an area from the Areas for Significant Protection will not indicate that no protection will apply, nor that the area is necessarily acceptable for any windfarm proposal. It will signify that in general terms the area is less heavily constrained. It will still be necessary for proposals to be assessed carefully in terms of any constraints that are present. The mapping of Areas for Significant Protection in the MIR was only a work in progress and broadly illustrative. Those who are seeking protection or development opportunity for particular areas will have opportunity to comment on full mapping as part of consultation on the SG.

The status of the Nigg Hill windfarm proposal was incorrectly depicted on the mapping in the MIR. That mapping is not repeated in the Plan itself and we will ensure that any mapping used for the SG is correct.

The Renewable Energy Developments policy includes specific reference to consideration of proposals for the extension of existing renewable energy facilities and the SG will provide additional advice about opportunities and constraints in these circumstances.

Further Considerations

The Electricity Transmission Infrastructure policy provides a basis for assessing proposals for infrastructure provision and seeking mitigation where necessary. Alternative routes should also be considered, and the SG can provide further advice on these matters. There is no blanket policy preventing the location of such infrastructure in any part of Highland.

Cairngorm National Park will be identified as a feature of national importance for protection through the Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage policy and through the SG. This can include the consideration of the impact of proposals which lie outside the Park.

As indicated above, SPP states that planning authorities should not impose additional zones of protection around areas designated for their landscape or natural heritage value. However, the proposed policy framework in the Plan does require the impacts of development on habitats and species and on the features of designated sites to be properly assessed.

The issue of Wild Land is discussed elsewhere in the response to issues raised on the MIR, including discussion of it as a constraint to renewable energy development. The Plan will list Wild Areas as feature to be afforded some protection through the Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage policy. In terms of developing the SG, the Council will need to consult on draft advice on this issue and on how it might be dealt with as a constraint, particularly in the spatial framework once Wild Land has been mapped by SNH.

The Plan contains policies on Public Access, on Peat and Soils and on Water Environment which provide for safeguarding. The SG can provide further advice if necessary and the Council can consider and consult on use of mapped areas of deep peat as a constraint in the spatial framework.

The SG is being informed by a landscape sensitivity and impact assessment study, undertaken by Macaulay Scientific Consulting Limited with a Client Steering Group including representatives from the Council, the Cairngorms National Park Authority and Scottish Natural Heritage. This will enable the incorporation of landscape considerations within both the mapping of the SG and within the written guidance, seeking to cover impact of proposals both individually and cumulatively as well as providing advice about different scales of proposal.

The Renewable Energy Developments policy provides for safeguarding of residential amenity in all locations. In addition to that, developers of large windfarms will be encouraged to locate their developments at least 2km from towns and villages through the definition of Broad Areas of Search.

Inclusion of the “Community” Renewable Energy Developments policy in the Plan together with supporting textual reference to opportunity for such development in Highland help to flag up this type of development and provides a basis for their consideration, which may enable them to be permitted in certain locations where a non-community scheme would not be supported. The SG will be able to provide and signpost further advice on community renewables.

Recommended Proposed Plan Policy Content

Policy – Renewable Energy Developments
 Policy – “Community” Renewable Energy Developments
 Policy – Electricity Transmission Infrastructure

Also a wide range of other relevant policies in the Plan cover considerations relevant to renewable energy development, development of related infrastructure and planning for climate change.

Text – Reference to: targets, climate change, energy security, contribution to local and regional economies, smaller scale schemes, micro-generation, onshore and offshore infrastructure, HRES, RERA, new Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance, energy and heat production from waste, Highland Heat Map and cross-reference to Sustainable Design policy. Position Statement on Renewable Energy Developments and ‘Community Benefit’.

Links to Supplementary Guidance – HRES, new Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance and (via Sustainable Design policy) to Designing for Sustainability in the Highlands and to the Highland Heat Map.

Vision and Spatial Strategy support in text and highlighting known opportunities and

needs in relation to marine renewables and supporting infrastructure on the spatial strategy mapping. Policy on Business and Industrial Land providing support in principle for marine renewables and other emergent industries with at present uncertain locational requirements.

See Committee Draft papers for wording