

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| Other settlements | Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports Other Settlements policy. Cromarty is already an established community and with the re-opening of Nigg further housing development would be seen as beneficial. | |
| Other settlements | Mr John Ross(00016) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0016/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees with the preferred approach to other (smaller) settlements. Considers providing some criteria are met development should go ahead. | |
| Other settlements | Kilmorack Community Council(00031) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0031/1/004 | Other Settlements | Agrees with the preferred approach to other settlements. Concerned that having developer funded mitigation mentioned means that it will be seen as an inducement to recommend. | Remove criterion 'whether any developer funded mitigation of impact is offered.' |
| Other settlements | Robert Boardman(00033) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0033/1/001 | Other Settlements | Considers that all or most criteria should be applied. | |
| Other settlements | Scottish Natural Heritage(00204) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/012 | Other Settlements | Tentatively suggests Invermoriston should have its own village chapter with more specific guidance on how the River Moriston SAC salmon and pearl mussel interests will be protected from any development pressures. Failing this, asserts that the criteria and in particular the penultimate criterion should not duplicate or contradict guidance elsewhere in the development plan - e.g. It shouldn't imply that only local natural heritage features will be taken into account. | |
| Other settlements | Mr John Finlayson(00244) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0244/1/001 | Other Settlements | Believes that Abriachan should have a settlement boundary defined with the Plan that encloses client's land as suitable for development because client's development would allow provision of sewerage system that could serve wider community, help underpin the hall as an existing facility and attract new services. | Addition of a mapped settlement boundary for Abriachan that encloses client's land as suitable for development. |
| Other settlements | Ardross Community Council(00267) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0267/1/003 | Other Settlements | It is unclear as to how a design criteria to match existing designs would work and think this might preclude the use of innovative design, and might carry on a legacy of matching existing poor quality design. Believe that this is how Senior Planners will interpret this in making decisions on applications. Would like more emphasis on the wild and remote aspect of where we live and that this should be respected and that housing criteria in our area should be slightly more restrictive. | |
| Other settlements | Beaully Community Council(00271) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/001 | Other Settlements | Support the Councils approach to other (smaller) settlements. | |
| Other settlements | Fortrose And Rosemarkie Community Council(00286) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0286/1/003 | Other Settlements | May support policy on grounds of sustainability and possibly employment opportunities. However must be safeguards to protect the environment, land availability and impacts on traffic and infrastructure. Concern policy could lead to speculative development proposals which are contrary to the best interests of the relevant community. Notes that both the East Ross Landscape Capacity Study 2001 and the SLA Citations emphasise the value of the unspoilt coastline to the setting to Fortrose and Rosemarkie. States the landward form slopes together with the Citation for the coastal aspect from the Soutars to Fort George enclose Fortrose and Rosemarkie in a setting of natural heritage and environmental value. Other settlements policy should not be implemented without proper safeguards for the limited green space and the environment generally. Criteria for assessing developments in other settlements should be applied to Fortrose and Rosemarkie. | |
| Other settlements | Glenurquhart Community Council(00288) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/001 | Other Settlements | Glen Urquhart Community Council support the general policy approach which the Council suggests for Balnain, however for the smaller settlements and housing groups (for example Milton and Shenval) which are intended to be covered by HIC they consider that both the HIC policy and the criteria of the other settlements approach should apply (please check my understanding on this as it is unclear). Glen Urquhart Community Council consider that a proposal should have to meet all the criteria of this policy. Glen Urquhart Community Council also consider the wording too vague and would prefer wording less open to interpretation such as number of permissions granted within a 5 year period should indicate a warning level - say 20%. | |
| Other settlements | Invergordon Community Council(00293) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0293/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees with the Councils preferred approach however feels that there should be a more restrictive set of criteria for hinterland areas. Also queries what happens when a settlement loses its last facility. | |
| Other settlements | Inverness West Community Council(00296) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0296/1/005 | Other Settlements | Requests better definition of terms used within draft policy criteria because as currently worded they are too subjective and therefore open to differing interpretations and thus dispute. In particular, the terms "harm" and "character and social balance" need better definition. Similarly, the definition and extent of locally important green spaces and heritage features should be included in the revised Plan if necessary as an appendix or publicly available supplement. | Revision to policy criteria to better define terms "harm" and "character and social balance". Appendix or supplement to set out definition and extent of locally important green spaces and heritage features. |
| Other settlements | Killlearnan Community Council(00297) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0297/2/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent supports the Other Settlements Policy. Supports the principle of not imposing housing developments solely for commercial gain with small settlements. | |
| Other settlements | Kiltarlity Community Council(00299) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0299/4/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent supports Other Settlements policy | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|---------------------|
| Other settlements | Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/001 | Other Settlements | Support the Council's preferred approach to development in other small settlements. | |
| Other settlements | Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/002 | Other Settlements | Agree with the preferred approach to other small settlements. | |
| Other settlements | Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0313/1/003 | Other Settlements | Supports other settlements policy in general but concerned there is no criteria stating whether or not the local community feel that it right for the area or not.Pitcalnie is listed but unclear where exactly is meant as there are a number of scattered areas referred to locally as Pitcalnie. | |
| Other settlements | Raigmore Community Council(00314) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0314/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports the preferred approach to Other Settlements. Believes gradually developing smaller settlements at the same time as community/commercial facilities develop is a good approach. However, care must be taken to ensure that existing communities always have input and are not overwhelmed. Also, the need for greenspace in these settlements must always be considered before any new development. | |
| Other settlements | Stratherrick And Foyers Community Council(00319) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0319/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees that Foyers should not have a village chapter with specific allocations for specific uses. Believes applications should be addressed on their individual merits across the community council area. However, believes planning policy for Whitebridge should be less supportive of development because of lack of infrastructure and services (particularly water and sewerage) there. | |
| Other settlements | Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0330/1/001 | Other Settlements | Concerned about development outwith the boundary of Avoch. May occur due to lack of available sites within the boundary or landowners desire to raise capital. Often justified on basis of housing clusters, greater clarity is needed regarding what is a cluster and when does it become a small settlement. Question the status of Killen and houses appearing at Wester Templand. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Fraser Stewart(00407) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0407/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent supports the preferred approach to Other Settlements. Positive yet controlled development within active travel distance of community facilities should be supported by design quality and siting is paramount. | |
| Other settlements | G H Johnston Building Consultants Ltd(00424) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0424/2/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent makes the following comments on the Other Settlements policy:- Second bullet point add "pattern".- Third bullet point "five year period" should read "three year period" to reflect the duration of planning permissions,- Fourth bullet point should say "whether the development can be adequately serviced".- Sixth bullet point (assumed respondent means fifth bullet point), the reference to green space is too embracing in a rural context. A field that otherwise fits the policy could lead to net loss of green space if developed. The policy cannot be intended to thwart development in these circumstances. If green space means community open space such as a kick pitch, park, informal amenity space, then that should be specified. Respondent suggests that it could be covered in the seventh bullet point (assumed respondent means sixth bullet point) if "community or" is added before "heritage" and "open space/amenity" is added after "burial ground" at the end. This would mean the bullet point referring to green space could be deleted. | |
| Other settlements | Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0491/1/002 | Other Settlements | The standard of design of new developments,would be improved through the application of a masterplanning and design process that considers the whole development site and puts this in a context for subsequent planning applications. All new development, whether on allocated sites or arising from other means should be required to conform to high standards of design and layout. Commend to Highland Council Designing Places as a starting point for improving the quality of design and layout. Concerned that active travel choices are encouraged and therefore we believe that issues of permeability and ensuring that all development is made attractive to pedestrians and cyclists should be accorded a high degree of importance. We therefore commend Design for Streets (and the technical standards in Manual for Streets) as the norm for the layout of the public realm of new developments and hope that Highland Council will bring forward revised Roads Consent Guidance in line with such at the earliest opportunity and in the meanwhile will approve developments that conform to these new standards. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| Other settlements | Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/003 | Other Settlements | Propose the following additions/amendments Policies to supplement and provide overall guidance for all development : A. Large sites (>50 houses) should have an associated Masterplan and for smaller developments (5-49 houses) development briefs are encouraged to establish at an early stage. Developers should be strongly encouraged to engage with local communities at an early stage in forming Masterplans and design briefs and the final product, including a clear statement of public engagement should be approved to the appropriate Area Committee and will then be a material consideration in the consideration of any subsequent planning application. B. Masterplans, development briefs and planning applications should be accompanied by a clear statement of how the proposal responds to the following design issues: 1. The site's content, including its response to local climate (winds, rain, snow and solar gain) and respect for its setting (its relationship to the existing landscape, townscape and neighbouring features); optimising the resource-efficiency; and 2. Appropriate use of materials, including consideration of embodied energy, reuse of construction materials, compactness of built form, and how well the materials relate to each other; and 3. Ensuring it performs the functions expected of it, including consideration of - its basic functions (provision of privacy, amenity, security, warmth, homeliness etc); and - support systems (sustainability of heating, lighting, water and waste systems over the design's lifetime, including the use of water-saving technology); and - connectivity (practicality and environment-friendliness of its access and servicing arrangements); and iv) flexibility to adapt to the changing circumstances of its occupants; | |
| Other settlements | Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/005 | Other Settlements | Concerned that the overall scale of development proposed, especially along the A96 corridor will create and add to 'dormitory towns' increasing commuting and urge a more holistic approach to all development with an aspiration at least to the creation of at least one new job in locations for each new house and point to the awarding-winning Rothienorman development in Aberdeenshire as an example of how even a small (74 house units, 3500ft2 commercial) in a rural village, can successfully mix housing and a range of business uses in an integrated development. Also concerned to ensure that growing communities have a mix of house sizes and tenures in order to accommodate the expected changes in demographics. In order to enable the masterplanned approach to design and layout of new development. Where feasible, the proposed Hx, Mux, Rx and Bx allocations be redesignated as MUx with developers required to create developments with a mix of uses as well as a mix sizes of units and tenures. Exceptions to this should be clearly explained (e.G. Where the proposed use may be a 'bad neighbour' or where reservation for a specific use is strategically important. | |
| Other settlements | Mrs C Stafford(00511) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/005 | Other Settlements | Policy is too confusing. | Assume greater clarity is sought in policy text/explanation |
| Other settlements | Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/001 | Other Settlements | SEPA agree with the Council's approach and support the inclusion of water and sewerage within the criteria. SEPA consider this should also be applied to other (smaller) settlements. SEPA do not have a view on whether development should meet all the criteria or just some the criteria as issues within our remit, e.G. Connection to public sewer, will still have to meet the requirements of the Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) general policies. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Anthony Chamier(00632) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00632/1/001 | Other Settlements | Considers the criteria for the preferred approach are all desirable and reasonable. Also strongly supports an alternative option of more restrictive application criteria for settlements within the hinterland as otherwise there is a risk that smaller settlements will eventually close up with major settlements, for example Ardross/Alness. In theory restraints on individual houses in hinterland should prevent this, however it is evident in practice that this cannot be guaranteed. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| Other settlements | Mr Roddy Macdonald(00635) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0635/1/001 | Other Settlements | I do not agree with the preferred approach to the other settlements policy issue. In respect of the potential for development to be set by active travel distances - the bulk of the community at Abriachan live outwith the 400m radius that was stated. - the use of this distance limit is I understand to encourage walking and cycling to the available facilities, this dsicriminates against those with mobility issues.- I was informed that the 400m referred to distance between bus stops, this appears a spurious measure as the nearest bus stop is miles away- given the lack of street lighting and pavements most people will continue to take cars and would not allow their children to walk at night or even during the day- the village hall is sustained by people over a largely dispersed area and the policy approach does not seek to deliver this same type of supportThe reference to the loss of locally important greenspace is unecessarrily vague and whilst it is important to preserve areas of outstanding beauty, surely these primarily would be areas would be utilised by the general public for walking or picnics or a wood, all public areas that are enjoyed both phsically or aesthetically. The term greenspace is not sufficiently precise and could be interpreted as all areas in a settlement such as Abriachan. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Aulay Macleod(00637) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0637/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports the preferred approach. | |
| Other settlements | Hazel Bailey(00638) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0638/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports the preferred approach to other (smaller settlements). | |
| Other settlements | Mrs Ann Macleod(00639) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0639/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach to other (smaller settlements). Keeps all houses together. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Peter Gilbert(00642) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0642/1/001 | Other Settlements | Prefers the policy to be worded proposals will be resisted unless all criteria are met since it is considered that all criteria are valid and important. Feels that a more negative default position would be appropriate. | |
| Other settlements | Mrs Karin Kremer(00729) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0729/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent supports the preferred approach to Other Settlements as they believe that smaller areas are "less like a ghetto than a large area" and would like to ensure that there is a good balance between housing and businesses. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Kit Bower(00754) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0754/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respodent supports the general approach but seeks- inclusion of a requirement for the community/commercial facility to be demonstrably viable- all criteria to be met because development in the countryside needs to be managed more vigorously | |
| Other settlements | Miss Annie Stewart(00757) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0757/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports all criteria listed in the preferred approach to other settlements. Thinks it is important to ensure other settlements remain viable; are enabled to grow and offer incentives for youth to remain. | |
| Other settlements | Miss Rachael Crist(00772) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0772/1/001 | Other Settlements | Objects to the Other Settlements Policy. The current Plan is adequate without developing around existing small settlements. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0774/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach and does not agree with any of the stated alternatives.Redcastle should be added to the list of Other Settlements. | Add Redcastle to list. |
| Other settlements | J.A. Wiscombe(00777) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0777/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach. Does not agree with any of the stated alternatives. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Paul A. Ross(00786) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0786/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent supports the preferred approach | |
| Other settlements | Mr Alistair Duff(00877) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0877/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports Other Settlements policy.Suggests adding Kilmorack to the list as it has a school and hall. | Add Kilmorack to list. |
| Other settlements | Nicam Developments Ltd(00882) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0882/1/001 | Other Settlements | Whilst supportive of preferred approach, respondent believes it should be site specific and applications should not be required to meet all the criteria. Objects to criteria 'similar in design' as house designs need to progress and not focus on Victorian designs. Qualified architects should review designs. | |
| Other settlements | Miss Mary Maciver(00883) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0883/1/001 | Other Settlements | Considers the approach to other settlements should be specific and positive i.E. 'support in favour providing some criteria are met.'Does not agree with criteria relating to 'similar in design' as existing design in the area may be poor. Considers we need progress rather than reference to Victorian vernacular. Seeks proper design review from qualified architects. | |
| Other settlements | Dr Ros Rowell(00885) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0885/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees with Torness not being on the list, as long as it has no facility the respondent considers that the only appropraite development is infill. | |
| Other settlements | Mackintosh Highland(00887) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0887/1/001 | Other Settlements | Support preferred approach but no reasons. | |
| Other settlements | Mackintosh Highland(00890) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0890/1/002 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach but no reasons. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Other settlements | Mrs Liz Downing(00892) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00892/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent supports the Council's preferred approach. Respondent considers ideally all of the bullet points should be met or as many as reasonably possible. Local residents should be involved in decision about which criteria are applied in their own settlements as priorities vary from settlement to settlement. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Forbes(00902) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00902/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent does not agree with the Council's preferred approach to other settlements or stated alternatives as Croft Croy is not named as an other settlement. Respondent prefers another approach, that being that Croft Croy should be included as an other settlement for the following reasons:-It lies 680 metres to the south west of Farr;-Without the inclusion of Croft Croy a gap in policy remains;-It is within active travel distance of Farr which has a village hall (640 metres), where a post office operates part time, and Farr Primary School (645 metres); -Development would increase viability of village hall and post office;- Development would increase the falling roll at Farr Primary School helping to safeguard its future;- Development would form part of an existing rural housing cluster and round off the settlement; and- Development would be sympathetic to the landscape and complementary to existing dwellings. Respondent notes that the vision for Inner Moray Firth set out in the HwLDP and the IMFLDP MIR, and SPP supports tourism development. Therefore considers that an additional criteria should be added to the policy - support for development proposals if they would enable the start up or enhancement of new and existing business and tourist facilities. Development at Croft Croy would fit under this criteria as it would generate funding for the landowner to expand existing self catering accommodation tourist facilities to include ancestral, horse and green tourism. This would result in a number of direct and indirect benefits to the local economy. | Inclusion of Croft Croy as an Other Settlement and additional criteria that supports development proposals if they would enable the start up or enhancement of new and existing business and tourist facilities |
| Other settlements | Mr Forbes(00902) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00902/2/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent does not agree with the Council's preferred approach to other settlements or stated alternatives as Tordarroch is not named as an other settlement. Respondent prefers another approach, that being that Tordarroch should be included as an other settlement for the following reasons:-It lies 1.5km to the south west of Farr;-Without the inclusion of Tordarroch a gap in policy remains;-It is considered to be within active travel distance of Farr Primary School (1440 metres); -Development would increase the falling roll at Farr Primary School helping to safeguard its future;-Development would round off the existing settlement/housing cluster; -Development would maintain existing housing clusters thus preventing sporadic development which is uncharacteristic in rural areas and detrimental to the landscape;- Development would maximise use of existing infrastructure;-Consistent with Planning Advice Note 75 that supports housing related to existing housing groups;-Development would not result in ribbon development - four dwellings on either side of the road form a cluster and allow opportunity for rounding off the settlement; -Would help meet demand for mid market accommodation for local people; and- Increase in permanent dwelling houses in a tourist area would support local services. Supports preferred assessment criteria. | Inclusion of Tordarroch as an other settlement |
| Other settlements | Strathdearn Community Council(00908) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/001 | Other Settlements | Strathdearn Community Council supports the Council's approach for other settlements, supports Moy not being included, and Tomatin having an inset map. | |
| Other settlements | Ferintosh Community Council(00910) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/003 | Other Settlements | Supports general approach of policy but requests that Mulbuie be added to list and that the policy wording only encourage housing that will support schools and community facilities. | Add Mulbuie to settlements list. Amend first criterion to only support housing that will underpin schools and community facilities . |
| Other settlements | Mr John Duncan(00915) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00915/1/001 | Other Settlements | Errogie is excluded from the list of other settlements presumably because it does not have any community or commercial facilities. Therefore it should not be under pressure to allow further development other than that which is in accordance with the extant Local Plan which encourages "infill development consistent with the established settlement pattern". Respondant endorses the principles stated in the extant Local Plan. Key development issues for Errogie:- Safeguard rural character of settlement.- Maintain existing restriction on lochside development.- Inadequate water and sewage.- Poor road and infrastructure.- No facilities.- Physical constraints (woodland, wetland, heathland).- Wildlife.- Safeguard against developments intended for commuters. | |
| Other settlements | Mr John Duncan(00915) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00915/1/002 | Other Settlements | Supports principle of approach but the following criteria should be added and a presumption against development unless all criteria are met:- Whether development would result in adverse impact on habitat and/or protected species- Whether development is within an area already experiencing high development pressure- Whether there is sufficient housing stock and plots on market and no more are required during lifetime of plan- More restrictive criteria for commuter housing- Developments should be as sustainable as possible in terms of energy efficiency and house plot ratios. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| Other settlements | Mr James Grant(00920) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0920/1/003 | Other Settlements | The respondent agrees with the preferred approach however it is considered that there should be more consultation at the planning application stage with those affected in the community. | |
| Other settlements | Mrs C Wood(00948) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0948/1/001 | Other Settlements | Objects to the Council's preferred approach and does not agree with the principle of developers having to address these objectives and requirements. Respondent accepts the principle of developers making appropriate justified contributions so long as they meet all 5 tests of Circular 1/2010. The Circular makes it clear that contributions must relate directly to the development and not try to obtain extraneous benefits that are unacceptable. It is not clear from the MIR if the approach that the Council proposed would accord with Circular 1/2010. Respondent considers that any policy which seeks to spread infrastructure costs across all developments within a settlement can not be seen to directly relate to a specific development promoted by a specific developer and it is not for developers to address pre-existing issues unrelated to their proposals. Respondent considers the preferred approach conflicts with the provisions of Circular 1/2010 and an alternative approach should indicate that developer contributions should be sought in line with the provisions of Circular 1/2010. Respondent considers the LDP or supporting guidance should make explicit reference to Matters Specified in Conditions and Section 42 applications should not be subject to developer contributions. Respondent considers explicit reference should be made to the consideration of abnormal developer costs in considering exemptions from or adjustments to developer contributions. | |
| Other settlements | The Scottish Government(00957) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0957/1/004 | Other Settlements | Supports the Councils preferred approaches for managing development in or close to smaller settlements. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Paul Whitefoot(00973) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0973/1/004 | Other Settlements | The respondent considers that although all the criteria are valid it could be less restrictive in the areas of lower demand. | |
| Other settlements | Mr James Kidd(00979) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0979/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent disagrees with assessing applications against a standard tick list, however the respondent considers applications should be assessed individually on their merits, how they fit the given location, amenity, design and whether there are sufficient services available etc. The respondent considers that given the pressure to maintain local services and facilities in Highland communities, there should be a presumption in favour of individual or small cluster developments. | |
| Other settlements | The Trustees Of The Cawdor Scottish Discretionary Trust(00984) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0984/1/001 | Other Settlements | The relative flexibility of policy for smaller settlements compared with 'mapped' settlements suggests a preference for development at the former; perhaps this is not intended. Preference for development at all settlements to be mapped or at least made clearer where development at the 'other settlements' sits in terms of the hierarchy of development within the plan area. Consider Brackla, near Cawdor should be included on the list of smaller settlements for the following reasons:- Undeveloped allocation for development in Nairnshire Local Plan;- Encompasses housing and a significant existing business use (Royal Brackla Distillery);- Planning permission in principle granted last year for a biomass facility near the which it is anticipated will create additional local employment; - The village lies within walkable distance (less than one mile) of Cawdor where a wide range of existing services are significantly under-utilised;- People can and do cycle from Brackla to Cawdor presently;- Presence of a bus stop;- Brackla is comparable in size and profile to Ferness and Daviot which are listed as smaller settlements; and- Expected that pressure for development there may arise during the lifetime of the plan due to the proximity of Brackla to Cawdor. | Addition of Brackla to other settlements list |
| Other settlements | Mr Ed Macdonald(01013) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01013/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent thinks there should be an allowance for development in Abriachan as it has stunning views of Loch Ness, is in the middle of the countryside but is still only 10 minutes commute to Inverness. If development was allowed it would give more people the opportunity to live there. | |
| Other settlements | Mr G Philip(01020) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01020/1/001 | Other Settlements | Flemington to be added to the list of Other Settlements because:- A key site is being promoted by the owners for mixed use development which would include housing, business and community uses- The development would contribute towards the sustainability of the community by providing housing choice, employment opportunities, community facilities and make a contribution towards the economic growth corridor- The site sits comfortably within the existing settlement and the surrounding landscape, particularly the A96.- There is already a shop/restaurant nearby - There are no heritage or physical constraints- Despite being greenfield it is a logical expansion site of the only settlement in the A96 corridor which has not been identified for further growth.- it is a sizeable rural community and there is a need for a community hall. | Flemington to be added to the list of Other Settlements |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| Other settlements | Mr Bob How(01047) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01047/1/001 | Other Settlements | Notes Errogie is excluded from list of 'other settlements' presumably because it does not have any facilities and thus any development would be unsustainable. Assumes that development at Errgoie would therefore only be permitted if it met the terms of Housing in the Countryside and Siting and Design policy. Believes the key development issues at Errogie are: safeguard existing character of settlement; limited primary school capacity; inadequate water and sewage capacity; poor road and infrastructure; no cycleway; no facilities within settlement; physical constraints ; wildlife, woodland and pollution constraints and safeguard against developments intended for or likely to attract commuters. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Bob How(01047) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01047/1/002 | Other Settlements | Broadly agrees with preferred approach but considers the criteria below should be added; unless all criteria are met development should be resisted.-Whether development would result in adverse impact on habitat and/or protected species;-Whether development is within an area already experiencing high development pressure;-Whether there is already sufficient house stock (including new builds) and development plots on the local market and that no further development is necessary;-Commuter housing should have a more restrictive set of criteria;-Developments in small communities should be as sustainable as possible in terms of energy efficiency, and house:plot ratios should be large enough to allow for self-sufficient enterprises, micro-industry, woodlots etc. | |
| Other settlements | Ashdale Property Company Limited(01062) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01062/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent objects to Other Settlement policy. Concerned about assessment of "social balance" and the final bullet point which implies an emphasis on developers offering contributions. This appears to be contrary to Circular 1/2010 and the use of legal agreements, with proposals being assessed on planning merits and not the offer of unilateral obligations. Respondent owns site allocated as H1 in Foyers in the Committee draft of the IMF LDP. Noted that Foyers does not have a settlement map in MIR and is listed in the Other Settlements policy. Would contend that Foyers should remain as a main settlement with a map due to:- its size and scale- existence of shop and school. Removal of its status as a main settlement will lead to unplanned, piecemeal development and "planning by appeal" which is contrary to Scot Gov policy. This site has been allocated for housing for a number of years in the Inverness LP. Housing market is currently subdued but there was interest in this site prior to downturn. It should remain as an allocation for housing so there is provision for future expansion of Foyers when the economic conditions improve. The site is flat, adjacent to existing development and access could be taken from Riverside Park. Recent consent for an adjacent caravan park suggests that the River Foyers bridge is not a major constraint. | |
| Other settlements | William Gray Construction Ltd(01071) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/2/001 | Other Settlements | Generally agrees with the preferred approach to Other Settlements policy as it allows for suitable development within or close to settlements. Also agrees with alternative as it could be more positive i.E. Providing a presumption in favour of suitable development subject to certain criteria. Respondent suggests another alternative to specifically allocate suitable development opportunities in, or close to, settlements but accord with the adopted and emerging plannig policy position , rather than relying on general policies of HwLDP. Would provide a greater degree of certainty and confidence for the development industry. | |
| Other settlements | Mr And Mrs A Manson(01077) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01077/1/002 | Other Settlements | Object to non-allocation of new village proposal at Newmore. Suggests that Newmore should at least be added to list of settlements covered by Other Settlements policy because: it has a qualifying community facility in terms of the primary school that could be underpinned by further development; infill and other integral development sites are available close to the school; there was an expressed community consensus in favour of some development at Newmore as part of the Plan workshop at Alness, and; the local topography and potential sites are likely to support development in keeping with the existing settlement pattern. Re-submit SEA site-assessment to demonstrate sustainability of location for limited development. | Addition of Newmore to list of Other Settlements |
| Other settlements | Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach to Other Settlements policy. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Grant Stewart(01097) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01097/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach to Other Settlement policy. Does not agree with the stated alternative and does not have any other preferred approach. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Elizabeth Barras(01105) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01105/1/001 | Other Settlements | Would prefer another approach but does not provide details. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Wallace Grant(01115) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01115/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach to Other Settlements policy. Does not agree with the stated alternative and does not suggest another approach. | |
| Other settlements | Mr John Hampson(01119) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01119/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach to other settlements but also agrees with the stated alternative. Gap sites should be infilled and make use of central locations. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Other settlements | Mr Donald Leith(01121) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01121/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports the preferred approach to Other Settlements. | |
| Other settlements | Kylauren Homes(01128) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01128/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach and objects to alternatives. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Eleanor Ross(01136) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01136/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports preferred approach to other settlements and does not agree with the stated alternative. | |
| Other settlements | J.E. And S.B Wood(01157) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01157/1/001 | Other Settlements | Does not agree with the preferred approach to other settlements or any of the stated alternatives. Would prefer another approach. Considers there is no input of local wishes or needs. The plan is based on government targets rather than established need. The approach should be based on local needs and requirements. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Irene Ross(01159) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees with preferred approach to other settlements as it is appropriate to size of settlement. Imagines it is too costly to do full consultation on every settlement. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Ross Glover(01170) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01170/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees with the preferred approach but also feels that development in rural areas should be encouraged in areas where residents would benefit from an active lifestyle. | |
| Other settlements | Heather Macleod And John Parrott(01193) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01193/1/001 | Other Settlements | Seeking confirmation that as Errogie is not on the list of smaller settlements that development proposals will be assessed against housing in the countryside policy.Considers that as Errogie has no facilities no development other than that consistent with housing in the countryside policy, in particular infill development consistent with the established settlement pattern, should be permitted. Considers the key development issues for Errogie to be:-Safeguard character of settlement;-Maintain the existing restriction on lochside development;-Limited primary school capacity;-Inadequate water and sewage capacity;-Poor road and infrastructure; no cycleway;-No facilities within settlement;-Physical constraints (wetlands, drainage etc.);-Wildlife, woodland and pollution constraints; and-Safeguard against developments intended for or likely to attract commuters. | |
| Other settlements | Heather Macleod And John Parrott(01193) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01193/1/002 | Other Settlements | Broadly agrees with the preferred approach but would add the following criteria:-Whether development would result in adverse impact on habitat and/or protected species;-Whether development is within an area already experiencing high development pressure;-Whether there is already sufficient house stock (including new builds) and development plots on the local market and that no further development is necessary;-commuter housing should have a more restrictive set of criteria; and-developments in small communities should be as sustainable as possible in terms of energy efficiency, and house: plot ratios should be large enough to allow for self-sufficient enterprises, micro-industry, woodlots etc.Development should be resisted unless all criteria are met. | Additional criteria added to other settlements policy |
| Other settlements | Ms Valerie Weir(01198) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01198/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports the exclusion of Errogie from this list as long as it has no facilities. It is considered that infill development consistent with the settlement pattern is appropriate. Respondent considers that the following are the key development issues for Errogie. - Safeguard character of settlement- Maintain the existing restriction on lochside development- Limited primary school capacity- Inadequate sewage capacity- Poor road and infrastructure; no cycleway- No facilities within settlement (school and hall, 3 miles; Foyers, doctor and shop, 7 miles- Physical constraints (wetlands, drainage etc.)- Wildlife, woodland and pollution constraints- Safeguarding water quality of loch- Safeguard against developments intended for or likely to attract commutersThe respondent broadly agrees with the policy approach but considers that development should be resisted unless all criteria are met and would add the following criteria- Whether development would result in adverse impact on habitat and/or protected species- Whether development is within an area already experiencing high development pressure- Whether there is already sufficient house stock (including new builds) and development plots on the local market and that no further development is necessary- Commuter housing should have a more restrictive set of criteria- Developments in small communities should be as sustainable as possible in terms of energy efficiency, and house plot ratios should be large enough to allow for self-sufficient enterprises, micro-industry, woodlots etc.. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Lucinda Spicer(01200) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01200/1/003 | Other Settlements | Agrees with the preferred approach as it seems like a sensible balance and does not think hinterland areas should be unduly restricted. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Christine Matheson(01203) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01203/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees with the preferred approach. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|
| Other settlements | Dr Maria De La Torre(01205) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/001 | Other Settlements | Agrees with some smaller settlement criteria but not others. Does not agree with developer funded mitigation bullet point as the criteria used should be about the specific proposal. Considers criteria relating to green space and impact upon important heritage features are particularly important as they are the core reasons for discouraging spread of housing in the countryside. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Alexander MacDonald(01227) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01227/1/001 | Other Settlements | Considers that there is a need for development in Abriachan and whilst understanding the need for controlling development in rural areas considers that proposals in abriachan should be supported. | |
| Other settlements | Munro Construction (Highland) Ltd(01235) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01235/1/001 | Other Settlements | Objects to the Council's preferred policy approach for Other Settlements for the following reasons- it does not offer sufficient clarity on the extent of housing and other development that is acceptable- it does not include Rhicullen/Newmore even although it has a local school- it does not pay attention to settlement form and is not in the interests of good placemaking- it creates a polarity between urban and rural areas and does not allow for creative developments (and this should be encouraged, particularly masterplanned mix use proposals) within the hinterland- it does not encourage employment generating development within the hinterland such as live work units in and around smaller settlementsThe respondent considers that the following criteria require amendment- active travel range should be defined- greater flexibility should be given to layout and density where it is led by good placemaking principles - greater flexibility when applying criterion 3 on the rate of development, as the circumstances vary and any benefits to that community and wider area need to be considered. It is also suggested that deliverability is important as permissions may not lead to construction within a reasonable time frame- for criterion 4 on infrastructure provision it does not matter whether it is cost efficient provision if it is viable for the private sector to deliver a solution- for criterion 5 about greenspaces this term needs defined and it is considered that it difficult to understand where these areas and the criterion 6 (local heritage features) are without a settlement plan- for criterion 6 adverse impact should be more clearly defined- criterion 7 should be dropped and criterion 6 better defined | |
| Other settlements | Conon Brae Farms(01236) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01236/1/001 | Other Settlements | The respondent agrees with the preferred approach to other settlements and agrees with some of the stated alternatives. Considers the approach should be site specific and positive, i.E. 'support in favour providing some criteria are met'. Does not agree with criteria requiring developments to be similar in design as existing development in the area may not be good. Considers progress is required, not reference to Victorian vernacular. Supports proper design review from qualified architects. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Jenny MacLennan(01237) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/001 | Other Settlements | Respondent does not agree that active travel distance should be a deciding criteria as even if people do live close to local facilities they are likely to continue to use their car for local journeys.Considers the benefit of community facilities is the continuation of local identity within an area and brings with it a sense of belonging. Development proposals should be seen to support the local community and be conducive to bringing people into an area, and therefore should contribute to roads and infrastructure.Suggests that not all criteria should be met but all should be considered, especially for larger developments as these will have the most impact and generate most income for the developer. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Hannah Stradling(01242) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01242/1/001 | Other Settlements | Considers that Abriachan is too desolate and therefore should be excluded from this approach and that there should instead be a more positive approach to development in Abriachan. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Cornelia Wittke(01244) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01244/1/001 | Other Settlements | Landowner in Arbriachan supports the principle of the Council's preferred approach as it removes that 25% rule but has the following detailed comments to make on certain aspects of the determining criteria listed as follows:- that 'active travel range' in criterion 1 should be clearly defined in order to help minimise misinterpretation.- the '5 Year period' in criterion 3, should be changed to 3 years given that planning permissions are only now valid for 3 years as per the Planning Etc (Scotland) Act 2006, (albeit only for approvals granted after the 03 August, 2009) as this is considered to be a more appropriate period to be taken into account when seeking to measure the potential cumulative impact of extant permissions not yet implemented- 'locally important green space' in Criterion 5 should be more clearly defined to help minimise misinterpretation given the likely rural nature of the proposals being determined under this policy. | |
| Other settlements | Mr Eddie MacDonald(01249) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01249/1/001 | Other Settlements | Does not support our current preferred approach but considers - that there is an inconsistency to our current approach - that a standardised approach would help- and that development should be encouraged in rural communities | |
| Other settlements | Mr Phil Anderson(01259) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01259/1/001 | Other Settlements | The respondent supports the Council's preferred approach but considers that Cawdor should be added to the list of settlements. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|--|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Other settlements | Mr Craig MacRae(01260) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01260/1/001 | Other Settlements | Supports the Council's preferred approach and considers that it is important to assist development in rural areas. | |
| Other settlements | Ms Marion Kennedy(01262) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01262/1/001 | Other Settlements | Generally agrees with the Council's preferred approach but considers that there should be a more positive approach for Abriachan. | |
| Other settlements | Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robertson Homes(01310) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01310/4/001 | Other Settlements | Scotia Homes as landowner of land adjacent to the west of Hill of Fearn submits this land for residential and mixed use development and objects to a policy approach rather than allocation of this site within the Local Development Plan. Scotia Homes consider the site to be suitable for the uses intended for the following reasons- the site is within the settlement boundary for Hill of Fearn and is identified for phased residential development in RACE LP- the site is capable of delivering effective phased housing in the short and longer term - the site is well contained by topographic features- Hill of Fearn provides local services to the surrounding community including shops, school, garage, and is in close proximity to the church - Hill of Fearn benefits from bus service provision, has a nearby railway station, and is well located in relation to the A9 - this site can help accommodate housing requirements that will emerge from the HwLDP employment growth strategy for this area (which includes intensification of activity at Nigg and Invergordon) - it could make use of the potential unlocked by upgrades to the A9Scotia Homes is committed to- a high quality design led masterplan approach which secures road, infrastructure and other community benefits and provides a landscape framework for its development | Addition of new mixed use site at Hill of Fearn |
| Other settlements | Mr And Mrs Campbell(01317) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01317/1/001 | Other Settlements | The 41 Strathnairn petitioners seek a detailed requirement for protection of trees and vegetation within the IMFLDP as per or stronger than the conditions on the Inverarnie Farm development should the TPO 115 identified for Inverarnie fail.The respondent considers this to be necessary given the removal of various trees and the Review body's concern over the removal of trees from within theTree Retention area. | |
| Other settlements | Cllr Kate Stephen(01348) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01348/1/001 | Other Settlements | Contends that the restriction of developments to within active travel to one community/commercial facility is too restrictive for the following reasons- there could be more opportunity for rural development where individual households can maintain a sustainable lifestyle supported by the land they have (e.G. Growing vegetables, keeping hens, coppicing, energy generation, etc). - there are high levels of car ownership and having a car depending on lifestyle and its efficiency is not necessarily considered unsustainable- without it there could be more encouragement of local food production The respondent considers that criteria relating to scale, density, similarity to existing settlement, character, social balance, and existing infrastructure are all very important to existing residents of communities. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr John Ross(00016) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00016/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the items listed under Key Development Issues and agrees with the principle of developers helping address these objectives and requirements. Respondent comments that principles are broadly agreed with however at the same time developers should not be scared off by onerous constraints. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mrs Suzanna Stone(00017) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00017/5/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The respondent considers that as per the guidance contained within Circular 1/2010: Planning Agreements, developer contributions should only be sought where they meet all of the tests considered necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms. They should therefore: - Serve a planning purpose; - Relate to the proposed development; - Fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development and be reasonable in all other aspects. The respondent considers that cross settlement contributions would therefore only be acceptable where they relate to the development proposal and are required to mitigate any adverse impacts from that proposal. The Respondent considers that any policy pertaining to developer contributions should be clear that contributions will only be sought to overcome problems in granting planning permissions and not to resolve existing deficiencies, as set out in paragraph 19 of the Circular. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Kilmorack Community Council(00031) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00031/1/005 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Disagrees with the approach and the principle of developers paying as they consider that this should be provided by the Council. Also considers that if a proposed development introduces these issues then it is inappropriate in scale. Comments that developer contributions should be separate from the deal as otherwise it suggests that cash can buy anything. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Robert Boardman(00033) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0033/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the items listed under Key Development Issues and the principle of developers helping to address them. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Novar Estates(00158) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0158/1/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Generally supports the Council's preferred approach to Cross Settlement Development Objectives and Developer Requirements. It is underpinned by an equitable approach to the funding of community infrastructure however implementation may be difficult. For example, where a number of sites are zoned for housing within a settlement, but developed over different time periods, would the developer of first site be expected to meet the full cost of an infrastructure project where the timescales of other developments remain unknown. Would the first developer be reimbursed these costs as subsequent developments occur? What would happen if the first site developer cannot finance the full cost of an infrastructure project. The Council should consider and assess developer contributions in a broad context including design quality which creates a public benefit for the whole community which cannot always be recovered, in full or in part, through market prices. Such public benefits should be an important factor in the negotiation of developer contributions. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Scottish Natural Heritage(00204) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/013 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with preferred approach but wishes policy to cover green infrastructure such as green networks and structural landscaping. | Proposed Plan policy to specifically include area-wide green infrastructure requirements. |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr John Finlayson(00244) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0244/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports - no reasons stated. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Beaully Community Council(00271) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Support the Council's approach to cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements, the items listed under Key Development Issues and the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Glenurquhart Community Council(00288) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Glen Urquhart Community Council considers that for smaller development under 4 houses, and proposals which are providing more than the minimum affordable housing contribution it may not be appropriate to seek a contribution. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Invergordon Community Council(00293) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0293/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the items listed under Key Development Issues and agrees with the principle of developers helping to address these. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/003 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Support the items listed under Key Development Issues. Do not agree with the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0313/1/006 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent unclear about what is meant by Key Development Issues. Respondent agrees that developers should be aware of the effect of their proposed development on an area and contribute towards their cost of providing extra facilities and services needed to support their development. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Raigmore Community Council(00314) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0314/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports preferred approach to Cross Settlement Development Objectives and Dev Requirements. Respondent highlights that developer contributions must be used to develop infrastructure at the appropriate time and not be delayed. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/003 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agree with approach but concerned it is 'shutting the door after the horse has bolted'. Council needs to facilitate cross settlement consultation prior to planning permission being granted as Community Councils are only alerted to planning applications within their boundaries. | Facilitation of cross settlement consultation on planning applications |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Tulloch Homes Ltd(00393) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00393/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent recognises there may be a need for consideration of the cumulative impact of development on infrastructure and services. The respondent stipulates that any contributions must be set in the context of the tests in Circular 2/2010. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Fraser Stewart(00407) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00407/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent supports the approach to cross settlement development requirements and objectives. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent emphasises that developer contributions need to be set at a level which does not render development uneconomically viable and act as a brake to the economy recovering. Equally, as it impacts on affordable housing, a better understanding of the economic viability of developments is required to ensure that developer contributions do not provide a constraint against provision. The impact of prescribed density levels in the Local Plan which do not contribute to sustainable affordable housing, especially in reference to greenfield land, needs to be better understood in order to make the optimum decisions. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | SEPA agree with the Council's preferred approach and consider it important that developers take account of, and where appropriate contribute to, cross settlement objectives and requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Anthony Chamier(00632) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00632/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Does not understand the question, cannot see the content of headings listed in the question | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Peter Gilbert(00642) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00642/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports items listed under Key Development Issues, and agrees with the principle of having developers address these. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mrs Karin Kremer(00729) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00729/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent agrees with the preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Kit Bower(00754) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00754/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The respondent supports this policy approach. | The respondent supports this policy approach. |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Miss Annie Stewart(00757) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00757/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Considers developers must help address key development issues. Challenges that capacity exists in secondary education in Nairn if further development is allowed. Other infrastructure needs to be reviewed including transport and sewerage. | Addition of other infrastructure items to key development issues for Nairn, including transport and sewerage. |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | J.A. Wiscombe(00777) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00777/1/005 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the principle of developers helping to address objectives and requirements. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The Iain Elliot Partnership(00781) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00781/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent agrees with items listed under Key Development Issues. Respondent agrees with the principle of developers helping to address cross settlement development objectives. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Paul A. Ross(00786) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00786/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent agrees with the items and the principle of developers helping to address objectives. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Alistair Duff(00877) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00877/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports policy of cross settlement objectives and developer requirements.Supports the principle of developers helping to address objectives and requirements.Developer should contribute all costs to developments outwith settlement boundaries.Developers of large developments could subsidise existing nearby housing for access to new services e.g. Mains sewerage. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Nicam Developments Ltd(00882) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00882/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Developer contributions should be fair, legible and properly administered. The size of local authority resource should reflect the size of the contribution so the application is dealt with efficiently. The private sector should be recognised as providing similar services efficiently. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Miss Mary Maciver(00883) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00883/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the items listed under Key Development Issues and the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. Also considers additional items should be included. Considers developer contributions should be fair, legible and properly administered. Should also be reflected in the way a proposal is dealt with i.e the larger the contribution the more local authority resource allocated to deal with the application efficiently. The importance of provide sector development in financing the economy should be recognised in an equivalently stream lines, lean return service. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mrs Liz Downing(00892) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00892/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent supports the Council's preferred approach.Respondent suggests that promotion of public transport, walking and cycling, protection of environment in terms of visual impact, flora and fauna, pollution etc and the provision of adequate road infrastructure should be included in the cross settlement developer requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Forbes(00902) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00902/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Does not agree with the items listed under Key Development Issues and does not agree with the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. Considers additional items/issues should be included.Makes reference to Planing Circular 1/2010: Planning Agreements which sets out the tests for developer contributions. Considers that cross settlement contributions would only be acceptable where they relate to the development proposal and are required to mitigate any adverse impact(s) arising from that proposal. Any policy pertaining to developer contributions should be clear that contributions will only be sought to overcome problems in granting planning permission and not to resolve existing deficiencies, consistent with the circular. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Forbes(00902) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00902/2/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Does not agree with the items listed under Key Development Issues and does not agree with the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. Considers additional items/issues should be included.Makes reference to Planing Circular 1/2010: Planning Agreements which sets out the tests for developer contributions. Considers that cross settlement contributions would only be acceptable where they relate to the development proposal and are required to mitigate any adverse impact(s) arising from that proposal. Any policy pertaining to developer contributions should be clear that contributions will only be sought to overcome problems in granting planning permission and not to resolve existing deficiencies, consistent with the circular. | Revisions to preferred approach to cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Strathdearn Community Council(00908) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Strathdearn Community Council support the Councils approach as developers should not impose an unfair burden on a community. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ferintosh Community Council(00910) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0910/1/004 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports preferred approach especially in reference to education and road improvements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr W Macleod(00912) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0912/1/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The respondent considers that as per the guidance contained within Circular 1/2010: Planning Agreements, developer contributions should only be sought where they meet all of the tests considered necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms. They should therefore: - Serve a planning purpose; - Relate to the proposed development - Fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development and be reasonable in all other aspects.The respondent considers that cross settlement contributions would therefore only be acceptable where they relate to the development proposal and are required to mitigate any adverse impacts from that proposal. Any policy pertaining to developer contributions should be clear that contributions will only be sought to overcome problems in granting planning permissions and not to resolve existing deficiencies, as set out in paragraph 19 of the Circular. | Clarification of Cross-settlement development objectives, scope and fit with Planning Circular. |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr John Duncan(00915) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0915/1/003 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Developers should be required to pay a fair share to help resolve cross settlement development issues however their willingness should not be a key factor in allowing development and over-ride other policies. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr James Grant(00920) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0920/1/004 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Objects to this approach as they are concerned that planning gain will affect assessment and will mean that proposals are not objectively assessed. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Inverness Estates(00944) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0944/2/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Objects to the Councils preferred approach and does not agree with the principle of developers having to address these objectives and requirements.Respondent accepts the principle of developers making appropriate justified contributions so long as they meet all 5 tests of Circular 1/2010. The Circular makes it clear that contributions must relate directly to the development and not try to obtain extraneous benefits that are unacceptable. It is not clear from the MIR if the approach that the Council proposed would accord with Circular 1/2010.Respondent considers that any policy which seeks to spread infrastructure costs across all developments within a settlement can not be seen to directly relate to a specific development promoted by a specific developer and it is not for developers to address pre-existing issues unrelated to their proposals.Respondent considers the preferred approach conflicts with the provisions of Circular 1/2010 and an alternative approach should indicate that developer contributions should be sought inline with the provisions of Circular 1/2010.Respondent considers the LDP or supporting guidance should make explicit reference to Matters Specified in Conditions and Section 42 applications should not be subject to developer contributions.Respondent considers explicit reference should be made to the consideration of abnormal developer costs in considering exemptions from or adjustments to developer contributions. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mrs C Wood(00948) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0948/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The Scottish Government(00957) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0957/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports the preferred approach for cross settlement development objectives. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0962/1/004 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Disagrees with Council's preferred approach because the HwLDP general policy on Developer Contributions provides adequate policy coverage and repeating it here would be unnecessary duplication. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Balnagown Estate(00964) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Disagrees with preferred approach because it duplicates policy coverage within the HwLDP which is adequate in regards to this issue. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Paul Whitefoot(00973) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00973/1/005 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent agrees with the approach as long as the contributions are proportionate to the developments impact and the money is appropriately ring fenced. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr James Kidd(00979) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00979/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent is in favour of large developments but not small developments contributing towards improvement or provision of facilities/infrastructure. The respondent also considers that the council should allocate more resources towards the viability and growth of small communities. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Brian Stewart(00993) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00993/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The principle of developers mitigating the impact of a development in the surrounding area should be rigorously applied. Thus the impact of any development should be assessed but in the wider locality. For example, a windfarm development on Ben Wyvis or the Dava Moor has a visual impact and consequences not just locally, but also on residents' amenity and tourism in Nairn. This requirement should be explicitly set out as part of the approach to planning. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Alastair Dunbar(01015) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01015/1/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent considers that developer obligations must be reasonable and meet the terms of Scottish Government policy and guidance. A flexible approach is required to ensure deliverability of development is not compromised by costs, particularly where wider benefits for a community can be illustrated. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Bob How(01047) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01047/1/004 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees that developers should be asked to pay a fair share to help resolve cross settlement development issues. However the developer's willingness to do this should not be a key factor in allowing development to proceed. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements and agrees with the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent unclear what was meant by this section of MIR. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Grant Stewart(01097) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01097/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the cross settlement development objectives for Ardersier. Agrees with the principle of developers helping to address objectives and requirements. Does not suggest any further items/issues to be added to list. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Wallace Grant(01115) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01115/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports the cross settlement development objectives. Agrees with the principle of developers helping to address objectives and requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Donald Leith(01121) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01121/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports the cross settlement development objectives. Agrees with the principle of developers helping to address objectives and requirements. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Kylauren Homes(01128) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01128/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports preferred approach and objects to alternatives. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Eleanor Ross(01136) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01136/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports the cross settlement development objectives. Agrees with the principle of developers helping to address objectives and requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | J.E. And S.B Wood(01157) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01157/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Does not agree with the items listed under Key Development Issues or the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements.Considers developers should not have any input until requirements have been decided and democratically agreed. Developers needs should have no priority. Developers should be chosen on the basis of local approval. It is essential that anti-corruption principles are afforded and that developers should not be seen to 'bribe' the Council/Community Council with payments or the provision of roads or services. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Irene Ross(01159) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the items listed under Key Development Issues and the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements but thinks there shouldn't be excessive road traffic. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Ross Glover(01170) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01170/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports items listed. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr John D Murrie(01182) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01182/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent believes that developers should not offer funding but be told the cost of planning gain as this will allow for a more consistent approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Heather Macleod And John Parrott(01193) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01193/1/003 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agree development should be asked to pay a fair share to help resolve cross settlement development issues. However the developers willingness to do this should not be a key factor in allowing development to proceed. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Valerie Weir(01198) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01198/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the approach as long as it is not a key factor in the determination of whether a development should proceed. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Lucinda Spicer(01200) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01200/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent agrees with items listed and with the principle of developers helping to address the objectives and requirements. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Christine Matheson(01203) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01203/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent agrees to the preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Dr Maria De La Torre(01205) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the items listed under Key Development Issues and the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. Does not consider any additional items/issues should be included. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Anne Thomas(01208) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01208/1/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Considers supports the Council's approach but feels that this needs to be much more robust than it is at present particularly in relation to provision of public transport and cycle paths. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Alexander MacDonald(01227) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01227/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports the Councils preferred policy approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Charles Allenby(01232) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01232/1/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The respondent would object to the suggestion that developers will be asked to contribute towards objectives/requirements listed for each main village or urban district unless it meets the following requirements- developer contributions must fully comply with the provision of SG circular 1/2010 and the 5 policy tests- and in particular as per the circular the need for any infrastructure or facilities so funded to arise directly from implementation of the proposed development and that attempts to extract excessive contributions from developers is unacceptable- and as per the circular developers should not be required to address pre- existing issues unrelated to their development proposals- the policy approach must state that contributions will relate directly to the development proposed taking full account of the "scale and kind" test in the Circular.- and the LDP must make reference to the requirement for the Council to take into account abnormal developer costs in considering any exemptions or adjustments to developer contributions.The respondent is concerned that - any policy which seeks to spread infrastructure costs across all developments within a settlement or between settlements cannot be seen to relate directly to a specific development | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Munro Construction (Highland) Ltd(01235) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01235/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Considers that Developer Obligations must be reasonable and meet the terms of Scottish Government policy and guidance. A flexible approach is required to ensure deliverability of development is not compromised by costs, particularly where wider benefits for a community can be illustrated. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Conon Brae Farms(01236) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01236/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the items listed under key development issues and agrees with the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements. Considers additional items/issues should be included. Developer contribution should be fair, legible and properly administered and should be reflected the way a proposal is dealt with, for example the larger the contribution the more local authority resource allocated to deal with the application efficiently. The importance of the private sector development in financing the economy should be recognised in an equivalently streamlined, lean return service. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Jenny MacLennan(01237) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Respondent agrees with the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Hannah Stradling(01242) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01242/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The respondent supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Eddie MacDonald(01249) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01249/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with our preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Redco Milne Ltd(01251) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01251/1/001 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Opposes any developer requirements that are not directly related to a particular site and its development. Believes any requirements should satisfy all 5 tests of Circular 1/2010 namely: necessity; planning purpose; relationship to proposed development; scale and kind, and; reasonableness. Warns against imposition of financial contributions that are excessive and imposed to obtain extraneous benefits. Asserts that new developers should not be asked to remedy existing deficiencies. Suggests that the Plan be amended to make contributions dependent on Circular 1/2010 conformity and in particular take account of the scale and kind test. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|--|--|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Phil Anderson(01259) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01259/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Mr Craig MacRae(01260) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01260/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | The respondent supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Ms Marion Kennedy(01262) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01262/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Agrees with the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Cllr Kate Stephen(01348) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01348/1/002 | Cross settlement development objectives and developer requirements | Considers that this policy should include increased consideration of flood risk and the effects of climate change. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr John Ross(00016) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00016/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with the preferred Hinterland boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Kilmorack Community Council(00031) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00031/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the preferred approach, disagrees with red line. Broadly supports the intention but feels a rule book approach is restrictive. Considers that Beaulys services and facilities have benefited from inward migration. However considers there to be a need for a balanced approach. | Change to policy approach. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Robert Boardman(00033) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with the preferred approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Scottish Natural Heritage(00204) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/014 | Hinterland boundary | Agree with retention of existing boundary. Disagree with alternative to contract the boundary south of Dores as this would encourage further development with potentially adverse effects upon Loch Ashie and Loch Ruthven SPAs. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | The Nairns Estate(00214) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00214/5/001 | Hinterland boundary | Comments on the opportunity to develop further existing clusters of houses within the hinterland such as Cranmore, at Nairns. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr John Finlayson(00244) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00244/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred boundary. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ardross Community Council(00267) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00267/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Considers the suggested Hinterland Expansion shown for Ardross as appropriate and are happy with outline of the area as indicated. | Inclusion of boundary extension in the Ardross area. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Fortrose And Rosemarkie Community Council(00286) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00286/1/005 | Hinterland boundary | Supports Council's preferred hinterland boundary. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Glenurquhart Community Council(00288) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Glenurquhart Community Council object to the current boundary, they consider the road to be an inappropriate boundary as this creates policies either side of the road. Recommend that the boundary should lie at least 2km from the road or follow geographic features, and therefore specifically recommend 2km west of Culnakirk or to follow Allt a Phuiul. Glenurquhart Community Council also consider that the whole of Bunloit should be within the Hinterland due to access and water constraints. | Amend boundary to lie 2km west of Culnakirk, or to follow Allt a Phuiul, also consider that the whole of Bunloit should be within the Hinterland. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Invergordon Community Council(00293) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with the preferred approach. They would support smallscale/individual houses in Newmore, Kindeace, Mossfield, Rosskeen, Achnagarron, Coillemore, Badachonacher. However they would also like to see an amenity area of Newmore covering the football pitch, car park and adjacent woodland. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Killlearnan Community Council(00297) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00297/2/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports Hinterland Policy. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Kiltarlity Community Council(00299) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00299/4/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports Hinterland boundary however also prefer the suggested expansion area around Kinerras. Kinerras is not an independent community and development should be considered in the context of Kiltarlity as a whole as it has the same school catchment area, post office etc and is dependent on the same services and infrastructure. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00302/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Support the Councils preferred hinterland boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Hinterland Boundary | Knockbain Community Council(00303) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0303/1/007 | Hinterland boundary | Support entire Black Isle lying within the hinterland. Argument for restrictions against development to be stronger. Note support for Council finding mortgage lenders prepared to accept conditions of a permanent agricultural connection for new houses. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0313/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary and approach. Comments on the alternative of 2km restricted development buffers around all major towns and settlements indicates that Nigg Energy Park is designated as a settlement, when it is not and it should be removed from the hinterland map. Supports green belts around towns but only if they can be enforced and keep towns from expanding into the countryside. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Raigmore Community Council(00314) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0314/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Support the preferred approach to the hinterland boundary, however, also supports a 2km buffer as this would help to avoid urban sprawl and retain existing boundaries between settlements (e.g. Inverness and Nairn) and support existing communities. | Inclusion of a 2km buffer around towns to protect settlement settings in addition to hinterland. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Tain Community Council(00322) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0322/1/010 | Hinterland boundary | Hinterland policy is over-restrictive around Tain, depriving local people of proper choice and potential affordability of individual new housing. Boundary should be withdrawn south from Tain at least as far as Kildary junction or where it meets the access across the railway line into the less restrictive policy area and north-east across to Lamington. Railway line is considered an arbitrary policy border and unless full justification of the hinterland policy application in terms of its relevance to the Tain area is forthcoming, then this historical zoning should not continue. | Withdrawal of hinterland boundary around Tain as far as Kildary. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Tarbat Community Council(00323) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0323/2/001 | Hinterland boundary | The Hinterland Boundary should be extended to cover the area between Portmahomack and Tain and from Portmahomack down to Rockfield. This is due to the landscape impacts, costly service implications and the reasons for the rural development area designation from the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan no longer being applicable to Portmahomack and it's hinterland. | Extend the hinterland boundary to cover the area between Tain and Portmahomack and Portmahomack and Rockfield |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Fraser Stewart(00407) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0407/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the approach to Hinterland, considers that design quality for housing in the countryside is key but recognises that due to there often being no chartered architect involvement design quality is sometimes missing. Considers there should be circumstances where hinterland housing development should be more positive if a design process is undertaken by a RIAS/RIBA chartered architect. | Modification to the exceptions in the HiC Policy to allow more flexibility for proposals which have been subject to a design process by a RIBA/RIAS architect. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0419/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Questions whether the Council is maintaining its current approach as it has evidence to show that it is fulfilling its objectives. Believes that the best policy is one which delivers the desired controls and prevents inappropriate ribbon-type development e.g. Scotsburn and Lamington. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mrs C Stafford(00511) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0511/1/006 | Hinterland boundary | Definition on hinterland in glossary of MIR is extremely confusing and lacks clarity. Croy workshop did not get to grips with the issues on this matter. There is a satisfactory definition of Hinterland in the glossary of the Development Plans' Team blog. Does support alternative option of 2km mini green belt around settlements.Considers applications for housing should be considered on merit and with due regard to environmental and infrastructure issues. Notes a larger settlement in the countryside can be just as far from amenities as a single house. | Amendment to hinterland definition to be included in the glossary of the Proposed Plan. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | SEPA generally agree with the Council's preferred approach as piecemeal housing development can lead to a proliferation of private waste water drainage systems and associated environmental problems. It is SEPAs understanding that there may be significant development pressure around the Torness and South of Dores to Farr areas due to the proximity to Inverness. SEPA's preference would therefore be that these areas are kept within the hinterland boundary to prevent an increase piecemeal housing development and associated environmental impacts. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Anthony Chamier(00632) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0632/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the preferred hinterland boundary. Supports the suggested expansion of the hinterland boundary north of Ardross as the landscape is already being spoilt by random development and the area contains the catchment for the Loch Acnacloch SSSI/SAC. Concerned that more housing without drainage could adversely affect the SSSI/SAC, SNH should be consulted about this. | Expansion of hinterland area to include suggested expansion area north of Ardross |
| Hinterland Boundary | Helena Ponty(00634) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0634/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Include site H70 as a housing site. (Marked incorrectly as site H71 in MIR). | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Aulay Macleod(00637) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0637/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred hinterland boundary. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Hazel Bailey(00638) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0638/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred hinterland boundary, | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mrs Ann Macleod(00639) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0639/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred Hinterland boundary. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Peter Gilbert(00642) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0642/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Prefers a wider hinterland boundary to protect greenspace and to prevent overstretching infrastructure. Concerned about the impact on services/infrastructure, the landscape, and habitats from recent ribbon expansion in Strathnairn. Feels that ribbon development needs to be positively resisted. | Expansion of a wider hinterland boundary. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Hugh Tennant(00643) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0643/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Interested in planning applications for the Farley area at Beaully Braes.No comments on the MIR. | None. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr George Baxter Smith(00654) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0654/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Support the Councils policy position on HIC but is concerned because frequently committee decisions overturn this position. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Andrew Currie(00658) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0658/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Consider that appropriate development occurred in Lamington on land outwith crofting tenure but that a historic decision to include good inbye land within the SDA was detrimental to the character of the area and introduced ribbon development. Concerned about the persistence of applicants in pursuing large scale proposals in Lamington and seeking an entire croft to be decrofted and consider that these proposals would result in suburbanisation and would require substantial public investment in waste water treatment and road improvement. Support the Councils position to not list Lamington as an Other Settlement. Consider that the current Hinterland boundary is appropriate as it limits housing in the countryside within this area, better for the public finances and preserving of recreational opportunities. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr John Keast(00705) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0705/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with preferred Hinterland Boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. Important to the local communities that Fortrose and Rosemarkie maintain their individual integrity. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mrs Janis Keast(00707) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0707/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with preferred Hinterland Boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. Important to the local communities that Fortrose and Rosemarkie maintain their individual integrity. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mrs Karin Kremer(00729) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0729/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with preferred approach but questions whether there should need to be a boundary and should the criteria not apply area-wide. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Kit Bower(00754) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0754/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the alternative to have a 2km buffer around settlements. | Inclusion of the alternative to have a 2km buffer around settlements. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Miss Annie Stewart(00757) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0757/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred hinterland boundary. Does not support a 2km restricted development buffer around each village. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Miss Rachael Crist(00772) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0772/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Supports hinterland policy. Does not prefer any of the alternatives. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0774/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Wood(00776) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0776/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to 'ribbon' development between settlements, e.g. Portmahomack, Fearn, Rockfield, Tain. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | The Iain Elliot Partnership(00781) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0781/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with the preferred Hinterland boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Paul A. Ross(00786) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0786/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred approach | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Dietrich Pannwitz(00867) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0867/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Does not agree with preferred Hinterland boundary or any of the stated alternatives. Would prefer another approach. Does not agree that development should be permitted on greenfield sites near supermarkets which have no relation to the Highland landscape, history or structure but on the other hand development of single houses in the countryside is not permitted. Considers single house developments should be assessed on its merits in the same way large projects are. | Assume removal of hinterland altogether |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Alistair Duff(00877) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0877/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports hinterland policy, does not prefer stated alternatives and would not prefer any other approach. Disagrees with the alternative of 2km restricted development buffer as it could lead to a situation where there is a development ring 2km away from the settlement boundary. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Peter Batten And Denise Lloyd(00878) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0878/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to Dores to Farr being removed from the Hinterland or to establishing a green belt around settlement, preference would be to include the whole of the IMFLDP area within the Hinterland. | Inclusion of the entire IMFLDP area within the hinterland. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Nicam Developments Ltd(00882) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0882/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the preferred approach but prefers 2km restricted development buffer approach providing applications within the 2km buffer are considered relative to existing supplementary guidance as development will help to improve the economy. | Inclusion of the 2km restricted development buffer approach. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Miss Mary Maciver(00883) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0883/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the preferred approach, prefers alternative of a 2km restricted development buffer around all major towns and villages. Believes this approach would be sensible provided proposals within the 2km buffer zone are considered relative to the existing supplementary guidance. States building is needed to fuel the economy. | Inclusion of 2km restricted development buffer around all major towns and villages |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Hinterland Boundary | Dr Ros Rowell(00885) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00885/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary and feels this represents the best compromise between supporting rural development whilst guarding against its worst effects. This protects a valuable resource which provides a base for our substantial tourism industry, feels that reducing the restricted area south of Dores would be a negative. Believe there is a need to safeguard the traditional character of Torness which is not linear development, and to safeguard the existing private water supplies as more houses would endanger supplies. Considers that the road network and condition make it unsuitable for commuters to Inverness. Considers that small urban plots are inappropriate in this type of area as they do not allow for self sufficient enterprises. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mackintosh Highland(00887) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00887/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Believes that well designed houses that fit a rural ("non-mainstream") context and location should be permissible within the Hinterland. | Seeks change in parent HwLDP Housing in the Countryside Policy to allow well designed (appropriate to context and location) houses anywhere within the Hinterland. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Miss Susanna Leslie(00888) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00888/2/001 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred alternative as best protecting countryside areas. Believes new developments should be kept within settlements. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mackintosh Highland(00890) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00890/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Believes that well designed houses that fit a rural ("non-mainstream") context and location should be permissible within the Hinterland. | Seeks change in parent HwLDP Housing in the Countryside Policy to allow well designed (appropriate to context and location) houses anywhere within the Hinterland. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mrs Liz Downing(00892) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00892/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the Council's preferred option and the 2km boundary option. | Inclusion of 2km option as well as retaining hinterland boundary. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Charlie And Sonia Ramsay(00894) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00894/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Jamestown should be maintained as a "contained settlement" as per the current policy BP2 in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. | Inclusion of Jamestown as a defined settlement. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Forbes(00902) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00902/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Does not agree with the preferred Hinterland boundary or any of the stated alternatives. Supports suggested contraction of the Hinterland boundary south of Dores to Farr but considers it should be contracted further to exclude the settlement of Croft Croy, meaning contracting the hinterland boundary to School Wood. Considers that contracting the hinterland boundary in this way will ensure that existing housing clusters are maintained, development is directed to the right locations and the landscape is protected from adverse sporadic development that would not be characteristic of rural locations. | Contraction of Hinterland boundary to exclude Croft Croy |
| Hinterland Boundary | Strathdearn Community Council(00908) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Strathdearn Community Council suggest extension of the hinterland boundary to approximately the slochd covering 2km either side of the A9 to manage the demand around Tomatin driven by its good A9 access and schooling. There is limited road network capacity and the water quality of the Findhorn (an important salmon river) needs to be protected from diffuse pollution. Considers that it would be better to concentrate development in Tomatin close to mains services, infrastructure and facilities. | Extension of the hinterland boundary to approximately the slochd covering 2km either side of the A9. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ferintosh Community Council(00910) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Supports application of current restrictive approach and therefore supports retention of existing boundary. Disagrees with mini green belt alternative. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr John Duncan(00915) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00915/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the preferred approach. Supports the alternative of contracting the boundary south of Dores and Torness. | Contraction of the boundary south of Dores and Torness. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Lochluichart Estate North(00916) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Support the Council preferred option that maintains the existing Housing in the Countryside hinterland boundary. This will help promote the properly planned development of land allocations in the main settlements. This approach is complemented by the ability to round off existing small groups of houses in the countryside. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Caroline Stanton(00943) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Agree with the preferred hinterland boundary however they also agree with the suggested expansion of the boundary to include Bunloit (which is not the Council's preferred approach). The dispersed crofting character, openness of landscape, sensitive receptors on the Great Glen Way and accessing the footpath to Meall Fuar - mhonaidh, mean that the area is would only be suitable for further sensitive development. Width and steep slope of single track road serving this area is also a problem. Does not agree with the alternative 2km restricted buffer. The limit of development should relate to the character of the settlement. Some settlements are focused in character and require a more restricted radius while others are more dispersed and the limit could be wider. There needs to be better policy control around the edges of hinterland areas. | Expansion of the hinterland boundary to include Bunloit. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mrs C Wood(00948) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00948/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | The Scottish Government(00957) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred approach for managing development in the hinterland. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| Hinterland Boundary | Highland Planning Consultancy(00963) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0963/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Does not consider that any extension, at Ardross, is appropriate and considers the policy over-restrictive. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Highland Planning Consultancy(00963) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0963/2/001 | Hinterland boundary | Believes Plan should endorse a housing in the countryside group at Little Cantray as having potential for 5-8 houses because: grouped development is better than ad-hoc single houses that have been developed in the Cantray area over recent years; houses in attractive rural locations are supported by Scottish Planning Policy as providing market choice; the location is sustainable; the proposal would be an infill development; the site is available, can be serviced and doesn't suffer from any constraints; it could offer good siting and design, and; it is poor agricultural land. | Inclusion in Proposed Plan of a housing in the countryside group at Little Cantray as having potential for 5-8 houses. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Paul Whitefoot(00973) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0973/1/006 | Hinterland boundary | Supports with the current Hinterland boundary. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Emma Jones(00976) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0976/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred Hinterland Boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr James Kidd(00979) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0979/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Considers the HIC policy too restrictive and supports the 2km edge of settlement alternative as long as there is sufficient land identified within these settlements to allow for growth, there should be a presumption in favour of small scale development in the countryside (dependent on assessment of services availability, visual impact, and size/design) because it is considered that this could help support services and facilities in these areas. | Inclusion of the 2km edge of settlement alternative. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Angus Mackenzie(00992) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0992/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Does not agree with preferred Hinterland Boundary. It currently takes a straight line from the top of Brin Rock roughly south east to the top of a small hill to the south east of the B851 which arbitrarily cuts in half a small field between the B851 and the River Nairn. Supports the reasonable alternative to reduce the restricted area south of Dores and Farr. | Inclusion of alternative to reduce the restricted area south of Dores and Farr. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Brian Stewart(00993) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0993/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Restrictions on construction in the countryside are necessary, and rural development should take account of the capacity of local services. But this carries a risk of accelerating the decline of rural areas. It would be reasonable (especially as dual-use, home-working, and cottage/workshop industries were, and can still be, part of the rural economy) to permit small-scale "organic" growth in the hinterland and to allow development where this is directly associated with local functions and employment. So, for example, permit construction of a local workshop or studio, but not a second-home for a city commuter. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Chris Barnett(01008) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01008/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the Council's non-preference to the expansion of hinterland at Bunloit because as a distinctive, established and dispersed crofting community not a commuter overspill area for Inverness sufficient controls exist within the Wider Countryside policy to control issues such as siting, design and servicing; the area is 24 miles from Inverness and outwith reasonable commuting time/distance by car or public transport; there is no evidence of commuter demand for this area; there is no evidence of how the landscape and/or servicing capacity of the area will be breached by further development; any proven servicing impacts can be offset by developer contributions; the expansion would be inconsistent with other areas such as the Seaboard villages area which is within commutable distance of Tain but is classified as wider countryside, and; it would harm hopes of regenerating the community which should be the policy aim for the area coupled with a landscape capacity assessment and developer contributions towards any service network issues. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Ruairidh MacIannan(01019) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the existing hinterland boundary and wishes to see it reduced because it stagnates, displaces and re-focuses development to the edge of the hinterland boundary, pushes development into rural areas with limited infrastructure and increases commuting to Inverness, impacts on land values due to being either in or out of the restricted development boundary which leads to speculative developments. This in turn makes it less affordable for local communities despite recognising need to control urban sprawl the current approach is not flexible enough it is too restrictive and unfair for an approach to depend on which side of an arbitrary line a proposal was on, especially some 10-20 miles from Inverness. Would like to see the boundary reduced at the south side of Loch Ness and Dores and around Loch Duntelchaig to allow for both residential and small scale commercial enterprises. Believes that the policy should be relaxed to allow for single plot eco-homes to be built and commercial ventures in land used for woodland commercial. This would help to deal with increased levels of disease among large plantations. | Boundary reduced at the south side of Loch Ness and Dores and around Loch Duntelchaig to allow for both residential and small scale commercial enterprises. Policy should be relaxed to allow for single plot eco-homes to be built and commercial ventures in land used for woodland commercial. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Bob How(01047) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01047/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | To conserve the rural nature of the area south of Dores and Torness, there should be a contraction of the hinterland boundary as indicated on the map. | Contraction of area hinterland at Dores and Torness. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the preferred hinterland boundary. If housing is to be considered in the countryside it should be managed and have positive local community involvement. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|---------------------|---|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/007 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to hinterland boundary. Concerned that existing boundary results in considerable divergence of approach to development on either side of a settlement boundary. Would prefer a more flexible approach to appropriate rural development that is in keeping with local settlement patterns, sympathetic to the landscape and does not put undue strain on other rural service network issues, does not support extension of hinterland boundary to include other land further from the main settlement corridors. | Removal of hinterland boundary and management of housing in the countryside through policy approach. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Hamish D MacLennan(01080) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Considers that in the wider area around Kiltarlity there should be more scope for large homes in groups in the countryside around the Kiltarlity area. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Grant Stewart(01097) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01097/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary and does not prefer any of the stated alternatives. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Wallace Grant(01115) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01115/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary and does not prefer any of the alternatives. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr John Hampson(01119) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01119/1/005 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary and does not prefer any of the alternatives. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Donald Leith(01121) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01121/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary and does not prefer any of the alternatives. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Kylauren Homes(01128) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01128/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred approach and objects to alternatives. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Eleanor Ross(01136) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01136/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred hinterland boundary and does not prefer any of the alternatives. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | J.E. And S.B Wood(01157) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01157/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Does not agree with the preferred hinterland boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns or with any other approach. Prefers mini-green belt alternative. Considers green-belt could be extended and would reduce 'kite-flying' planning applications. Lack of local input and proposals are predicated on expansion even in areas where demand is non-existent. | Inclusion of 2km restricted development buffer and removal of hinterland boundary. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Irene Ross(01159) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with the preferred Hinterland boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Roderick And Livette Munro(01161) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01161/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Remove Contin from Hinterland | Contraction of hinterland boundary to exclude area around Contin |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Ross Glover(01170) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01170/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports preferred approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Heather Macleod And John Parrott(01193) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01193/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Supports contraction of hinterland boundary to the south of Dores to conserve the rural nature of the area. | Contraction of hinterland boundary to the south of Dores |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Valerie Weir(01198) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01198/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the suggested contraction of the boundary at Dores and Torness but considers that this will conserve the rural nature of this area. | Contraction of the boundary at Dores and Torness. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Lucinda Spicer(01200) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01200/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the preferred hinterland boundary. Considers the suggested expansion areas are sensible as the poor quality of existing roads in the area means no additional traffic/services is really practical. | Expand hinterland boundary to include Eskadale and Polmally. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Christine Matheson(01203) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01203/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Evan McBean(01204) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01204/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Housing development in the countryside could be considered if managed by the concerning governing body and with positive local community involvement. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Dr Maria De La Torre(01205) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Agrees with the preferred hinterland boundaries. However considers a 'mini greenbelt' should be established to protect the green areas that benefit Inverness. Considers housing pressure on the hinterland is due too many peoples desire to live in areas with suitable space and green areas. Feels the promotion of individual parcels of land and smaller scale developments within Inverness rather than large scale developments by volume builders which dominate Inverness. This would allow more diverse development suited to the needs of local people that will live in these spaces. | Inclusion of a mini greenbelt to protect green areas around Inverness. |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|---------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Floris Greenlaw(01206) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01206/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Object to, on behalf of 12 households. with the existing hinterland boundary around the Kiltarlity area as it is not predicated on any reasoning and is not formed by any urban or natural landscape feature; past housing development outwith the existing hinterland boundary has led to septic tanks, pressure on water supplies or new boreholes and increasing traffic on narrow country roads; HwLDP Policy 29 is not a means of controlling housing development in the countryside; and development should be considered in the context of Kiltarlity, its services, facilities and catchment area which is wider than the existing hinterland boundary.Consider the hinterland boundary should be expanded to include the suggested expansion area at Eskdale and the whole of Kinerras, Clunevakie and probably Glen Convinth. Tentative view on Clunevakie is that some local opinion regarding opposition to further development of housing in the countryside both within and beyond the existing hinterland boundary, a number of new houses have been built, most of which are unrelated to management of the adjoining land.Tentative view on Glen Convinth is that the adverse impact of an increasing number of new homes fronting onto the A833 currently ends shortly before the road junction near Glen Convinth House. Extension of the hinterland boundary would safeguard the much more rural landscape beyond this point. | Expansion of hinterland boundary to include Eskdale,Clunevakie and Kinerras. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Anne Thomas(01208) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01208/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Considers that small developments within existing settlements would be the best approach, would like stricter controls on housing in the countryside and would therefore support a wider hinterland area. | Inclusion of a wider hinterland area. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Roderick Mackenzie(01210) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01210/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the preferred Hinterland boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. Considers Invergordon settlement development area is too tightly drawn around some parts of the fringes of the town, notably at The House of Rosskeen. Considers this area of Invergordon offers development potential that relates more to the expansion of the town and should therefore be excluded from the Hinterland area. | Exclusion of House of Rosskeen area in Invergordon from Hinterland. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Alexander MacDonald(01227) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01227/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Support the Council's preferred policy approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Robbie Munro(01228) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01228/1/001 | Hinterland boundary | Object to Contin being within the Hinterland area because of the facilities lost to the village over the last decade and because this presumes for over development | Removal of Contin from the hinterland. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Neil Sutherland Architects(01233) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01233/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the suggestion of a 2km mini green belt for the following reasons, it stops organic growth of incremental development within and around existing settlements, it provides a barrier to access to land for growing enterprises not suited to industrial/business land allocations that can be legitimately connected with suitable house development. Development cannot always be planned there needs to be flexibility for mixed use developments to come forward. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Munro Construction (Highland) Ltd(01235) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01235/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Object to the hinterland boundary and policy approach and considers it should be amended to take better account of local circumstances and be more positive about achieving a high standard of development on appropriate sites in rural areas. It should allow development which facilitates gains such as affordable rural housing, economic development, rural diversification or productive use of land should be supported more positively and allow the rural hinterland to be a transitional zone between urban centres and more remote rural living. | Amendment of the hinterland boundary and policy approach. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Conon Brae Farms(01236) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01236/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Does not agree with the preferred hinterland boundary around major Inner Moray Firth towns. Prefers one of the stated alternatives. The 2km restricted development would be a sensible approach, providing proposals within a 2km zone are considered relative to existing supplementary guidance. Building is needed to fuel the economy. | Hinterland policy to be 2km restricted development buffer around major towns and villages |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Jenny MacLennan(01237) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Feels hinterland boundary should be retained but agrees with the suggested contraction to the south of Inverness as shown in the MIR. | Contraction of hinterland boundary to the south of Inverness |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Hannah Stradling(01242) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01242/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Eddie MacDonald(01249) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01249/1/004 | Hinterland boundary | Supports this preferred approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Mr Craig MacRae(01260) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01260/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the Council's preferred approach. | Supports the Council's preferred approach. |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Marion Kennedy(01262) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01262/1/003 | Hinterland boundary | Supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Hinterland Boundary | Ms Pat Wells(01301) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01301/1/002 | Hinterland boundary | Objects to the current boundary and seeks the inclusion of Tomatin as far as Slochd as it is within easy commute of Inverness and demand for housing may therefore increase, there are road safety issues from lack of footpath provision in Tomatin that would be exacerbated by additional traffic and also due to concern about the location and design of housing in the countryside. | Inclusion of Tomatin and as far as Slochd within the hinterland boundary |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| Special Landscape Areas | Hilda Hesling(00005) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0005/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Refers to the suggested extension to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA shown in the IMFLDP, to include Blackfold, the south eastern part of the Caiplich plateau and Loch Laide, and the high viewpoint of Carn na Leitir.Supports this extension for the following reasons:- it would mirror the area round Lochs Duntelchaig and Ashie, with which the extension shares many natural history and cultural features;- the road to Blackfold provides the first glimpse of Loch Ness and a real sense of its proximity to the Moray Firth which cannot be experienced from the A82;- the high plateau of Caiplich shares the plateau formation of the its southern counterpart, with many similar archaeological remains. - Loch Laide was formerly a site for nesting Slavonian grebe, like Loch Ruthven; has a possible crannog site, and was considered a special landscape area, in the development plan of 1991. - the Great Glen Way which passes along Caiplich which is on the line of the former old road from Inverness to Urquhart, and is a route of great antiquity.- viewpoint Carn na Leitir is well visited and accessible by a footpath which affords some dramatic panoramas, with a real sense of the 'rift valley' of the Great Glen, with dramatic views south over the Monadhliath; and also north over Ben Wyvis and Glen Strathfarrar, and west to the mountains. - this an important position to appreciate the landscape setting of the great glen, and that the whole massif should be within the SLA. The respondent refers to SPP 2010 para 140 which defines the purpose of designating a SLA as 'to safeguard and enhance the character and quality of landscapes which are important or particularly valued locally or regionally' and to 'safeguard and promote important settings for outdoor recreation and tourism locally'. The respondent considers that this extension meets both of these objectives. | Supports the suggested extension to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA shown in the IMFLDP, to include Blackfold, the south eastern part of the Caiplich plateau and Loch Laide, and the high viewpoint of Carn na Leitir. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr John Ross(00016) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0016/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with the preferred Special Landscape Area boundaries within the Inner Moray Firth. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Save Our Dava(00022) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0022/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Save our Dava agrees with the following parts of the Council's preferred approach to the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area.Agrees with the northern 'preferred extension' area for the following reasons:- would consolidate boundary to the geographical feature of the River Findhorn in its eastern streens sections and its meltwater gorge feature at Dulsie Bridge which is Listed and where there are interpretation boards- western streens sections that already lie within SLA would be enhanced by preferred extensionSupport the Council's non-preference for the suggested western exclusion area as it comprises a major plateau area of similar landscape type to the remainder of the SLA. Loss of increasing parts of the adjacent Monadhliath upland area to wind farm development should be considered in retaining this section undeveloped and within the SLA.Support the Council's non-preference for the suggested central exclusion area as it comprises the new native pinewood plantation that supports habitat networking. Furthermore there is no central hole in any other Highland SLA's. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Save Our Dava(00022) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0022/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Save our Dava objects to the Councils non preference of the following suggested extensions to the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area.Considers that the Southern suggested expansion area at Balvraid should be re included having been included within the original SLA boundary prior to the Inverness Local Plan being prepared, and cites the following reasons: - those set out in respondents submission to the HwLDP and accompanying photography (which indicates that this site has diversifying forest and a river gorge feature)- this was excluded from present boundaries due to pressure from wind farm developers and not on landscape grounds and should be reinstated if the pending wind farm application is refused by Scottish Ministers, but should remain excluded if the application is approved.Considers the Council's non preferred suggested extension area to north of Dava junction should be included for the following environmental, landscape and social reasons:- the wildlife corridor link between SPAs and SACs;- it provides for the best panorama of the SLA in its entirety encapsulating its association as a contrasting landscape type, highlighting the juxtaposition of the broad tablelands with the Cairngorms massif;- it includes the A940 from Forres south to join the A939 before the Cairngorms National Park Boundary (part of the official tourist route between Inverness and Aberdeen);- it is noted that this section lies wholly within Moray Council's administrative boundary, but that the expansion of the SLA should not be compromised by potential administrative complications. | Expansion of Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA to include the non preferred suggested expansion areas to the North of Dava junction and to the west at Bavraid. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Kilmorack Community Council(00031) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0031/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with SLA boundaries as shown. Considers that SLAs should not allow wind farms | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Robert Boardman(00033) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0033/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with the SLA boundaries as shown. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Special Landscape Areas | Scottish Natural Heritage(00204) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/015 | Special Landscape Areas | Queries the lack of rationale for the alternatives. Opposes both contraction alternatives to the Drynahan, Lochindorn and Dava SLA because the respective citation is partly based upon the vast sense of scale of the area and this special quality would be diminished by contraction. Unable to comment on expansion alternatives without seeing further justification for them. | Opposes both contraction alternatives to the Drynahan, Lochindorn and Dava SLA, but is unclear about the suggested extensions without being able to consider the reasons why these changes to the SLA boundaries are being consulted on. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr John Finlayson(00244) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0244/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Disagrees with alternative of extending Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA to cover wider Abriachan area because the change is not clear in its boundary and justification, is only apparently supported by one individual and would if implemented have serious consequences for the community. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Beauly Community Council(00271) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Support the Councils approach to Special Landscape Areas boundaries within the Inner Moray Firth. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Carrbridge & Vicinity Community Council(00272) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0272/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Carrbridge and Vicinity Community Council supports the Council's preferred approach to Special Landscape Areas, particularly in regard to the Drynahan, Lochindorb and Dava Moor SLA. Does not agree with the reasonable alternatives of a suggested exclusion areas to the Drynahan, Lochindorb and Dava Moor SLA for the following reasons:- Exlcusion area of the new native pinewood to east of B9007 and west of Lochindorb is important to habitat networks and no other SLAs possess a "hole" within them. - Exclusion area to west is a SAC comprising a major plateau area of similar landscape type to the remainder of the SLA. The plateau is a significant area of upland of wild character relative to its proximity to Inverness and the A96 corridor so should remain in SLA as a area of contrast. The loss of parts of the adjacent Monadhliath to wind farm development should be considered in retaining this section of the SLA. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Dalnain Bridge Community Council(00282) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0282/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent supports the non-preferred status of the exclusion the the Lochindorb and the Carn nan Tri-tighearnan areas from the Drynahan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA due to the histoic, environmental and recreation benefits to the local community. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Fortrose And Rosemarkie Community Council(00286) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0286/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports Council's preference for SLA boundaries. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Glenurquhart Community Council(00288) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Glenurquhart Community Council asks us to confirm that Meall Fuar-mhonaidh is within the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Basil Dunlop(00289) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0289/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the Highland Council's preferred extension of the Drynahan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA as the special nature and fragility of the area requires protection. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Invergordon Community Council(00293) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0293/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with the preferred SLA boundaries and that SLAs require a greater degree of protection. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Inverness West Community Council(00296) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0296/1/006 | Special Landscape Areas | Suggests large westward expansion of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA boundary because the upland area north west of Loch Ness shares many of the same characteristics and qualities of the Ashie, Duntelchaig and Ruthven area which is within the current boundary. Offers detailed landscape and visual assessment work as a justification for the suggested boundary change with the following the main conclusions from this when comparing this suggested area to the citation for this SLA:-- this area includes the distinctive upland moorland and agricultural area around Abriachan and Caiplich; and the distinctive upland moorland area over Culnakirk and Loch nam Faoileag; - the area is comparable to the Ashie, Duntelchaig and Ruthven area and Caiplich and Abriachan with "undulating moorland plateau characterised by rocky knolls and small-scale woods and forests, and peppered with upland lochs"around Rivoulich and includes the distinctive Glen Convinth and Culnakirk area which the A833 affords views to;- it would include crofting townships;- there is a scheduled hut circle and field system in the Blairmore forest and there are numerous hut circles, historic field systems and cairns above Culnakirk and Upper Drumbuie. There is also the remains of the Culdrish crofts; and- this area of upland plateau, includes distinct hill tops such as Creag Ard and Cnoc Snataig, and elevated positions to view 'long vistas of grand proportions' where you can see the glen within its context of elevated plateaux and hills. It also contains the open stretch of the Great Glen Way with elevated and open views, with most other stretches within woodland or at the foot of the glen. | Large westward expansion of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA boundary to enclose Glen Convinth and Caiplich. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Killearnan Community Council(00297) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0297/2/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports SLA policy however proposes a new SLA. Respondent has previously submitted requests to the Council regarding the creation of a conservation area to protect against unsuitable development within the Redcastle, Kilcoy and Coulmore areas and suggests that alternatively it could be considered as a Special Landscape Area. Respondent is requesting clarification of the Council's position. | New SLA to cover Redcastle, Kilcoy and Coulmore areas |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Special Landscape Areas | Kiltarlity Community Council(00299) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0299/4/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports SLA boundaries however also supports the suggestion made by Inverness West Community Council that the SLA boundary is extended on the west side of Loch Ness which will copy the extent and qualities of the Ashie, Duntelchaig and Ruthven areas. | Supports Inverness West Community Council's proposed modification of Loch Ness, and Duntelchaig SLA. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | Support the preferred Special Landscape Area boundaries identified in the Main Issues Report. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Knockbain Community Council(00303) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0303/1/008 | Special Landscape Areas | Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA needs to be extended to include Munloch Bay. Kessock Bridge would make a simple boundary. | Extend Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA to include Munloch Bay, boundary should be Kessock Bridge. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0313/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred SLA boundaries. Hill of Nigg is shown as being within a SLA and therefore any proposed development on the top of these hills should be opposed by the Council. More detail should be given on building restrictions within an SLA. Respondent thinks SSSIs should also be shown to give a complete picture. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Raigmore Community Council(00314) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0314/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | There are many areas of historic significance and natural beauty which need to be protected and a balance can be made between this and providing jobs. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Tarbat Community Council(00323) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0323/2/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Considers Tarbat Ness should be designated a Special Landscape Area. This is due to the views from this area. The respondent considers that given the development pressures in the area it should be a SLA to prevent further degradation of the special qualities of the landscape. | Tarbat Ness to be covered by an SLA designation. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0330/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Consider Sutors of Comarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA should be extended south to Kilmuir to enclose the railway line, protected woodland between Avoch and Fortrose, Ormand Hill and Munloch Bay, a special area in terms of landscape and habitat. | Extend Sutors of Comarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA south to Kilmuir to enclose the railway line, woodland between Avoch and Fortrose, Ormand Hill and Munloch Bay. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Fraser Stewart(00407) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0407/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent supports the preferred approach. Respondent considers that a designation which will safeguard the landscape from wind energy development should be welcomed. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0419/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Broadly supports the current position on SLAs | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Anthony Chamier(00632) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0632/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Does not agree with the preferred SLA boundaries or the stated alternatives. Concerned that there is no SLA between Ben Wyvis and Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLAs. Considers this is the most populated area north of Inverness and needs protected as recreational space. Seeks consideration of a new SLA at the Strathrusdale/Alness River valley complex as the area already contains a protected designed landscape, SSSI; is convenient as an amenity for Alness and is adjacent to a main tourist route (the Struie). | New SLA at Strathrusdale/Alness River valley complex |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mrs P Thompson(00633) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0633/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA should be expanded to include the Davidston area. It is a high area on Black Isle which provides stunning views over the Cromarty Firth, looking north and west. | Expand Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA to include the Davidston area. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Roddy Macdonald(00635) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0635/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Support this policy approach in order to preserve the Loch Ness scenic landscape. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Aulay Macleod(00637) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0637/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred SLA boundaries. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Hazel Bailey(00638) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0638/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred SLA boundaries | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Peter Gilbert(00642) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0642/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the expansion of the existing boundaries shown in the MIR so as to better safeguard existing areas (by protecting against impacts from development outwith the SLA). | Expand the SLAs as shown in MIR |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr John Keast(00705) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0705/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Broadly agrees with the SLA boundaries around the Inner Moray Firth. However considers the Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA should be extended to include the Cragie Woods between Fortrose and Avoch. | Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA should be extended to include the Cragie Woods |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mrs Janis Keast(00707) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0707/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Broadly agrees with the SLA boundaries around the Inner Moray Firth. However considers the Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA should be extended to include the Cragie Woods between Fortrose and Avoch. | Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA should be extended to include the Cragie Woods between Fortrose and Avoch |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mrs Karin Kremer(00729) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0729/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent seems to misunderstand the SLA policy as they are concerned about relevance of the boundary extending westwards and mentions the hinterland boundary. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Kit Bower(00754) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0754/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent seeks a buffer zone around SLAs. | Respondent seeks a buffer zone around SLAs. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Miss Annie Stewart(00757) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0757/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the expansion of the Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA to include both the preferred and suggested expansion areas. Does not favour the suggested exclusion area. | Inclusion of all suggested expansion areas to Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLAs. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Miss Rachael Crist(00772) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0772/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports SLA approach and does not prefer any of the stated alternatives. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to preferred SLA boundaries. Respondent thinks Munloch Bay should be included as an SLA for the following reasons:- aspect, both into it and from it;- it contains important geological features;- it contains tidal flats and mature stands of broadleaf trees;- the landscape is determined by the interaction of geology, climate (glacial and present) and land use (historical and present) which are all in evidence at Munloch Bay;- and notes specific elements of significant historical, and cultural importance in the area such as Thomas Telford's Littlemill Bridge and the Bay Quarry which was used as a stone source for Fort George | Include Munloch Bay as an SLA. |
| Special Landscape Areas | J.A. Wiscombe(00777) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00777/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred Special Landscape Area boundaries. Does not prefer any of the stated alternatives. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Paul A. Ross(00786) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00786/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent supports the preferred approach. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Hunter Gordon(00789) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00789/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to current list of SLAs. The entire Beaully Estuary should be a SLA due to its great natural beauty. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Dietrich Pannwitz(00867) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00867/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Does not agree with the preferred SLA boundaries or any of the stated alternatives and would prefer the Council leave the boundaries until planning officers have spare capacity. | No alteration to SLA boundaries. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Alistair Duff(00877) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00877/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports existing SLA boundaries. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Nicam Developments Ltd(00882) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00882/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred approach. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Miss Mary Maciver(00883) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00883/1/006 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with Council's preferred Special Landscape Area boundaries within the Inner Moray Firth | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Dr Ros Rowell(00885) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00885/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent believes that the whole of Stratherrick including Loch Mhor, the Pass of Inverfarigaig and as far East as the Killin area should be included within the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA, its landscape being important to both visitors and residents alike for the following reasons:- the uniqueness of its combination of wildness qualities and historic settlements with traditional settlement pattern;- the wildlife, woodlands, waterfalls, remnants of Caledonian Pine, and fact that part of the Farigaig pass is a SSSI;- the corkscrew road from Inverfarigaig and magnificent Dun Deardil; and- because there is concern that the area could turn into a commuter suburb of Inverness rather than people living and working in a rural sustainable way. | Seeks extension of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA to include the whole of Stratherrick. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mackintosh Highland(00887) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00887/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred approach. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mackintosh Highland(00890) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00890/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred approach. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mrs Liz Downing(00892) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00892/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | The respondent supports the Council's preferred approach to SLA | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Strathdearn Community Council(00908) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Strathdearn Community Council support extensions to cover Dulsie/Strens, and Balvraid and oppose exclusion of carn nan Tri-trighearnan to safeguard the landscape qualities of Strathdearn. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ferintosh Community Council(00910) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports designation of Ben Wyvis SLA and its application in preserving views of the massif from the Black Isle. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr John Duncan(00915) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00915/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | The Loch Ness and Duntelchaig Special Landscape Area should be extended to the south-east to the south east to include the Fechlin Glen, Loch Killin, Loch Mhor and Inverfarigaig Pass for the following reasons:- the landscape is picturesque, and very important to both locals and visitors for recreation and a sense of well-being. Loch Killin is a wild and lonely place and the strath has beautiful rivers, pools and waterfalls;- the area around Loch Mhor has numerous pre-historic hut circles, crannogs, field systems and other archeologically important sites, including General Wade's Road stretching from Carnoch to Torness;- the area is habitat for important bird species such as Ospreys and Divers and has a SAC and SSSI within it;- the hills above Farraline have remnant Caledonian pine, which is beginning to regenerate; - the Inverfarigaig Pass is an ancient steep-sided route from Errogie to Loch Ness which is often used by visitors; and- from the summit of the Suidhe, there are spectacular views down the length of Stratherrick. | Seeks amendment to the boundary of the Drynahan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. It should be extended to the south east to include the Fechlin Glen, Loch Killin, Loch Mhor and Inverfarigaig Pass. |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr James Grant(00920) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0920/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | The respondent objects to the current boundary of the The Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie & Fort George Special Landscape Area and considers that the boundary should be extended westward as far as Avoch, and from the shoreline to the minor road that runs through Knockmuir, and include the hillside that lies between and behind Fortrose and Rosemarkie. (The Hill of Fortrose).The reasons for this proposed extension are as follows- This area is contiguous with and has similar characteristics of form, panorama and geology to the area listed in the SLA citation- Fortrose is a historic village with several important structures within it including the cathedral- The area contains Craigie woods which consists largely of native woodland trees which are considered to be a desirable addition to the SLA(and is without any commercial plantings which are a detraction in other parts of the SLA)- It includes the abandoned rail line between Avoch and Fortrose which is now used for pedestrian access between the villages- It would complete the buffer zone between Fortrose and Rosemarkie | The respondent objects to the current boundary of the The Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie & Fort George Special Landscape Area and considers that the boundary should be extended westward as far as Avoch, and from the shoreline to the minor road that runs through Knockmuir, and include the hillside that lies between and behind Fortrose and Rosemarkie. (The Hill of Fortrose). |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mrs E MacDougall(00922) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0922/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Attended Stratherrick and Foyers Community Council meeting where it was explained that development has to be sensitive in Special Landscape Areas such as Loch Ness and Duntelchaig. Concerned this was ignored when planning permission was granted for a large caravan and campsite in a prominent green area of Foyers. Development of campsite will be intrusive in terms of impact upon roads and increase in noise. Questions if development of campsite can still be halted. Note preference is for a housing development in a strategically sited area to help revive falling school numbers. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Caroline Stanton(00943) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0943/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondant agrees with the alternative suggestion of extension to Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA to include Abriachan, however it should be extended to include Craggainvaillie, Glen Convinth, Culnakirk, Upper Drumbuie and southern slopes of Urquhart Bay that include the route of the Great Glen Way. This area includes key landscape characteristics and special qualities listed within the citation and would mirror the area of Ashie and Duntelchaig so that the SLA seems more robust as a whole.Offers detailed landscape and visual assessment work as a justification for the suggested boundary change with the following the main conclusions from this when comparing this suggested area to the citation for this SLA:- this area includes the distinctive upland moorland and agricultural area around Abriachan and Caiplich; and the distinctive upland moorland area over Culnakirk and Loch nam Faoileag; - the area is comparable to the Ashie, Duntelchaig and Ruthven area and Caiplich and Abriachan with "undulating moorland plateau characterised by rocky knolls and small-scale woods and forests, and peppered with upland lochs"around Rivoullich and includes the distinctive Glen Convinth and Culnakirk area which the A833 affords views to;- it would include crofting townships;- there is a scheduled hut circle and field system in the Blairmore forest and there are numerous hut circles, historic field systems and cairns above Culnakirk and Upper Drumbuie. There is also the remains of the Culdrish crofts; and- this area of upland plateau, includes distinct hill tops such as Creag Ard and Cnoc Snataig, and elevated positions to view 'long vistas of grand proportions' where you can see the glen within its context of elevated plateaux and hills. It also contains the open stretch of the Great Glen Way with elevated and open views, with most other stretches within woodland or at the foot of the glen. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mrs C Wood(00948) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0948/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Keith Urquhart(00968) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0968/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred extension from Drynahan to Dulsie Bridge and eastwards to the A939 trunk road west of Dava junction as this would consolidate the boundary to the River Findhorn and incorporate the meltwater gorge at Dulsie Bridge the listed historic bridge itself. This would also help to enhance the existing SLA area.Supports the non-preferred status of the suggested exclusion west of Lochindorb as it has likely been proposed to allow for windfarm to be developed, the new woodland was created in accordance with environmental habitat networking, and it would create a non-eligible 'hole' in the SLA.The respondent supports the non-preferred status of the suggested exclusion of the Carn nan Tri-tighearnan SLA as it comprises a major plateau with significant wild character. Due to its close proximity to Inverness and A96 it provides a good contrast between development and natural landscapes. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Keith Urquhart(00968) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00968/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to the non-preferred status of the Balvaird Suggested Extension of the Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA as it is a diversifying forested land type with a river gorge. Feels that to be consistent with the objectives of the SLA the windfarm proposal in that area should be rejected. Also supports the suggested extension area north of Dava as it would help to protect an important habitat network, and protect the panoramic views of the SLA and CNP for people travelling south on the A940. Does not agree with item 6.8 of the MIR as it can result in industrial development immediately adjacent to an SLA boundary. The respondent believes that large wind turbines which are developed in close proximity to an SLA will significantly erode the landscape quality of protected area. | Seeks inclusion of suggested extensions: at Balvaird and north of Dava, and considers that the SLA boundaries should include buffer areas. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr James Kidd(00979) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00979/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent considers that all the Highlands is a special landscape area and that the map of proposals should contain NSAs. Respondent is in favour of the proposal if it means that the areas designated will be protected from wind farm development. | Respondent considers that the map of proposals should contain NSAs. Respondent is in favour of the proposal if it means the areas designated will be protected from wind farm development. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Gordon Grant(00981) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00981/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent wishes to see the SLA at Sutors of Cromarty and Fortrose extended westward to Avoch, from the shoreline to the minor road that runs through knockmuir and the hillside behind Fortrose and Rosemarkie for the following reasons:- similar raised beach landscape as Craigie woods which is an important habitat for wildlife and forms part of a natural woodland- these features enhance the appearance of the landscape- the abandoned railway provides an attractive area for walking with occasional views of the firth- Fortrose should be included as it contains many interesting and historical connections | Seeks extension to Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA westward to Avoch. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Brian Stewart(00993) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00993/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred approach to extend the Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Michael And Helen Dickson(01009) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01009/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent supports the preferred extension to the Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. Respondent supports the continued inclusion of the Carn nan Tritigheanan part of the Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. Respondent supports the response of Save our Dava. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Michael And Helen Dickson(01009) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01009/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | The respondent supports the extensions to the Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA at Dava and Balvaird. | Expansion of the Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA in the suggested locations. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Strathdearn Against Windfarm Developments(01012) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01012/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent, on behalf of Strathdearn Against Windfarm Developments (SAWD), supports the Council's preferred approach to SLAs. Respondent supported the non-preferred status of the suggested exclusion east of Moy and the area in the middle of the SLA as it is an attractive area with excellent views in all directions. It also has valuable vegetation and wildlife and removing this integral part of the SLA would devalue the designation. Respondent objects to the current boundary and seeks the inclusion of the area in the vicinity of Streens and wants western boundary to be straight as it travels south from the Streens and the small area at Balvaird included. | Seeks the inclusion of the area in the vicinity of Streens and wants western boundary to be straight as it travels south from the Streens and the small area at Balvaird included. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Seafield And Strathspey Estates(01032) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01032/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Request better scale map of existing and alternative boundaries of Drynchan SLA. Dispute south and east boundary of existing SLA because it doesn't match the Council's own criteria that SLAs should follow definite landforms and avoid severing self contained landscape features. Cite Cairngorms Landscape Assessment 1996 and Cairngorms National Park Forest and Woodland Framework in support of argument. Believe Council's method and criteria used for original and current AGLV boundaries is not robust. Offers to work with Council to establish a more appropriate boundary on land in their ownership. | Reduction of land within Drynchan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA on its current south and east boundaries. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Iain Cameron(01043) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01043/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent considers that there are landscapes more special that are not designated citing the riverside between the end of Loch Ness area and Inverness city boundary as being arguably more attractive than Loch Ness itself. | Identification of area between Loch Ness and the Inverness city boundary as a SLA. |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Bob How(01047) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01047/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | Suggests that Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SPA is extended to the south-east to include the Fechlin glen and Loch Killin, the whole of Loch Mhor, and the Farigaig pass for the following reasons:-The landscape is beautiful, and very important to both locals and visitors for recreation and a sense of well-being;-Loch Killin is a wild and lonely place, and contains a population of arctic char;-The glen has beautiful rivers, pools and waterfalls and it is a wonderful place to walk;-The area around Loch Mhor has numerous pre-historic hut circles, crannogs, field systems and other archeologically important sites, including General Wade's Road stretching from Carnoch to Torness;-Loch Mhor is a fishing ground for osprey and divers as well as a locally important site for waders. It is also a breeding ground for ospreys;-The hills above Farraline have remnant Caledonian pine, which is beginning to regenerate. -The Farigaig pass, which is included in the Ness Woodlands SAC and includes an SSSI, is an ancient steep-sided route from Errogie to Loch Ness, one which is often used by visitors; -From the summit of the Suidhe, there are spectacular views down the length of Stratherrick; and-Visitors regularly tour the loop from Inverness to Foyers or Fort Augustus, returning to Inverness via the B862, and the whole area should be designated in order to conserve its spectacular nature. | Expansion of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SPA to the south-east to include the Fechlin glen and Loch Killin, the whole of Loch Mhor, and the Farigaig pass. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Graeme Grant(01048) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01048/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent objects to the preferred approach and would like to see the Suotors of cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA boundary extended to include all of Fortrose, the hill behind it and Craigie Woods (woodland between Fortrose and Avoch). As the area is similar in character to the existing SLA sites including native woodlands; panoramas across the Beaully Firth; remnants of old railway track, and ancient settlement of Fortrose. | Extension of the boundary to include all of Fortrose, the hill behind it and Craigie Woods (woodland between Fortrose and Avoch). |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred SLA boundaries as it may impede development of windfarms close to any rural housing. Windfarms have a distinct negative impact for the immediate wildlife and visually for the rural community. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Lady Balgonie Of Glenferness Estate(01073) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01073/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to the designation of the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moor SLA, to the boundary of the SLA, and to the process which had been followed prior to its designation in the HwLDP. With regard to this SLA boundary:- It is noted that this SLA is identified as relating to an area of open moorland but that within the SLA boundary there are significant woodland plantations. It is considered that such plantation areas are not compatible with the description and characteristics identified within the SLA citation as being important for protection. - It is also noted that the SLA boundary overlaps with the CNPA boundary. | Seeks removal of the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moor SLA, or if not removal at least change to the boundary of the SLA to remove the plantation forestry areas and the area lying with the CNPA area. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Sarah Brodie Woodlands(01074) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01074/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to the designation of Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA and its boundary and the process followed prior to its designation in the HwLDP. Also objects to inclusion of the Dunearn plantation within the SLA boundary as this does not form part of the moorland landscape area. | Seeks the removal of the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA or failing that alteration of the SLA boundary to exclude the Dunearn plantation. |
| Special Landscape Areas | EJ And M Brodie Partnership(01075) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01075/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to the designation of Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moor SLA and its boundaries. Objects to the process taken prior to its inclusion in the HwLDP, and how its boundaries were formed. | Seeks removal of the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA and failing that alteration of its boundary. However whilst alteration of the boundary is sought no amendments have been specifically sought. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with preferred SLA boundaries. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Grant Stewart(01097) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01097/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred SLA boundaries and does not prefer any of the stated alternative. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Wallace Grant(01115) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01115/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred SLA boundaries and does not prefer any of the stated alternatives. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr John Hampson(01119) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01119/1/006 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred SLA boundaries and does not prefer any of the stated alternatives. SLA work is well thought out. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Donald Leith(01121) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01121/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the preferred SLA boundaries. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Kylauren Homes(01128) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01128/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred approach and objects to alternatives. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Eleanor Ross(01136) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01136/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred SLA boundaries and does not prefer any of the alternatives. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | R.V. Hewett(01142) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01142/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports preferred approach to SLA boundaries and supports the Council's suggested expansion of the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. Respondent disagrees with the suggested alternatives of excluding parts of this SLA. Tourists pass through the area and use it for leisure activities and observe the SLA as a whole panorama along with the Cairngorm Massif. This area should have been included within the Cairngorms National Park. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Special Landscape Areas | J.E. And S.B Wood(01157) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01157/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Does not agree with the preferred SLA boundaries within the Inner Moray Firth or any of the stated alternatives. Would prefer another approach as it implies open planning in non-designated areas or development up to a boundary, and this compromises special areas. The entire area should be designated, any development must be justified and fulfil local needs and approval. There should be buffer zones to prevent enclosure of SLAs. | Seeks buffer areas to be identified and protected for the SLAs. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Irene Ross(01159) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with preferred SLA boundaries within the Inner Moray Firth. Would prefer that the Lochindorb landscape and surrounding moor is protected in its appearance from any wind farm application. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Ross Glover(01170) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01170/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent supports the SLA boundaries, particularly the non-preferred status of the extension at Abriachan. However, respondent would prefer to see a more detailed map. The respondent also highlights the range of outdoor activities that the Abriachan area has to offer and considers that further development in the area would enhance these and the local community. The extension to the SLA would remove this opportunity. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Ben Reardon(01172) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01172/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent agrees with the preferred SLA boundaries. Agrees that the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA should not be extended to include Abriachan as it may limit development opportunities in within the area. Considers Abriachan could flourish if further development and expansion were allowed to take place. Abriachan is close to Inverness and appeals to outdoor enthusiasts, particularly walkers. Considers attractions are too large to be restricted by the possible decreased development possibilities that would be synonymous with the expansion of the SLA boundary. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Cawdor Marriage Settlement Trust(01188) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01188/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects in principle to whole of Drynacahan etc SLA because of the process that was followed prior to its identification in the HwLDP. However, if area remains, objects to existing boundary and stated alternatives and suggests area is limited to that land east of the B9007 and Dunearn plantation because: the existing boundary contradicts the relevant local landscape character assessments and Highland SLA citations; it encloses moorland that has no special quality (it is not rare or unusual within Highland); it contains areas of naturally regenerating woodland which will undermine the open moorland characteristic; it may be remote but this in itself is not rare or a reason for protection; it overlaps with the Cairngorms National Park which has its own designations and this is contrary to Scottish Planning Policy, and; it is contrary to the criteria in the MIR in terms of not following definite landforms/features, enclosing land to the national park boundary simply as a buffer, and severs a self-contained landscape and goes into a different landscape character type. | Deletion of the Drynacahan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA failing that, reduction in the present boundary to only include Lochindorb and land east of the B9007 and Dunearn plantation |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Suzann Barr(01192) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01192/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Considers the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA should be extended to include the Abriachan, Caiplich, Glen Conveinth and the lochans to the west of the B833. Reasons are as follows:- Area provides excellent 'Highlands in a nutshell';- Contains many features referred to in the MIR explanatory text in section 6.8;- Would follow definite landforms such as ridges and avoid severing self contained landscape features such as river gorges; and- Would meet another aim of SLAs by enclosing an area of similar or complementary landscape in terms of their type and/or quality. | Expansion of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA to include Abriachan, Caiplich, Glen Conveinth and the lochans to the west of the B833. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Heather Macleod And John Parrott(01193) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01193/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to boundary of Drynahan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. It should be extended to the south east to include the Fechlin Glen, Loch Killin, Loch Mhor and Inverfarigaig Pass for the following reasons:- the landscape is picturesque, and very important to both locals and visitors for recreation and a sense of well-being. Loch Killin is a wild and lonely place and the strath has beautiful rivers, pools and waterfalls;- the area around Loch Mhor has numerous pre-historic hut circles, crannogs, field systems and other archeologically important sites, including General Wade's Road stretching from Carnoch to Torness;- the area is habitat for important bird species such as Ospreys and Divers and has a SAC and SSSI within it;- the hills above Farraline have remnant Caledonian pine, which is beginning to regenerate; - the Inverfarigaig Pass is an ancient steep-sided route from Errogie to Loch Ness which is often used by visitors; and- from the summit of the Suidhe, there are spectacular views down the length of Stratherrick. | Extension of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig to the south east to include Fechlin glen and Loch Killin, the whole of Loch Mhor, and the Farigaig pass |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Valerie Weir(01198) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01198/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to boundary of Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. It should be extended to the south east to include the Fechlin Glen, Loch Killin, Loch Mhor and Inverfarigaig Pass for the following reasons:- the landscape is picturesque, and very important to both locals and visitors for recreation and a sense of well-being. Loch Killin is a wild and lonely place and the strath has beautiful rivers, pools and waterfalls;- the area around Loch Mhor has numerous pre-historic hut circles, crannogs, field systems and other archeologically important sites, including General Wade's Road stretching from Carnoch to Torness;- the area is habitat for important bird species such as Ospreys and Divers and has a SAC and SSSI within it;- the hills above Farraline have remnant Caledonian pine, which is beginning to regenerate; - the Inverfarigaig Pass is an ancient steep-sided route from Errogie to Loch Ness which is often used by visitors; and- from the summit of the Suidhe, there are spectacular views down the length of Stratherrick. | Suggests that the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig Special Landscape Area should be extended to the south-east to include the Fechlin glen and Loch Killin, the whole of Loch Mhor, and the Farigaig pass. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Lucinda Spicer(01200) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01200/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent does not agree with the preferred SLA boundaries. Considers the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA boundary should be extended to include Abriachan for the following reasons:- landscape of similar quality and character to the Duntelchaig area on the east side of Loch Ness;- the sides of the rift valley are sloping and points such as Carn na Leitire and Carn a Bhodaich contribute to a sense of increasing slope;- more expansive landscape and includes the Abriachan area and the Caiplich plateau/Cragganvallie area. The current boundary does not include the landscape necessary to place this upper section of the Great Glen completely in context. Including these high points and the sloping landforms around them (which conclude on the Caiplich plateau) meets the twin criteria of forming part of a self contained landscape (the northern section of the Great Glen) and enclosing similar/complementary landscape as to type/quality.- provides complementary progression from Lochend to the more dramatic slopes of Meall Fuarhnaidh to the south, in the way that the Loch Duntelchaig area to the east side of Loch Ness does to the craggy areas opposite Urquhart Bay- Would support the plans vision of 'allowing people to move through the green network' as the area includes the Great Glen Way and Abriachan Forest Trails;- Area has important wildlife; and- Area is within easy reach of Inverness with excellent road access which is vital for leisure and tourism objectives. | Extension of Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA to include Abriachan |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Christine Matheson(01203) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01203/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | The Respondent supports the non preferred extension to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA at Abriachan for the following reasons- Blackfold has a commanding view down the Loch, as well as a panoramic view towards the Moray Firth- Caiplich is a moorland plateau, similar in many respects to Duntelchaig/Ashie on the opposite side of Loch Ness- the stunning 360 degree views from the summit of Carn na Leitir provide a real sense of how towards the south, the Great Glen fault has impacted on the landscape parallel to the shores of Loch Ness towards the Moray Firth beyond - from the summit of Carn na Letir is considered that we can appreciate the different geological processes which have fashioned the hills of Easter Ross and the Affric and Strath Farrar ranges and experience the vast extent of this wilderness area of the Highlands which makes it so special. -towards the west can be seen the iconic Meall Fuar-mhonaidh, the most prominent summit around Loch Ness and the highest conglomerate hill in Scotland. | The Respondent supports the extension consulted on but not Council supported to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA at Abriachan |
| Special Landscape Areas | Dr Maria De La Torre(01205) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA, considers it should be extended to include Dores beach and the River Ness as far as Clachnaharry as this area is a major view and feature of Inverness city. Notes it is disappointing that the landscape of Inverness is not given any value or protection. Also supports suggested extension of this SLA to include Abriachan.Agrees with suggested/preferred extension areas to the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA.Does not consider SLA coverage in Highland is comprehensive, feels critical areas with dramatic landscapes in the West of Scotland have been missed, in particular:- Gairloch-Ullapool-Assynt mountain range;-Torridon mountain range (&Loch Torridon);-Applecross peninsula;-South Skye (Cullins ridge and Loch Corrisk); and-Parts of Knoydart. | Extentions to Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA to include Dores beach and the River Ness as far as Clachnaharry and supports suggested extension of this SLA to include Abriachan; and seeks all the suggested extensions to Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA to be incorporated into this SLA. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Anne Thomas(01208) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01208/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the Council's preferred SLA boundaries. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Alexander MacDonald(01227) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01227/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the Council's preferred boundary for the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA as it is considered that the Abriachan area would benefit from further development and the respondent is concerned that an extension of the SLA would restrict housing development in the area. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Conon Brae Farms(01236) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01236/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent agrees with the preferred Special Landscape Area boundaries within the Inner Moray Firth. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Jenny MacLennan(01237) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Considers boundary around SLAs should include visual impact areas which would affect the nature of the landscape, for example Ben Wyvis. Not just the land area but the visual montage that it represents as a vista should be preserved. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr And Mrs P. Hemmings(01238) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01238/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Agrees with the following parts of the Council's preferred approach to the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area. Agrees with the northern 'preferred extension' area for the following reasons:- would consolidate boundary to the geographical feature of the River Findhorn in its eastern streens sections and its meltwater gorge feature at Dulsie Bridge which is Listed and where there are interpretation boards- western streens sections that already lie within SLA would be enhanced by preferred extension. Support the Council's non-preference for the suggested western exclusion area as it comprises a major plateau area of similar landscape type to the remainder of the SLA. Loss of increasing parts of the adjacent Monadhliath upland area to wind farm development should be considered in retaining this section undeveloped and within the SLA. Support the Council's non-preference for the suggested central exclusion area as it comprises the new native pinewood plantation that supports habitat networking. Furthermore there is no central hole in any other Highland SLA's. Save our Dava objects to the Council's non preference of the following suggested extensions to the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area. | Expansion Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area to include all preferred and suggested extension areas shown in the MIR |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr And Mrs P. Hemmings(01238) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01238/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Considers that the Southern suggested expansion area at Balvraid should be re included having been included within the original SLA boundary prior to the Inverness Local Plan being prepared, and cites the following reasons: - those set out in respondents submission to the HwLDP and accompanying photography (which indicates that this site has diversifying forest and a river gorge feature)- this was excluded from present boundaries due to pressure from wind farm developers and not on landscape grounds and should be reinstated if the pending wind farm application is refused by Scottish Ministers, but should remain excluded if the application is approved. Considers the Council's non preferred suggested extension area to north of Dava junction should be included for the following environmental, landscape and social reasons:- the wildlife corridor link between SPAs and SACs;- it provides for the best panorama of the SLA in its entirety encapsulating its association as a contrasting landscape type, highlighting the juxtaposition of the broad tablelands with the Cairngorms massif;- it includes the A940 from Forres south to join the A939 before the Cairngorms National Park Boundary (part of the official tourist route between Inverness and Aberdeen);- it is noted that this section lies wholly within Moray Council's administrative boundary, but that the expansion of the SLA should not be compromised by potential administrative complications. | Expansion of Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA to include the non preferred suggested expansion areas to the North of Dava junction and to the west at Bavraid. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Hannah Stradling(01242) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01242/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent supports the preferred approach, and is concerned that the SLA extension could restrict opportunities for rural housing in Abriachan. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Cornelia Wittke(01244) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01244/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | The respondent reserves judgement on the Council's non preferred extension to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA until a more detailed plan is available and a Council rationale is given for its extension. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Scott Macdonald(01248) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01248/1/002 | Special Landscape Areas | Respondent considers that we need to have appropriate protection for all landscapes not just designated landscapes. | Considers that we need to have appropriate protection for all landscapes not just designated landscapes. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Eddie MacDonald(01249) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01249/1/005 | Special Landscape Areas | The respondent supports the Council's preferred approach as the existing Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA boundary is considered more suitable because:- this protects the Loch Ness bank and views of it from the public road;- Abriachan would benefit from expansion of housing and more community facilities; and- there is concern that extension of the SLA would restrict this development. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | RES UK And Ireland Limited(01252) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01252/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Disputes lack of reasoning for boundary amendment alternatives. Scottish Planning Policy requires reasoning to be stated. Believes any extensions should be consistent with the reasons for the original designation, comply with national planning policy and the Highland wide Local Development Plan, and explain why the extension area was not within the original boundary. Fears that undue constraints may be placed on renewables developments which are required to meet national targets. Requests that Proposed Plan does not include any new boundary changes not highlighted in Main Issues Report and that any changes retained are properly justified in the text of the Plan. | Any SLA boundary changes retained need to be justified in the text of the Plan. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Phil Anderson(01259) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01259/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the Council's preferred approach. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Craig MacRae(01260) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01260/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the Council's preferred approach and objects to the proposed extension of the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA at Abriachan because it is considered that this would restrict housing development in Abriachan. | |

| ISSUE | NAME | OUR REF. | POLICY/SITE NAME | COMMENT | MODIFICATION SOUGHT |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Marion Kennedy(01262) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01262/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | The respondent supports the Councils' preferred approach and is concerned about the proposed extension to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA boundary at Abriachan because of concern about restriction of housing development and additional community amenities. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Mr Raymond Bainbridge(01277) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01277/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | The respondent supports the Council's preferred approach and objects to the exclusion of areas from the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA as it is considered that this outstanding natural landscape needs to be protected. | |
| Special Landscape Areas | Ms Pat Wells(01301) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01301/1/001 | Special Landscape Areas | Supports the non-preferred status of the suggested exclusions as it is considered that this could have a significant detrimental effect on the SLA. Supports the preferred status of the Streens area, and suggests an additional area close to Balvraid to give a straight line from the Streens southwards. | Inclusion of the suggested extension at Balvraid. |
| Special Landscape Areas | Cllr Kate Stephen(01348) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01348/1/003 | Special Landscape Areas | Considers that the area between Inverness and Fort George (or to nairn) should be included as a Special Landscape area and section from the Raigmore roundabout to Milton of Culloden (or to Ardersier designated as a Local Nature Reserve). | Considers that the area between Inverness and Fort George (or to Nairn) should be included as a Special Landscape area and section from the Raigmore roundabout to Milton of Culloden (or to Ardersier designated as a Local Nature Reserve). |
| Special Landscape Areas | Richard Crawford - Collective Response(01352) | IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01352/1/004 | Special Landscape Areas | Objects to the Council's preferred approach to the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA's, supporting the Council's position in terms of the retention of areas suggested for exclusion, and preferred extension at Streens but also supporting the other suggested extensions which are non preferred and proposing a possible extension east of Moy. | Seeks inclusion of the non preferred suggested extensions to Dryanachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA and propose a possible extension east of Moy. |