

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	Mr Tony Kell(01025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01025/1/003	Suggested sites outwith settlements	Considers alternative travellers site could be at the quarried area beside the A9 at Slochd. Considers T3 allocation at Auchnahillin is unsuitable as: - access is from a reasonably busy unresitricted B class road, only a few yards from a blind left hand bend as approach from the north; - respondant understands there is no intention to install sanitation facilities at the site which could give rise to public health problems in an area so close to domestic housing; - elderly persons living nearby may feel apprehension about possible social or criminal problems should this site be chosen; and - the local school is very small and considerable disruption could be caused by an influx of non local children.	Non-allocation of T3 and allocation of travellers site at the Slochd .
Inverness Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	Mr Forbes(00902)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00902/1/004	Suggested sites outwith settlements	Submission was made during the Call for Sites exercise for the allocation of land for 2 dwellings as enabling development at Croft Croy, Farr, however this site was not identified in the MIR. Noted the Council are not considering such small sites for allocation however it is requested an exception is made given the uniqueness of the proposal. Consider the site should be allocated for the following reasons:-Site will form part of an existing settlement and round it off;-Will not result in ribbon development;-Will form an attractive addition that fits well to the existing settlement;-Raise finance required to expand the landowners existing leisure and tourism business, allowing the business to offer a greater level of tourist related activities, focusing on ancestral tourism and equestrian tourism;-Lack of bank financing presently available means without finance raised through the sale of land tourism expansion would not be possible;- Expanded tourism business would create employment opportunities and contribute directly and indirectly to the local economy and local area, consistent with the Government's aim for sustainable economic growth;-Local benefits – support falling school role and safeguard its future and increase the use of the village hall and post office	Allocation of site for two houses at Croft Croy
Inverness Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/2/005	Suggested sites outwith settlements	Respondent would like a site at Comar Woods, immediately south west of Cannich allocated in the LDP as tourism opportunity. The site accomodates circa 50 acres of rural land and woodland and is located in the open countryside. Planning permission was granted in June 2008 for a 4 bed fishing lodge on the site and consent remains live, therefore respondent would like site allocated in LDP as a tourism opportunity. NOTE: MAP IS ATTACHED TO REP. Gives policy assessment in rep.	Respondent would like a site at Comar Woods, immediately south west of Cannich allocated in the LDP as tourism opportunity.
Inverness Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	Mr And Mrs George Coutts(01083)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01083/1/001	Suggested sites outwith settlements	Respondent provides information on potential new development site at Craggie Farm, Daviot, IV2 5XQ for single plot development. The respondent describes the land as low-grade upland agricultural land and that this type of development site is in high demand and would help support the existing services such as the school.	Allocation of single plot development site at Craggie Farm, Daviot .
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00266/2/005	Ardersier General	Suggests other sites which should be allocated at 'Mary's Flowers' site should be designated for community use and the 'Old School' site The 'Agricultural Garage', Stuart Street, should be allocated as Mixed Use with the remaining area to the north continuing to have no allocation.	
Ardersier	Cyril A Smith(00615)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00615/1/001	Ardersier General	Object to the Council's stated preference to include the south side garden/ parking/ garage of the property Tigh na Mara (50 Stuart Street), within an open space zoning. It is not open space and falls within the fenced area of this property.	Deletion of garden ground from preferred open space.
Ardersier	Mrs Ellen W. Smith(01144)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01144/1/001	Ardersier General	Council should focus on promoting landscaped entrances to Ardersier and suggests demolishing public toilets at Stuart St and relocating them near to the Community Pocket Garden and slipway and a band stand and information boards in place of the current toilets.	
Ardersier	Mrs Ellen W. Smith(01144)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01144/1/002	Ardersier General	Object to the Council's stated preference to include the south side garden/ parking/ garage of the property Tigh na Mara (50 Stuart Street), within an open space zoning. It is not open space and falls within the fenced area of this property.	Deletion of garden ground from preferred open space.
Ardersier	J.E. And S.B Wood(01157)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01157/1/006	Ardersier General	Considers that if housing is needed derelict buildings and land should be used first. Plan should include information on possible impact from development in other areas, for example sewage/drainage from west Nairn.Considers LDP should be broadened, it should not be taken that the plan allows any development in the future without extensive consultation once implications become apparent. The LDP should be a living document, evolving to meet local needs. The LDP should not:-Be a champion for developers;-Be used to set community against community; or-Be seen as an instrument to impose unpopular decisions on the public because 'it was hidden in the plan' .	
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00266/2/006	Ardersier H01	Identifies the housing allocations in Ardersier H3 and H5 as first choices with H2 in third position due to being move difficult to develop and H1 as last resort due to opposition from neighbouring properties.	
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/1/001	Ardersier H01	The developer has recently withdrawn from H1 and H2 and that development of the sites is challenging due to the water table. Also considers that H3 and H5 should be allocated as alternatives to ensure adequate future house building potential, though they may also prove challenging to develop.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/008	Ardersier H01	Supports the non-preference of housing on H1 for the cons stated in the MIR	
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0266/2/006	Ardersier H02	Identifies the housing allocations in Ardersier H3 and H5 as first choices with H2 in third position due to being move difficult to develop and H1 as last resort due to opposition from neighbouring properties.	
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/1/001	Ardersier H02	The developer has recently withdrawn from H1 and H2 and that development of the sites is challenging due to the water table. Also considers that H3 and H5 should be allocated as alternatives to ensure adequate future house building potential, though they may also prove challenging to develop.	
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/007	Ardersier H02	Considers B1 is potentially an option for housing and could be used to give access to H2 and may also get less objections	Allocation of B1 for housing in Proposed Plan.
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/009	Ardersier H02	Supports housing on the site only if necessary	
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0266/2/006	Ardersier H03	Identifies the housing allocations in Ardersier H3 and H5 as first choices with H2 in third position due to being move difficult to develop and H1 as last resort due to opposition from neighbouring properties.	
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/1/001	Ardersier H03	The developer has recently withdrawn from H1 and H2 and that development of the sites is challenging due to the water table. Also considers that H3 and H5 should be allocated as alternatives to ensure adequate future house building potential, though they may also prove challenging to develop.	
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/010	Ardersier H03	Would prefer green space	Allocation of H3 for green space
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0266/2/007	Ardersier H04	Objects to the Mixed Use allocation prefer it to be used for community purposes, e.g. sea sport compound/boat shed to promote the site's historical role as a local community amenity.	Reallocation of MU2 to community use.
Ardersier	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/021	Ardersier H04	SEPA support the non-preferred status of this site. Would object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removal of site unless it can be demonstrated that the site is above 3.66m AOD prior to adoption. A Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Ardersier	Mr Malcolm Leiper(01001)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01001/1/001	Ardersier H04	Supports the allocation of site H4 with housing designed to be in character with the conservation area with a strip of ground adjoining the foreshore for community use eg amenity seating.	Allocation of H4 either for housing alone or preferable for housing and community uses.
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/2/001	Ardersier H04	H4/MU2 should be allocated for community and amenity use, in particular a sea sports base, this would ensure the site is retained as open space; minimise intrusion on seaward views; enhance amenity and view of the adjoining terrace. Built development should only come one third of the way from the southern edge of the site. Landownership issues will need to be resolved before development can take place. Given the abundance of other numerous long term unimplemented planning permissions; number of houses for sale in the village in addition to large scale housing allocations there is no justification for H4/MU2 to be allocated for housing. Reinstatement of the site for the benefit of the community is preferred.	Re-allocation of H4/MU2 for community use in Proposed Plan
Ardersier	J.E. And S.B Wood(01157)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01157/1/005	Ardersier H04	Considers H4 is community land should be re-instated for community use, for example allotment/bowling green/boat club.	Re-allocation of H4 for community use.
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0266/2/006	Ardersier H05	Identifies the housing allocations in Ardersier H3 and H5 as first choices with H2 in third position due to being move difficult to develop and H1 as last resort due to opposition from neighbouring properties.	
Ardersier	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/022	Ardersier H05	SEPA will not object to this allocation provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan; text is modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. This may affect the area available or development options for the site. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application. A tributary of Ardesier Burn passes through the south of the site. The burn is designated as heavily modified and is currently at moderate potential. Morphological status is currently bad, there is therefore a priority for restoration. The burn through the site has been historically realigned. Development of the site should therefore consider the requirement for restoration of the watercourse allowing appropriate space for restoration works and space for future development of natural processes. This will require a morphological assessment to be submitted with any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/1/001	Ardersier H05	The developer has recently withdrawn from H1 and H2 and that development of the sites is challenging due to the water table. Also considers that H3 and H5 should be allocated as alternatives to ensure adequate future house building potential, though they may also prove challenging to develop.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Ardersier	Mr John Ross(00016)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0016/1/005	Ardersier MU01	Supports allocation of MU1 for community and business use as it will give all interested parties an opportunity to develop this land to everyone's benefit, likely proposals; camping/caravan site, retained beach access, toilet/shower block and manager's house/shop. Envisages design of houses as wooden chalet or Eco House style but will work with Council on designs. Vegetation loss and re-contouring will be minimised and habitat/recreational access mitigation will be incorporated. The development will have the following positive effects: accommodate demand from caravan and camper vans; local employment; spin-off custom for local pubs/shops etc, and; shower/toilet facilities for growing kite surfer market; net improvement or existing unkempt area.	Retention of site option specifically for community and business uses.
Ardersier	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/017	Ardersier MU01	Concerned about loss of semi-natural woodland, any loss should be minimised especially where it links to the north and that developer requirements should include pre-determination protected species survey (including reptiles).	Inclusion of developer requirements for woodland safeguard or compensatory planting, and for protected species survey (including reptiles).
Ardersier	Mr David Daschofsky(00507)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0507/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the allocation of this site . The community value, quality and accessibility was ignored in it's omission from the 2010 Highland Greenspace Audit however protecting and promoting this green wedge could have economic benefits by increasing visitor numbers. This aspiration is referred to in the Invernes and Nairn Biodiversity Action Plan whereby a link from Longman to Fort George is considered worthy of promotion.	Inclusion of this site as open space.
Ardersier	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/023	Ardersier MU01	SEPA object unless the following further information is gathered prior to Proposed Plan or the allocation is removed from the Plan unless it can be demonstrated that the site is above 3.66m AOD prior to adoption.Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Ardersier	Mr Robert And Sandra Ross(00895)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0895/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports the proposal for using the site as a caravan site to bring a much needed facility to the village, business to the local shops and encourage more visitors to go to Fort George.	
Ardersier	Mr Colin Fettes(00896)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0896/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports MU1 for commercial use, Ardersier is a busy tourist area which has very few facilities for tourists.	
Ardersier	Mr Stewart Graham(00899)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0899/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Support for allocation of MU1 for a caravan site given the location and the economic boost it would give to local shops, pubs and sporting organisations.	
Ardersier	Mr Derek Ritchie(00901)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0901/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports this site being allocated for a caravan park for economic reasons.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Mr Martin Ross(00903)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0903/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports this site being allocated for a caravan park for economic reasons.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Miss Hazel Ross(00907)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0907/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports this site being allocated for a caravan park for economic reasons.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Mr Pat MacDonald(00909)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0909/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports this site being allocated for a caravan park for economic reasons.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Mr Steve Ross(00911)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0911/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports caravan / holiday park use of site because of high numbers of passing tourists. Such a facility would capture more trade and employment for the village.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Mr Michael Job(00913)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0913/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports a caravan park use for the site as fulfilling a need/demand and providing a benefit to the area.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Sandy Henderson(00918)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0918/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports this site being allocated for a caravan park for economic reasons.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Mrs I. Fraser(00955)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0955/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to this site being used as a caravan park due to concerns regarding its access and its impact on the flora and fauna of the common also concerned that the site would be seasonal and that there would be resident caravans during the winter months.	Removal of potential for seasonal tourism use (e.G. Caravan park) on this allocation.
Ardersier	Mr Billy Lowrie(00966)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0966/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports site for caravan park use because this would bring jobs, people and money into the area.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Mr Don Stewart(00980)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0980/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports this site being identified for a caravan park as it is considered to offer lower cost accomodation to tourists and benefits the general public by offering facilities they can use.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Ms Cara Stewart(00982)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0982/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Supports development of caravan park on MU1 as it would greatly benefit the area from a tourism and local community perspective.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Ardersier	Ismail And Denise Vince Koprulu(01051)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01051/1/002	Ardersier MU01	Objects to site MU1 being allocated for development and should only be allocated as community land or preferably as open space. The site has lots of trees, plants, insects etc and the loss of it would have an ecological and environmental impact. The number of windsurfers/kite surfers using Ardersier bay has fallen and they usually access the bay towards Fort George and do not need the facilities the applicant is suggesting. Considers that the long term aim of the landowner is to use the proposed caravan park for static caravans and eventually to get housing allowed on the site. Object to any building on this site. Increased large traffic vehicles on the slip road adjacent to the High Street will cause further vibration to properties and road safety concerns. Landowner also proposes a wind turbine which would not contribute to the community or natural beauty of the site which should be preferred open space.	Deletion of site for any development purposes, propose open space for site.
Ardersier	Mr Grant Stewart(01097)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01097/1/005	Ardersier MU01	Objects to MU1 being used for community/business use and feels it would be better used for tourism purposes which could assist other businesses in Ardersier.	Allocation should specify use as being for tourism use only.
Ardersier	Mr Wallace Grant(01115)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01115/1/005	Ardersier MU01	Supports MU1 and thinks a caravan site would be good for the village.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park.
Ardersier	Mr Donald Leith(01121)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01121/1/005	Ardersier MU01	Supports site MU1 Ardersier needs this sort of development; a tourist facility is badly needed and the proposal is appropriate.	
Ardersier	Ms Eleanor Ross(01136)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01136/1/005	Ardersier MU01	Supports MU1 as it would enhance Ardersier which needs an economic boost.	
Ardersier	Mr James Devidge(01138)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01138/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to MU1 as the site has a flood risk and has flooded previously in a very high spring tide and strong west wind and during the North Sea Surge of 1953. The site was excavated during World War 2 taking it below high tide making it unsuitable for any development. Residential properties nearby would suffer from visual impact, noise during development, reduction in quality of life and potential loss of property value. Mature trees and wildlife in area and potential endangered species.	Removal of site for any development purpose.
Ardersier	Ms Halla McLean(01145)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01145/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the allocation of MU1 for a caravan park for the following reasons:-Disruption to wildlife;-Impact upon high water table;-Loss of attractive woodland, contrary to woodland removal policy.-Planning application for a house was refused in the same area for a number of reasons including flood risk and residential amenity;-More suitable sites nearby that would not have such an adverse effect on wildlife;-Impact upon picnic spot on Ardersier Common;-Impact to local residents upon amenity value of the common;-Visual impact;-Increased noise will negatively impact residents and wildlifeConcerned that the Strategic Environmental Assessment form accompanying the landowners Call for Sites submission for MU1 was not completed accurately by the land owner.	Removal of site for any development purpose.
Ardersier	Ms Halla McLean(01145)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01145/2/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the allocation of MU1 for a caravan park for the following reasons:-Disruption to wildlife;-Impact upon high water table;-Loss of attractive woodland, contrary to woodland removal policy.-Planning application for a house was refused in the same area for a number of reasons including flood risk and residential amenity;-More suitable sites nearby that would not have such an adverse effect on wildlife;-Impact upon picnic spot on Ardersier Common;-Impact to local residents upon amenity value of the common;-Visual impact;-Increased noise will negatively impact residents and wildlifeConcerned that the Strategic Environmental Assessment form accompanying the landowners Call for Sites submission for MU1 was not completed accurately by the land owner.	Removal of site for any development purpose.
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/3/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the allocation of MU1 for a caravan park for the following reasons:-Disruption to wildlife;-Impact upon high water table;-Loss of attractive woodland, contrary to woodland removal policy.-Planning application for a house was refused in the same area for a number of reasons including flood risk and residential amenity;-More suitable sites nearby that would not have such an adverse effect on wildlife;-Impact upon picnic spot on Ardersier Common;-Impact to local residents upon amenity value of the common;-Visual impact;-Increased noise will negatively impact residents and wildlifeConcerned that the Strategic Environmental Assessment form accompanying the landowners Call for Sites submission for MU1 was not completed accurately by the land owner.	Allocation of MU2 for community/amenity use or green space in the Proposed Plan
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/012	Ardersier MU01	Supports with the Council preference for preferring mixed use on MU1, this proposal for site could bring business/tourism to the village and have a positive knock-on effect on adjacent businesses and improvement to safety with new footpath to picnic area. There are no existing facilities for visitors passing through.	
Ardersier	Mrs Dawn Mackenzie(01171)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01171/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Concerned that the Junior Ardersier and Petty Environmental Society community 'pocket garden' may be developed if not gifted or marked on plans as community land. This garden was created in 2004 with the Beechgrove Garden, it would be a great loss for the community if the site was developed in the future.	Allocation of "pocket garden" site as open space.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Ardersier	Mr Richard McLean(01190)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01190/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the allocation of MU1 for a caravan park for the following reasons:-Disruption to wildlife;- Impact upon high water table;-Loss of attractive woodland, contrary to woodland removal policy.- Planning application for a house was refused in the same area for a number of reasons including flood risk and residential amenity;-More suitable sites nearby that would not have such an adverse effect on wildlife;-Impact upon picnic spot on Ardersier Common;-Impact to local residents upon amenity value of the common;-Visual impact;-Increased noise will negatively impact residents and wildlife	Removal of site for any development purpose.
Ardersier	Mr John Orr(01211)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01211/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the Council's preference for mixed use development on MU1 for the following reasons:-Adverse impact upon important, historic and well established flora and fauna;-Poor site drainage, flood risk and impact upon site levels;-Visual impact, particularly from the shoreline looking inland;-Contrary to HwLDP Policy 57 and A96 Corridor Green Network Priority; and-Scottish Government Control of Woodland Removal Policy presumes in favour of protecting Scotland's woodland resources.Considers MU1 would be better designated as preferred open space to retain the important mature habitat and allow an existing overgrown path to be reopened for improved access.	Removal of site for any development purpose and allocation of MU1 for open space in the Proposed Plan.
Ardersier	Mrs Kate Fairclough(01218)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01218/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the Council's preference for mixed use development on MU1 for the following reasons:-Adverse impact upon important, historic and well established flora and fauna;-Site is currently used by the community;-Planning application for a house was refused in the area for a number of reasons including flood risk and impact upon local residents amenity;-There are other more appropriate sites in the area;- Infrastructure associated with a caravan park would irreversibly damage the site;-Caravan site will create noise will which adversely affect neighbours and wildlife;-Poor site drainage, flood risk and impact upon site levels;-Caravan parks have created eyesores in other beautiful places such as Sanna Bay on Ardnamurchan;-Negative impact upon long distance views and the look and feel of the beach path;- Scottish Government Control of Woodland Removal Policy states that anything over 0.1 hectares should not be removed from existing woodland when there is public benefit;-Ardersier has already lost valuable woodland to the airport business park proposals; and-Ardersier has potential as a tourism destination due to its proximity to Fort George and Castle Stuart - creating a caravan park at the entrance to the village will not enhance villages attraction.	Non-allocation of MU1 in the Proposed Plan
Ardersier	Ms Siobhan MacKenzie(01271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01271/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the Council's preference of this site for mixed use development for the following reasons- it is valuable part of the common space and has significant amenity value to the community- the land is a flood risk being under water for part of the year- it provides valuable habitat for wildlife- concern about the impact of built elements, houses, toilet blocks and shop- the site would be a highly visible development from the beach walk and would change the line of trees forming the outside wall of the common- it is considered that there are more appropriate sites for caravans within the community	Removal of site for any development purpose.
Ardersier	Ms Susan Macpherson(01272)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01272/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Objects to the Council's preference of this site for mixed use development for the following reasons- it is a valuable part of the common space and has significant amenity value to the community and tourists- it provides valuable habitat for wildlife including rare butterfly Dingy Skipper - there is concern about the impact of built elements, houses, toilet blocks and shop- this sites development would be a highly visible development would remove woodland - the land is a flood risk being under water for part of the year, and the respondent is therefore concerned about the impact land raisingwould have- it would bring noise and light pollution- jobs created would likely be seasonal- public access to changing facilities is not important to watersports users	Removal of site for any development purpose.
Ardersier	Petition MU1 Ardersier(01315)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01315/1/001	Ardersier MU01	Support of the Council's preference for this site to be allocated for business/community use and for this site to be developed as a small caravan site with facilities for water sports enthusiasts. Petition of 59 signatories.	Allocation should specify use as being for caravan/holiday park with facilities for water sports.
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00266/2/007	Ardersier MU02	Objects to the Mixed Use allocation prefer it to be used for community purposes, e.g. sea sport compound/boat shed to promote the site's historical role as a local community amenity.	Reallocation of MU2 to community use.
Ardersier	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/024	Ardersier MU02	SEPA object unless the following further information is gathered prior to Proposed Plan or the allocation is removed from Plan unless it can be demonstrated that the site is above 3.66m AOD prior to adoption.Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Ardersier	Mr Malcolm Leiper(01001)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01001/1/002	Ardersier MU02	Supports development of 2 houses that would keep the area tidy and would consider discussions with the regarding the disposal of the remainder of the site.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/2/001	Ardersier MU02	H4/MU2 should be allocated for community and amenity use, in particular a sea sports base, this would ensure the site is retained as open space; minimise intrusion on seaward views; enhance amenity and view of the adjoining terrace. Built development should only come one third of the way from the southern edge of the site. Landownership issues will need to be resolved before development can take place. Given the abundance of other numerous long term unimplemented planning permissions; number of houses for sale in the village in addition to large scale housing allocations there is no justification for H4/MU2 to be allocated for housing. Reinstatement of the site for the benefit of the community is preferred.	Re-allocation of H4/MU2 for community use in Proposed Plan
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/011	Ardersier MU02	Considers MU2 needs taken care off, but any proposed building on the site, community or private, should be minimal	
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0266/2/004	Ardersier MU03	Supports the preferred allocation for MU3 but feels that adequate screening will be required.	
Ardersier	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/018	Ardersier MU04	Suggests developer requirement to safeguard route of Inverness-Nairn Coastal Trail within site.	Inclusion of developer requirement to safeguard route of Inverness-Nairn Coastal Trail within site.
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0266/2/002	Ardersier MU04	Supports the preferred MU4 allocation in Ardersier because there is necessity to move the dairy to a more suitable location and help fund a modernised dairy. Much of the historic buildings should be retained to improve the gateway to the village. Proposed development should be set back from the road and possible screening as this is also a key gateway into the village.	Inclusion of requirement for setback of development from road and planting to mitigate visual impact.
Ardersier	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/025	Ardersier MU04	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan unless its allocation is supported by a FRA or further information (topo levels) prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.A tributary of Ardersier Burn passes through the site. The burn is designated as heavily modified and is currently at moderate potential. Morphological status is currently bad and is therefore a priority for restoration. The burn through the site has been historically realigned. Development of the site should therefore consider the requirement for restoration of the watercourse allowing appropriate space for restoration works and space for future development of natural processes. This will require a morphological assessment.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Ardersier	Moray Estates(01039)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01039/1/001	Ardersier MU04	Support preference for MU4 to be allocated for mixed uses, as the site is flat, serviceable and developable; drainage constraints can be mitigated through good design; potential contamination is likely to be of low significance and capable of remediation; and loss of farmland outweighed by fact site adjoins existing settlement; is part brownfield; is accessible and will contribute to delivering a mix of housing, employment space to supporting marginal existing facilities in Ardersier. Moray Estates intend to relocate the existing dairy to a more appropriate purpose built facility in the centre of the farming operation the current site is not ideal as it is adjacent to a residential area and on the edge of the farming operation.	
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/006	Ardersier MU04	Serious consideration needs to be given to the appearance of the approach of the village.	
Ardersier	Mr Richard McLean(01190)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01190/2/001	Ardersier MU04	H4/MU2 has long been allocated to community use and was previously used as a bowling green. Concerned that proposed development would only serve to profit individual developers at the cost of the community. A plan supported by the Community Council and the village to use this site to the benefit of Ardersier Boat Club would bring together members of the community for a common shared purpose, allowing both social and practical interaction for the people of the village would benefit the entire community.	Reallocate site for community use.
Ardersier	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0266/2/003	Ardersier B01	Objects to the preferred business use at B1 and believes that it should be allocated as Mixed Use as it may provide medium industrial space and housing and flexibility to allow future access to H3.	Seeks reallocation of B1 from Business to Mixed Use
Ardersier	Mr Alisdair McKay(01155)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01155/3/002	Ardersier B01	Development of a caravan park would be more suitable in the south of village on land close to the B9006, for example site B1 rather than MU1.	Allocation B1 for tourism use, specifically as a caravan park.
Ardersier	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/007	Ardersier B01	Considers B1 is potentially an option for housing and could be used to give access to H2 and may also get less objections	Allocation of B1 for housing in Proposed Plan.
Beaully	Kilmorack Community Council(00031)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0031/2/002	Beaully General	Kilmorack Community Council is concerned and wildfowling and conservationists have shared this concern about the scale of development proposed especially around the Beaully Firth and north side of the Moray Firth. They consider that the scale of housing needs to be in keeping with the area and economically viable. It is also considered that sites have been identified on the flood plain in Beaully and that the Hatfield Farm's two proposals are out of scale and are without the infrastructure to support them.	Identification of lower scale of housing land in Beaully; do not allocate sites that are within the flood plain or out of scale with the available infrastructure.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/020	Beaully General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for reptile surveys. Any development site containing a water body should require a great crested newt survey.	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for reptile surveys. Any development site containing a water body should require a great crested newt survey requirement.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/022	Beaully General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for reptile surveys.	Settlement-wide developer requirement for reptile surveys.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/013	Beaully General	The disused building and tennis court area between the Shinty Club & Bowling Green behind the Phipps Hall could be re-developed for a much needed modern indoor Sports facility and Entertainments/Community use.	Allocate the disused building and tennis court area between the Shinty Club & Bowling Green behind the Phipps Hall for a sports facility and entertainment/community use.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/014	Beaully General	The following areas should be designated and added as Green Areas on the plan: - Aird Road playing field; - Maple Vale play park; - Croyard Drive and Kings Court play park.	Designate Aird Road playing field, Maple Vale play area, Croyard Drive and Kings Court play park as open space in the Proposed Plan.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/015	Beaully General	Beaully population is increasing. However demand for housing currently outstrips availability.	Allocation of additional land for housing.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/016	Beaully General	At present both the Railway Station and a shared responsibility of the War Memorial at the Toll junction are outside our current CC boundary. The War Memorial in particular is the joint responsibility of the British Legion of Beaully & Kilmorack cc. Since we are the only CC pressing to have the Station platform & parking area improved and we also share some of the tree maintenance work at the War Memorial (Toll junction), we feel the boundary of the village should break the existing railway line delimiter and be extended to the Toll Junction. This then would also encompass the green area and public footpath from Beaully that runs alongside the river to Lovat Bridge.	Extend settlement boundary to include Toll Junction.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/017	Beaully General	There is a great need for more business premises to be made available within the main cortex of the town.	Allocation of land for business use within Beaully town centre
Beaully	G. Simpson(00661)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0661/1/001	Beaully General	Suggests allocation of new site to the south west of House of Beaully for special needs housing (close care / elderly / affordable) for the following reasons:- Good track record of locally based company that employs local tradespeople;- Planning application/local plan history establishes principle of development;- Appropriate in scale and type to a large market town with a good mix of facilities and a rail halt that lies close to the Easter Ross Growth Corridor;- Site serviced or capable of being serviced;- The House of Beaully site would allow the completion of a vacant area - Loss of employment potential would be compensated by employment land at the Wellhouse proposal (other site being promoted for development by the landowner);- Housing needs whether for the elderly or affordable would be met at these locations in line with the Council's aspirations;- Site is not prime farmland;- Site is hard standing; and- Other preferred options suffer from greater good farmland, access, physical, ownership and/or settlement pattern constraints.	Allocate of new site to the south west of House of Beaully for special needs housing (close care / elderly / affordable) .
Beaully	G. Simpson(00661)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0661/1/002	Beaully General	Suggests allocation of new site at Wellhouse (north of Beaully) for a 3.9 hectare mixed use of Classes 4, 5, 6 and 8 plus close-care housing and its enclosure within the SDA for Beaully for the following reasons:- Good track record of locally based company that employs local tradespeople;- Planning application/local plan history establishes principle of development;- Appropriate in scale and type to a large market town with a good mix of facilities and a rail halt that lies close to the Easter Ross Growth Corridor;- Site serviced or capable of being serviced;- The House of Beaully site would allow the completion of a vacant area - Loss of employment potential would be compensated by employment land at the Wellhouse proposal (other site being promoted for development by the landowner);- Housing needs whether for the elderly or affordable would be met at these locations in line with the Council's aspirations;- Site is not prime farmland- Site is hard standing- Other preferred options suffer from greater good farmland, access, physical, ownership and/or settlement pattern constraints- Offers the prospects of more employment land in a better and less constrained location than preferred site alternatives. The commercial units at the House of Beaully have not proved marketable.	Allocation of Wellhouse (north of Beaully) for a 3.9 hectare mixed use of Classes 4, 5, 6 and 8 plus close-care housing and enclosure within the SDA for Beaully.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0271/1/005	Beaully H01	Considers H1 should be allocated for housing as the distance from the village or flooding are not issues.	Allocation of H1 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Beaully	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0491/1/015	Beaully H01	Support the Councils non-preferred status for this site as it is too remote.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Beaully	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/026	Beaully H01	No objection to the allocation provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan and text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and if development is close to the watercourse and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application unless development does not encroach on the watercourse or include crossings.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/005	Beaully H02	Comments that proposed development likely to have a significant effect on European natural heritage site.	Developer requirement for appropriate mitigation.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/019	Beaully H02	Concerns that development of the site may have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA because this flat area of farmland is used for bird feeding, notably geese.	Non confirmation of site option if HRA demonstrates adverse effect on integrity of Inner Moray Firth SPA.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/007	Beaully H02	Comments concern H2, H3 & H4. The bottom of H3 (especially) is very close to the village but any one of these sites could be shared with a developer to build Sheltered Housing/Retirement Bungalows with warden. These sites should all incorporate some part of a ring road system around Beaully with speed reduction system which could link into Priory Way at the SW end of town.	
Beaully	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/016	Beaully H02	There would be merit in a properly masterplanned development on MU1, H2, H3, H4 and C2 but piecemeal development should be avoided and the overall scale of development carefully phased to ensure that Beaully develops as a place to live and work.	
Beaully	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/027	Beaully H02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan and text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/005	Beaully H03	Comments that proposed development likely to have a significant effect on European natural heritage site.	Developer requirement for appropriate mitigation.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/019	Beaully H03	Concerns that development of the site may have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA because this flat area of farmland is used for bird feeding, notably geese.	Non confirmation of site option if HRA demonstrates adverse effect on integrity of Inner Moray Firth SPA.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/007	Beaully H03	Comments concern H2, H3 & H4. The bottom of H3 (especially) is very close to the village but any one of these sites could be shared with a developer to build Sheltered Housing/Retirement Bungalows with warden. These sites should all incorporate some part of a ring road system around Beaully with speed reduction system which could link into Priory Way at the SW end of town.	
Beaully	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/016	Beaully H03	There would be merit in a properly masterplanned development on MU1, H2, H3, H4 and C2 but piecemeal development should be avoided and the overall scale of development carefully phased to ensure that Beaully develops as a place to live and work.	
Beaully	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/030	Beaully H03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan. A review or new FRA may be required at this site if the layout or development is different from previously agreed. Consideration should be given for blockage at the culvert downstream which has blocked previously. No development can increase the risk to existing properties. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application or review of old information depends if development different from previously agreed.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/005	Beaully H04	Comments that proposed development likely to have a significant effect on European natural heritage site.	Developer requirement for appropriate mitigation.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/019	Beaully H04	Concerns that development of the site may have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA because this flat area of farmland is used for bird feeding, notably geese.	Non confirmation of site option if HRA demonstrates adverse effect on integrity of Inner Moray Firth SPA.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/007	Beaully H04	Comments concern H2, H3 & H4. The bottom of H3 (especially) is very close to the village but any one of these sites could be shared with a developer to build Sheltered Housing/Retirement Bungalows with warden. These sites should all incorporate some part of a ring road system around Beaully with speed reduction system which could link into Priory Way at the SW end of town.	
Beaully	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/016	Beaully H04	There would be merit in a properly masterplanned development on MU1, H2, H3, H4 and C2 but piecemeal development should be avoided and the overall scale of development carefully phased to ensure that Beaully develops as a place to live and work.	
Beaully	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/031	Beaully H04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan and text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. A Flood Risk Assessment is required in support of a planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.



ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Beauly	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00165/1/003	Beauly H05	Objects to the whole of MU1 being allocated as mixed use as the landowners would prefer it to be wholly or partly allocated for housing. It is proposed that this would allow development to progress from the south part of the loop road which is already built. Respondent has concerns that allocating it all for mixed use may deter prospective developers and hinder development. Requests that the 'Curling Pond' field be reallocated as housing with the remainder being mixed use as this would allow good access to the mixed use area from the loop road but with the added advantage of direct pedestrian access via Croyard Road to the centre of the village.	Requests that the 'Curling Pond' field be reallocated as housing with the remainder being mixed use.
Beauly	Beauly Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/008	Beauly H05	H5 + MU1 should all incorporate some part of a ring road system around Beauly with speed reduction system which could link into Priory Way at the SW end of town.	
Beauly	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/032	Beauly H05	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan and text to state that FRA required (or FR to be considered as part of DIA) and outcome may limit the scale and layout of development on the site. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Beauly	Kilmorack Community Council(00031)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00031/1/001	Beauly H06	Objects because of limited capacity of the road network, lack of services, and the excessive scale for a rural situation.	
Beauly	Beauly Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/004	Beauly H06	Support the Councils non-preferred status of H06, this site lies outwith Beauly and is an inappropriate site for development, the trees felled in this area should be replanted.	
Beauly	Ake & Pauline Inghammar(00609)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00609/1/001	Beauly H06	Support the Councils non preference of this site. The site is farmland that has been used for various agricultural purposes. They feel that the development proposed would not fit with the pattern or character of the area and is too far from public transport links. They also have concerns about surface water drainage due to existing problems with flooding, and they do not believe that the access road is of a sufficient standard or condition. They also question the deliverability of a public sewer connection unless this was delivered alongside twin tracking of the road (as land below the site is in separate ownership).	
Beauly	Dr Stephen P Madeleine C Robinson(00616)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00616/1/001	Beauly H06	Considers it to be an inappropriate proposal. Concerned about a significant extension from the mains electricity supply since they are doubtful whether the proposed hydro scheme would make any significant contribution. Comment that they would be concerned about the run off to houses below from a Package Sewage Treatment Plant or Reed Bed System. They worry that existing surface water problems would be made worse. Concerned about the standard, steepness, and condition of the road (particularly in winter) and its capacity for this scale of development, and also its distance to public transport. Suggests that H1 is better in this respect and has a pavement into the village. Concern about light pollution from houses and potentially street lighting. Concern about the visual impact of a prominent site. Considers it to be habitat for a lot of wildlife (buzzards, red kites, owls, woodpeckers, red deer, red squirrels and pine martins) so concerned about the impact any development would have on them. Considers this to be a relatively wild area which would affect the local amenity for walkers, birdwatchers etc. Considers that this is not in character with the area due to the density proposed. The current access is by way of a high stile over a 7ft fence which is considered less than ideal.	
Beauly	Mr And Mrs Reynard(00625)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00625/1/001	Beauly H06	Supports the Council's non-preference of site H6. Roads, sewage, access, water and lack of a bus service are problems for the site. A major upgrade of local roads would be required.	
Beauly	Fiona Duff(00631)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00631/1/001	Beauly H06	Supports Councils non-preference of site H6 in Beauly for the following reasons: it is a single track road full of potholes which is difficult to get down in winter months; water problems with water flooding into the drive at the top of Dunmore; unclear where sewage will go; and there are no buses.	
Beauly	Robin Pape(00652)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00652/1/001	Beauly H06	Respondent is concerned about the proposal H6. Respondent considers that: - the land is actively used for farming, - that the proposal is not inkeeping with the rural character and existing properties in this location, - that the proposal could exacerbate existing surface water issues, - that there may not be the capacity in the public water supply and that the site would be difficult to service from the public sewer, - it is a poor location for access to public transport, - the public road network and its condition particularly in winter is unsuitable for the level of traffic this proposal would generate. The respondent is the farmer of the field to the south and is concerned the water quality in his field could be affected.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Beaully	Mr And Mrs Paul And Helen Ross(00785)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00785/1/001	Beaully H06	Supports the Council's non-preference for H6 for the following reasons:- it is questionable whether the developer can treat the waste on site (which is proposed);- despite the developer stating that the existing drainage is sufficient there has been significant problems with surface water run off since the trees on the site have been felled and more trees are proposed to be felled for the development;- the existing road network would require significant upgrading due to the considerable increase in vehicular traffic. Although the developer proposes that SSE will be upgrading the road network, the C1104 is not included in their plans;- the 13% gradient of the brae at Ruilick exceeds the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges maximum gradient of 8% for safe roads. - access to the site is from an unregulated road and the junction cannot meet the requirement of at least 215m visibility;- access for walkers/cyclists to Hatfield Farm is generally very limited;- the site is a significant distance, particularly for pedestrians, from the centre of Beaully and even further to the train station;- public transport is very limited with only two buses per week (both on a Wednesday);- the site is adjacent to the proposed SSE sub station which will result in a low frequency hum and a magnetic field;- the scale of development is out of keeping with Ruilick and Dunmore and a more appropriate density would be 6/7 houses across the entire site;- wildlife in the unfelled area includes red squirrels, crossbills and pine martins; and- the proposed street lighting would have significant light pollution in an area where there is virtually none present.The respondent recognises the need for social housing and prefers sites at MU1, H2, H3, and H4. Despite the distance from the village H4 is also preferred over H6 due to the provision of a pavement and regular bus service.	
Beaully	Mr Paul A. Ross(00786)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00786/1/005	Beaully H06	Supports non-preferred status of H6 due to the distance to Beaully, sewage and waste water issues, surface water run-off and light pollution.	
Beaully	Mr Alistair Duff(00877)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00877/1/005	Beaully H06	Supports non-preference of H6 for the following reasons:- lack of waster water treatment so private treatment plant would be required. The ground is unlikely to be able to cope with discharge from 38 properties. - Due to site being partly cleared of trees, the run-off has increased, damaging roads in the area and water is running into neighbouring properties.- 38 houses would double the number of vehicles using the C1104. The SSE planning application appears to suggest that they will not be using the C1102 which would mean that the road would not be improved. This contradicts what was said by the developer at the MIR workshop in Beaully.At the MIR workshop in Beaully a comment was made that a benefit of site H6 was that it would not flood unlike other sites. Respondant suggests that the land between the railway line and the unclassified road that runs between Wellbank and Farley would be preferable before H6 as it higher and still within easy reach of Beaully.	
Beaully	Hatfield Farms, Farley Estate(00967)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00967/1/001	Beaully H06	Requests retention of site within Proposed Plan because: it has now been reduced in scale and impact taking account of comments made locally; proposal reduced from 30 to 19 plots which will allow better integration with local landscape through more inter-plot landscaping; it is no more distant from Beaully than the length of Beaully and will therefore provide ongoing support to the school and other local services; additional local road capacity will be provided by the improvements scheduled by SSE as part of line undergrounding in the area; first time public sewerage provision more likely to Ruilick area if this larger development confirmed in the development plan, and; no worse and with proposed planting far less adverse landscape impact than recent development on the Braes. Disputes arguments against development because: winter maintenance is not a material planning consideration and even if it was more development would increase the priority of the route; the gradient of the road cannot be a material consideration given the development approved to date in this area; road improvements will offset any additional traffic impact; hydro-electric scheme a sustainable top-up not the primary energy source for the development; land area sufficient to achieve no net detriment in terms of surface water and soakaway drainage; public transport provision more likely with more development and recent development hasn't been refused because of its lack of provision; development will be phased and therefore so will its impact; street lighting offered if required but not proposed and planting will offer containment of any house lighting; any sound pollution limited to construction phase and conditionable; protected species will be surveyed and mitigation undertaken; no intention to impact on right of way and will work with local interests to establish net betterment through access management plan, and; the development will be masterplanned, sustainable and help meet housing demand.	Allocation of H6 in the Proposed Plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Beaully	Jane And Steve North(00969)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00969/1/001	Beaully H06	The respondents support the non-preferred status of H6 as the proposed development of 38 houses is contrary to the existing character of the area and clearly does not reflect the Housing in the Countryside policy. The site also has a lack of adequate services with poor road (e.G. Public transport), sewage and water connections, and the area, including surrounding properties, already suffer from surface water drainage problems. The scale of development would also impact on the local amenity value as it is a popular walking route. The respondents also question how the "development would fit with the proposed substation and infrastructure being planned for the same site".	
Beaully	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00165/1/003	Beaully MU01	Objects to the whole of MU1 being allocated as mixed use as the landowners would prefer it to be wholly or partly allocated for housing. It is proposed that this would allow development to progress from the south part of the loop road which is already built. Respondent has concerns that allocating it all for mixed use may deter prospective developers and hinder development. Requests that the 'Curling Pond' field be reallocated as housing with the remainder being mixed use as this would allow good access to the mixed use area from the loop road but with the added advantage of direct pedestrian access via Croyard Road to the centre of the village.	Requests that the 'Curling Pond' field be reallocated as housing with the remainder being mixed use.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/005	Beaully MU01	Comments that proposed development likely to have a significant effect on European natural heritage site.	Developer requirement for appropriate mitigation.
Beaully	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/019	Beaully MU01	Concerns that development of the site may have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA because this flat area of farmland is used for bird feeding, notably geese.	Non confirmation of site option if HRA demonstrates adverse effect on integrity of Inner Moray Firth SPA.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/009	Beaully MU01	H5 + MU1 should all incorporate some part of a ring road system around Beaully with speed reduction system which could link into Priory Way at the SW end of town. If new school is re-located to the MU1 site with an included sports facility then it could have a dual use as a Health Centre.	
Beaully	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/016	Beaully MU01	There would be merit in a properly masterplanned development on MU1, H2, H3, H4 and C2 but piecemeal development should be avoided and the overall scale of development carefully phased to ensure that Beaully develops as a place to live and work.	
Beaully	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/035	Beaully MU01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan text to state that FRA required (or FR to be considered as part of DIA) and outcome may limit the scale and layout of development on the site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of the planning application if close to the watercourses.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/011	Beaully B01	This site is an eyesore and needs re-designating, possibly for housing and cleaning up. There are complaints from residents of the over height of the stacked containers on this site.	
Beaully	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/036	Beaully B01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan text to state that FRA required if development close to the flood plain and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of the planning application if development within or close to flood plain.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/012	Beaully B02	Railway Station Car park is currently over capacity and becoming dangerous as sometimes the turning space have cars parked in them. Both the Station Platform and car park is in desperate need of being extended down the field adjacent to the railway line. This is currently under discussion with Scot-Rail. Technically the railway station is a few feet outside the current Beaully CC Boundary but we are the only CC pressing Scot Rail to make improvements to the station car park. The boundary should therefore be moved to incorporate it within the Community Council.	
Beaully	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/037	Beaully B02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan text to state that FRA required if development close to the flood plain and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of the planning application if development within or close to flood plain.	
Beaully	Mr And Mrs Paul And Helen Ross(00785)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00785/1/002	Beaully B02	Despite lying outwith the railway line boundary the respondent supports B2 for business development as it has been fallow land for many years and would give opportunities to expand the station car park and platform.	
Beaully	Beaully Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/006	Beaully C01	C1 and the rest of designated Sites are solely within the Beaully Community Council Area and should all be kept on the current plan. Could be used for development of Retirement Flats with wardens (like Clachnaharry). Alternatively this site could ideally be reserved for a much needed Day Care Centre in Beaully. Support the inclusion of this site for community use.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Beauly	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/033	Beauly C01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan and text inserted to state that a FRA is required and the outcome may limit the scale and layout of development on the site.A FRA may need to consider both fluvial and tidal interaction here and avoid development within an areas identified at risk.	
Beauly	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00165/1/002	Beauly C02	Objects to preferred status of C2 for allotments as it occupies a prime site in the village with other more appropriate sites on the periphery, e.g. Along the railway. The proximity to the centre of the village means it would be better suited to amenity housing or day care centre.	Allocation of C2 for Housing or Mixed Use in Proposed Plan.
Beauly	Beauly Community Council(00271)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00271/1/010	Beauly C02	This site should be retained for allotment use.	
Beauly	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/016	Beauly C02	There would be merit in a properly masterplanned development on MU1, H2, H3, H4 and C2 but piecemeal development should be avoided and the overall scale of development carefully phased to ensure that Beauly develops as a place to live and work.	
Beauly	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/034	Beauly C02	SEPA will not object provided the allocation is only allotments and no buildings proposed. No Flood Risk Assessment required if only additional allotment plots are proposed but FRA would be required at planning application stage if any building were considered	
Croy	Mrs E Holland(00509)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00509/1/001	Croy General	Expresses concerns regarding the level of development in and around Croy; enhancement of existing infrastructure is required before any new development takes place in the area; the village hall is well used and maintained by the local community but it does not have the capacity to support increases in population of Croy; questions the gas pipeline being a constraint and the set back which is required for development; oncerned about adequate water supply for the area.Support is given for the Council's aim of increasing sustainable transport but believes that increasing the population of Croy will not help this as there are very few public transport services. Prime agricultural land should be protected for food production and provides local employment. Allocated land often is not used and can lie vacant for many years. Housing should be situated on moorland rather than high quality arable land. The Council's housing predictions have not been met and there is not such a demand for housing as the figures indicate. There is an optimum size for a rural community and Croy is now reaching that point, increasing it further will result in it becoming another suburb of Inverness.	Seeks reduced scale of development proposed in Croy.
Croy	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/007	Croy General	Does not agree with many of key development issues listed for Croy. That there is limited capacity in the sewage works; only limited development should take place until major employment opportunities are available at the planned airport business park and there is limited capacity at Culloden Academy. Development should be coordinated carefully to ensure educational provision keeps pace with the demands of numerous development sites in the area. Concerned that additional burdens on existing waste water treatment infrastructure may impact upon Loch Flemington SSSI SPA. The local road system should not be expected to carry a lot more development without significant improvements, with fatalities in recent years at Croy.Considers significant development at Croy is not sustainable as new residents would need to travel to Inverness or Nairn for most services and leisure activities. More could be made of the history of the 'Clach na Sanais' the legend of which is noted by the Highland Council Archaeology Department - and safeguards should be in place to ensure that it suffers no detriment.Overall very careful thought must be given to balancing the need for residential accommodation with employment, environmental, amenity proximity and road safety issues. A range of sites should be available to allow flexibility and to resist any remaining character and history that the village has left being totally overwhelmed by standardised modern development straight out of any one developer's pattern book.	Seeks revision of key development issues to acknowledge limited capacity in sewage works and limited capacity at Culloden Academy
Croy	Alison Lowe And Michael Hutcheson(00520)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00520/1/003	Croy General	Site to east of Heathfield should be considered for development as it has good accessibility, is well drained and relatively flat.	Allocation of site for development east of Heathfield

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Croy	Alison Lowe And Michael Hutcheson(00520)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00520/1/004	Croy General	Lack of sufficient information is given to enable considered comments on aspects of the plan. Understand supply of water is constrained and there is uncertainty as to where additional supplies can be sourced from and must be resolved before large scale development promoted in the plan can be supported. Object to 'no more than 25% development of a settlement in a 10 year period' policy no longer applying. Supported this policy as it enabled smaller communities to retain a sense of their identity, being able to absorb newcomers and help them become part of the community they have moved into. Request it is reinstated. Increased traffic from large scale development in Cawdor and Croy should be considered more carefully. Acknowledge government policy is in support of sustainable transport modes and encouraging people to work closer to home, however in reality this is not working. Therefore request scale of development currently supported in Croy is reconsidered due to impact of commuter traffic on the A96 and B9006 at the outskirts of Inverness. Could impact attractiveness of quality and reduced pace of life in the Highlands.	Seeks reduced scale of development proposed in Croy. Also seek reinstatement of 25% settlement expansion policy.
Croy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/287	Croy H01	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Croy	Church Of Scotland General Trustees(01040)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01040/1/001	Croy H01	Objects to non-preference of sites H1 and H2. These were originally submitted as potential housing sites during the HwLDP alongside site H3 which continues to be a housing allocation. Both sites are outwith the current settlement boundary but this is only because it is drawn to exclude Mains of Croy, Cawdor and Croy and Dalcross Manse and Croy and Dalcross Church, these should all be within the settlement boundary as historic and culturally important buildings, site H2 would become an infill site and H1 would be a rounding off. H1 is approximately a 600m walk to Croy Primary School which is not much more than from certain houses in Heathfield and closer than parts of development allocated at MU1. There is already ribbon development along the B9006 and further development at H1 and H2 will not change this. However with appropriate landscaping and high quality designed buildings, there is the opportunity to enhance this part of the village. The existing B9006 is narrow in places however with development taking place throughout the village there is opportunity to widen it and introduce new passing places and perhaps a pavement. The Church controls land along part of the road (H3) and would be willing to discuss this. The Church also controls road frontage at H1 and H2 and would consider road widening and new passing places int these locations. H1 could provide a new gateway feature for the village.	Seeks review of settlement boundary of Croy to include sites H1 and H2 for housing development.
Croy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/287	Croy H02	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Croy	Church Of Scotland General Trustees(01040)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01040/1/001	Croy H02	Objects to non-preference of sites H1 and H2. These were originally submitted as potential housing sites during the HwLDP alongside site H3 which continues to be a housing allocation. Both sites are outwith the current settlement boundary but this is only because it is drawn to exclude Mains of Croy, Cawdor and Croy and Dalcross Manse and Croy and Dalcross Church, these should all be within the settlement boundary as historic and culturally important buildings, site H2 would become an infill site and H1 would be a rounding off. H1 is approximately a 600m walk to Croy Primary School which is not much more than from certain houses in Heathfield and closer than parts of development allocated at MU1. There is already ribbon development along the B9006 and further development at H1 and H2 will not change this. However with appropriate landscaping and high quality designed buildings, there is the opportunity to enhance this part of the village. The existing B9006 is narrow in places however with development taking place throughout the village there is opportunity to widen it and introduce new passing places and perhaps a pavement. The Church controls land along part of the road (H3) and would be willing to discuss this. The Church also controls road frontage at H1 and H2 and would consider road widening and new passing places int these locations. H1 could provide a new gateway feature for the village.	Seeks review of settlement boundary of Croy to include sites H1 and H2 for housing development.
Croy	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/021	Croy H03	Site should be HRA assessed for possible impact upon Loch Flemington SPA - i.E. Sewerage treatment for site should not increase phosphorous levels in loch.	Inclusion of developer requirement for highest standard of treatment of effluent.
Croy	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/017	Croy H03	Development of MU1 and H3 would constitute excessive development and therefore we only support the MU1 development, properly masterplanned and phased.	Non-allocation of site H3 in Proposed Plan.
Croy	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/009	Croy H03	Any development on H3 should be low rise but perhaps slightly higher density with semi-detached bungalows and 'back to back' units to provide a choice and range of affordable units in the village. This would be in keeping with existing small properties in that part of the village.	Developer requirement for H3 to be low rise with potentially higher density semi-detached bungalows.
Croy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/287	Croy H03	No Flood Risk Assessment required	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Croy	Croy And Culloden Moor Community Council(00028)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0028/1/002	Croy MU01	Objects to site because: excessive scale relative to size of existing community; poor surface water and ground conditions; part of Loch Flemington catchment and risks of pollution of that water body; not possible to form safe access connection to B9006; previous community opposition has been ignored; it will only magnify the dormitory function of Croy because of the lack of local employment; will promote more car journeys because of the expense of public transport; the B9006 is a visually sensitive tourist route and has insufficient capacity to accommodate the additional trips generated especially at its Inverness end. Main Issues Report did not contain a comprehensive list of cons for the site and therefore the Council have based its preference on an erroneous and incomplete judgement; lack of housing types suitable for the elderly, and; better alternative housing sites available such as east of Heathfield where access and drainage is easier.	Non-allocation of site in Proposed Plan and inclusion of new site east of Heathfield, Croy..
Croy	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/021	Croy MU01	Site should be HRA assessed for possible impact upon Loch Flemington SPA - i.E. Sewerage treatment for site should not increase phosphorous levels in loch.	Inclusion of developer requirement for highest standard of treatment of effluent.
Croy	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0491/1/017	Croy MU01	Development of MU1 and H3 would constitute excessive development and therefore we only support the MU1 development, properly masterplanned and phased.	Non-allocation of site H3 in Proposed Plan.
Croy	Mrs E Holland(00509)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0509/1/003	Croy MU01	Objects to MU1 site in Croy due to poor surface drainage with several natural springs in the area which feed into the Croy Burn and in turn the regenerated Loch Flemington. This can result in flooding and earth movement which has been seen at adjacent housing development. Access is a seen as a problem and the density proposed is unsuitable for a rural community. Suggests "building on flat land east of Croy would be preferable over MU1.	Non-allocation of MU1 and inclusion of new site on land to the east of the village allocated for housing if required.
Croy	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0511/1/010	Croy MU01	Trees at the northern boundary of the site are missing and notes the site is also traversed by a 'prong' of the Kildrummie Kames. Development of the site should not disturb Croy Burn and surrounding area as Croy Burn flows into Loch Flemington. Indicates that SEPA, SNH and the CEH have been working together to ensure that polluting inputs are minimised further to significant monies being spent to clean up the loch. Also concerned that any disturbance of the geology in the local area will impact on pollution into the Loch via the groundwater. High rise development on MU1 should be discouraged and low level development encouraged. Unit numbers on the site should allow for measures to protect the burn and the local geology and history. No problem with compact semi-detached bungalows but these should not be shoe horned into the site with no thought to environment.	Inclusion for requirement of drainage requirement for site not to disturb Croy Burn. Delivery of low rise housing development appropriate on site.
Croy	Alison Lowe And Michael Hutcheson(00520)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0520/1/002	Croy MU01	Substantial part of MU1 is unsuitable for development due to adverse ground conditions. There is a steep slope and extremely boggy area through which the Croy Burn runs. Suggest boundaries are redrawn to reflect true site conditions.	Reduced extent of MU1 to exclude undevelopable areas.
Croy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/287	Croy MU01	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Croy	Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robertson Homes(01310)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01310/3/001	Croy MU01	Supports reaffirmation of site and minor extension to include land west of Dalcroy Road for mixed use: the land is effective, deliverable and in a single, developer, ownership; a planning application will be lodged soon; community consultation has already taken place; it is allocated within the recently adopted HwLDP; it is earmarked for longer term expansion in the Inverness Local Plan 2006; it offers an opportunity for a high quality, masterplanned development; it will offer reasonable and proportionate developer contributions and can be mixed use and phased; other uses will include open space, allotments, wild meadow, woodland and commercial units, and; Scotia have listened to community comments and made several changes to reduce housing numbers and density and to increase community elements.	Inclusion in use mix: housing, open space, allotments, wild meadow, woodland and commercial units.
Croy	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0491/1/018		Development of MU1 and H3 would constitute excessive development and therefore we only support the MU1 development, properly masterplanned and phased.	Non-allocation of site H3.
Croy	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0511/1/008		Objects to Council's non-preference for H2. Considers limited development should be supported in the form of an affordable housing development or select private development to facilitate construction of affordable housing on H3. Development at School Brae/Ardgowan is accessed from a single track road.	Allocation of H2 for affordable housing in Proposed Plan.
Croy	Donald Boyd - Collective Response(01351)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01351/1/004		The collective Community Councils consider that there is a need to carefully phase development over the longer term, and are concerned about the removal of the 25% settlement expansion policy and consider that the necessary infrastructure should go in before development.	Inclusion of developer requirements to carefully phase development over the longer term managed by a 25% settlement expansion policy also that the necessary infrastructure should go in before development.
Dores	Dores And Essich Community Council(00029)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0029/1/002	Dores General	The Community Council supports the zoning of additional land for housing on the condition that consideration and upgrading where necessary is given to the road infrastructure within the village and between Dores and Inverness.	
Dores	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/025	Dores General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys including reptiles.	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys including reptiles.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Dores	Mr Ruairidh MacLennan(01019)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/005	Dores General	Despite recognising the need for additional commercial ventures in the village, objects to preferred status of B1 because:- unrealistic that the former petrol station will be developed- too small for business uses- required for vehicle turning and parking- surrounded by houses which would limit type of use- alternatives should be identified as there has been no take up/demand for the site in several decadesSuggests a more appropriate business site in Dores would be the car park of the Dores Inn because:- it has existing car parking- is suitably screened from residential properties- close proximity to services- existing and previous uses are business related including former water sports facility- any localised negative impacts would be outweighed by the greater need for increased local employment- potential for other commercial spin-offs and general improvement of the visitor experience.However, respondent emphasises that any development on the site must be of high quality design, sympathetic to the landscape, and not have significant light or noise pollution.	Seeks removal of B1. New Business Site within Dores Inn carpark.
Dores	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/009	Dores H01	Comment that there may be significant natural heritage issues in terms of the potential impact on ancient woodland category 2a.	
Dores	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/024	Dores H01	Concerns about loss of long-established semi natural origin woodland. Argues this nationally important feature merits protection under Council and Government policy. Believes other site options (MU1, H2 and H3) are preferable. If the site is developed only supports the lower portion of it as better matching exiting settlement pattern. Believes other constraints such as visual prominence in public views across the loch from A82 and steepness of upper slopes should constrain potential of site.	Non retention of site option or the reduction of it to only cover that part closest to B852.
Dores	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0491/1/020	Dores H01	Development of MU1 and H3 would constitute excessive development and therefore we only support the MU1 development, properly masterplanned and phased.	
Dores	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/038	Dores H01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan text to state that FRA required if development close to the flood plain and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of the planning application if development within or close to flood plain.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Dores	Mr John Hedger(00636)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0636/1/001	Dores H01	Concerned about its remoteness from the centre of the village and considers this to be ribbon development.Concerned about the amenity value lost from the trees that would be removed (not all commercial). Thinks that the site is too close to the loch.	
Dores	Mr Ruairidh MacLennan(01019)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/002	Dores H01	Recognises the need for housing expansion in Dores but objects to H1 and H2 due it creating a ribbon style development resulting in an even more linear shaped village. To expand the village at both ends will give the impression of a sprawling landscape with limited opportunity for screening. Respondent argues that this would have a damaging effect on the character of the village. As a result infill sites are supported over H1 and H2.	
Dores	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0491/1/020	Dores H02	Development of MU1 and H3 would constitute excessive development and therefore we only support the MU1 development, properly masterplanned and phased.	
Dores	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/288	Dores H02	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Dores	Mr Ruairidh MacLennan(01019)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/002	Dores H02	Recognises the need for housing expansion in Dores but objects to H1 and H2 due it creating a ribbon style development resulting in an even more linear shaped village. To expand the village at both ends will give the impression of a sprawling landscape with limited opportunity for screening. Respondent argues that this would have a damaging effect on the character of the village. As a result infill sites are supported over H1 and H2.	
Dores	Mr Iain Cameron(01043)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01043/1/002	Dores H02	The respondent supports this allocation of this land for housing development if the landowner offers a small piece of land adjacent to the site or NW of the B862 as a replacement for the small playing field in use next to the Dores Inn. There is a desire to protect the field NW of the road and it considered that a small playing field would preserve this area. The respondent gave a lease on the playing field next to the Dores Inn which has expired and another use may be proposed here soon.	
Dores	Dr William Erskine(01061)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01061/1/002	Dores H02	Respondent is the owner of H2 and supports it for the following reasons:- adjacent to recent development- access is good- within walking distance of existing village facilities - at the appropriate end of the village for the primary school - topography of the site means it is relatively well screened on the approach to the village from he north. Respondent is willing to discuss further screening and understands there is some local concern about the historic development in H3 but any development in H2 should not be compromised by sacrificial screening for H3. Site H2 will encourage viability of the village.	
Dores	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0491/1/020	Dores H03	Development of MU1 and H3 would constitute excessive development and therefore we only support the MU1 development, properly masterplanned and phased.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Dores	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/039	Dores H03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan text to state that FRA required (unless site already under construction) .There are flood risk issues but if it is partly built it may be too late to require FRA. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Dores	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/019	Dores MU01	Development of MU1 and H3 would constitute excessive development and therefore we only support the MU1 development, properly masterplanned and phased.	
Dores	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/288	Dores MU01	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Dores	Church Of Scotland(00663)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00663/1/001	Dores MU01	Respondent supports site MU1 and remains committed to seeing it developed for housing and would actively support the designation within the emerging local development plan as suitable for housing.	
Dores	Mr Ruairidh MacIannan(01019)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/003	Dores MU01	Questions whether MU1 should be allocated for development as the owners are not willing to release the land for development. As a result it is giving a false view of available land.	
Dores	Mr Ruairidh MacIannan(01019)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/005	Dores B01	Despite recognising the need for additional commercial ventures in the village, objects to preferred status of B1 because:- unrealistic that the former petrol station will be developed- too small for business uses- required for vehicle turning and parking- surrounded by houses which would limit type of use- alternatives should be identified as there has been no take up/demand for the site in several decadesSuggests a more appropriate business site in Dores would be the car park of the Dores Inn because:- it has existing car parking- is suitably screened from residential properties- close proximity to services- existing and previous uses are business related including former water sports facility- any localised negative impacts would be outweighed by the greater need for increased local employment- potential for other commercial spin-offs and general improvement of the visitor experience.However, respondent emphasises that any development on the site must be of high quality design, sympathetic to the landscape, and not have significant light or noise pollution.	Seeks removal of B1. New Business Site within Dores Inn carpark.
Dores	Dores And Essich Community Council(00029)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00029/1/001	Dores C01A	The Community Council supports the protection of the agricultural land to the north west of Dores for amenity / community use in the future.	
Dores	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/008	Dores C01A	Comment that there may be significant natural heritage issues in terms of the potential impact on the Geological Conservation Review Site.	
Dores	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/023	Dores C01A	Opposes principle of any development requiring foundations and any tree planting within site because the land is within a nationally important Geological Conservation Review site. This site is protected because of its geomorphological value as an example of raised shorelines. The site needs to be protected physically (no foundations) and visually (as an educational resource).	
Dores	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/040	Dores C01A	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. A FRA would consider the watercourse adjacent and within the site, the culvert under the road adjacent to the site and avoid development in any areas at identified at risk of flooding. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Dores	Mr Ruairidh MacIannan(01019)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/004	Dores C01A	Wishes to see the sites C1a and C1b safeguarded from development as it would impact negatively on the character of the village, particularly the views down the glen.	
Dores	Dr William Erskine(01061)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01061/1/001	Dores C01A	Owens site C1 and has no plans for any form of development on this site. It will remain as agricultural land with the exception of the existing agreement with the Rock Ness Festival organisers.	
Dores	Dores And Essich Community Council(00029)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00029/1/001	Dores C01B	The Community Council supports the protection of the agricultural land to the north west of Dores for amenity / community use in the future.	
Dores	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/041	Dores C01B	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text to be modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA if development is close to the watercourse and all development will avoid the functional floodplain.Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application if development close to watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Dores	Mr Ruairidh MacIannan(01019)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01019/1/004	Dores C01B	Wishes to see the sites C1a and C1b safeguarded from development as it would impact negatively on the character of the village, particularly the views down the glen.	
Dores	Dr William Erskine(01061)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01061/1/001	Dores C01B	Owens site C1 and has no plans for any form of development on this site. It will remain as agricultural land with the exception of the existing agreement with the Rock Ness Festival organisers.	
Dores	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/011		Few stopping points on Loch Ness. Dores is one of a limited number of locations where new mooring facilities could be provided.	



ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Drumnadrochit	Mr Angus Mackay(00012)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0012/1/001	Drumnadrochit General	Seeks the allocation of three house plots within Blairbeg Woodland, Drumnadrochit. Makes reference to previous Local Plan Inquiry when an objection was made to only part of the woodland being protected for amenity use. The reporter recommended the entire wood was protected for amenity use as it was regarded as a major amenity feature; lack of protection could result in felling and loss of desire line footpaths which would affect its character. The Council agreed with the reporter and allocated the entire woodland for amenity use (Policy BP3 feature). Considers the future of the allocation of three house plots should be reconsidered despite the conclusions of the previous inquiry. Considers plots should be allocated for the following reasons:-New houses will form a group with existing properties, including a planned brewery;-Plots are low density;-Low visual impact as each plot will be 1 and a half stories;-Site will be accessed from Kilmore road and not the A82;-Although some felling will be required, this will be confined to one area, some trees could be retained on each plot and character of wood will not be affected;-Impact upon desire lines is minimal;-Impact upon rookery will be limited as any works affecting the trees will not take place during nesting season; and-Willing to gift the remaining woodland to the local community to allow for its proper management.Submission includes Tree Survey which confirms that significant felling would be required, but that many of these trees are classified as being low value.	Allocation of three house plots within Blairbeg Woodland, Drumnadrochit
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/027	Drumnadrochit General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).
Drumnadrochit	Janet Bell(00624)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0624/1/003	Drumnadrochit General	Need for more shop units (e.G. Butchers/bakers)	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/012	Drumnadrochit General	Support should be given to developments which provide economic benefits beyond the construction phase.	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/013	Drumnadrochit General	Design of social housing should fit in and strengthen the character of the village. It should be balanced with larger individually designed houses.	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/014	Drumnadrochit General	Development which builds on the core activities should be supported. Inward investment to the village for small industries , workshops and community run facilities should be supported to help provide employment for local people and school leavers.	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/015	Drumnadrochit General	Development of the village should recognise and support the access to Loch Ness from the village including enhanced access and a footbridge in the Cover.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0943/1/012	Drumnadrochit General	A community strip should be identified along the south side of the A82 between Balmacaan Road and Borlum Bridge for a footpath and cycleway. This would provide a safer route for pedestrians and cyclists. A parallel route divided from the A82 by trees would also offer greater amenity value.	
Drumnadrochit	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0957/1/007	Drumnadrochit General	A number of the sites are located adjacent to the A82(T). An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/026	Drumnadrochit H01	Concerns that site may have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Urquhart Bay Wood SAC via River Enrick connectivity. Fears that increased run-off from site would affect the water regime within the SAC and "export" invasive, non-native species to the designation area. Reports that there is already a problem with non-native invasive species.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/005	Drumnadrochit H01	Glenurquhart Community Council support the allocation of these sites for the purpose identified in the MIR.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/042	Drumnadrochit H01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Review of the Jacobs Baptie River Enrick Study shows the site is adjacent to floodplain on all sides, but is not at risk of flooding itself in the 0.5% AEP event. There are known issues with erosion on the Enrick which may need to be considered when designing the development. This should be flagged up within the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment is not required provided no development within flood plain.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/002	Drumnadrochit H01	Respondent supports this site for a well designed development. Respondent considers the site should leave a route for a river crossing for safe walking/cycling to the school.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0943/1/003	Drumnadrochit H01	Supports site H1 - would fit landscape pattern and is a brownfield site.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/006	Drumnadrochit H02	Glen Urquhart Community Council supports the Councils non preference of these sites.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/043	Drumnadrochit H02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Site is adjacent to floodplain along northern perimeter. May need to consider this in site layout as there may be potential for future erosion problems. This should be flagged up within the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment is not required provided no development within flood plain.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00917/1/003	Drumnadrochit H02	The respondent supports the non-preferred status of this site.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/004	Drumnadrochit H02	Objects to non-preference of site H2. Preferred area of development over MU3, MU4 AND MU5. Housing could be discrete on eastern side of minor road and fits with character of settlement and good access to facilities centred around the Post Office and Druimlon. Western side of road would impinge upon Creag Monie and recreation area.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/026	Drumnadrochit H03	Concerns that site may have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Urquhart Bay Wood SAC via River Enrick connectivity. Fears that increased run-off from site would affect the water regime within the SAC and "export" invasive, non-native species to the designation area. Reports that there is already a problem with non-native invasive species.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/005	Drumnadrochit H03	Glenurquhart Community Council support the allocation of these sites for the purpose identified in the MIR.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/044	Drumnadrochit H03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Watercourse buffer, site is adjacent to floodplain along northern perimeter. May need to consider this in site layout as there may be potential for future erosion problems. This should be flagged up within the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application if development proposed adjacent to flood plain. River Enrick runs along the boundary of the site. The water body is currently at good status for morphology. The watercourse is known to be dynamic with a high sediment load and frequent planform change. This site is situated downstream from a meander bend and is therefore very vulnerable to the development of future river processes i.E. Erosion and planform change. Significant river engineering is likely to be required either as part of the development or in the future to protect the site. This is likely to have knock on effects on river process which could lead to similar problems nearby. Significant morphological assessment would be required to demonstrate the viability of the site for development in these terms. River engineering is a very sensitive subject in this catchment due to flooding problems in Drumnadrochit. Any assessment should take into account previous assessment work already carried out on restoration and flooding.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Drumnadrochit	Janet Bell(00624)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00624/1/002	Drumnadrochit H03	Supports that the H3 site has been kept to a minimum.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/028	Drumnadrochit H04	Concerns that development of site would result in loss of semi natural woodland contrary to policy and should only be allowed if there are over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, tree loss in minimised, prior species surveys are undertaken and a high standard of compensatory planting is secured.	Non-retention of site or adequate mitigation.
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/005	Drumnadrochit H04	Glenurquhart Community Council support the allocation of these sites for the purpose identified in the MIR.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/289	Drumnadrochit H04	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00917/1/004	Drumnadrochit H04	Respondent supports development of this site with a preference for individually designed houses.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/005	Drumnadrochit H04	Supports preferred sites H4 and H5 - could fit settlement pattern if designed sensitively.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/007	Drumnadrochit H05	Glenurquhart Community Council suggest that this site is prone to flooding and forms part of the green wedge as you look over area C1. Glenurquhart Community Council wish to see it removed from the LDP.	Non-retention of site.
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/289	Drumnadrochit H05	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00917/1/005	Drumnadrochit H05	Respondent supports development of site H5 if there is good design and mitigation of the seasonal flooding on the site. Respondent notes that the site will have a visual impact.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/005	Drumnadrochit H05	Supports preferred sites H4 and H5 - could fit settlement pattern if designed sensitively.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/008	Drumnadrochit H06	Glenurquhart Community Council suggest that this site is suitable for a small number of houses, set back against the embankment, retaining and enhancing the pond and ridge leading down to H5. This would include repairs and access to the Mausoleum.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/289	Drumnadrochit H06	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/005	Drumnadrochit H07	Glenurquhart Community Council support the allocation of these sites for the purpose identified in the MIR.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/006	Drumnadrochit H07	Glen Urquhart Community Council supports the Councils non preference of these sites.	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/006	Drumnadrochit H07	Would support the development of this site for 2 well designed houses providing the pedestrian access along Kilmore Road was improved. (Further details improvements are contained within the response).	
Drumnadrochit	Mr John PM Fraser(00245)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0245/1/002	Drumnadrochit H08	Considers H8 should be allocated for housing for the following reasons:-Area already 'joined' by existing buildings;-Would limited to low density infill development;-Access would either be from north east or off Balmacaan Road;-Area is quite and private; and-Would possibly use site to develop 1 or 2 house for respondent's family, meaning minimal development and maximum garden/wild green space.	Allocation of H8 for housing in Proposed Plan
Drumnadrochit	Mr John PM Fraser(00245)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0245/2/002	Drumnadrochit H08	Requests the following is noted in addition to existing comments: wish site to be allocated for maximum 3 units despite being large enough to accommodate many more; keen to maintain a green line of sight from the top of Balmacaan Road, and maximise the green open aspect of the site; development would therefore contain houses with large gardens and appropriate screening for privacy.	Allocation of H8 for three houses in Proposed Plan
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/009	Drumnadrochit H08	Glenurquhart Community Council support the applicants proposals for 2/3 houses provided this completes development in that field and retains an open aspect between Balmacaan and Lewiston.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/289	Drumnadrochit H08	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/007	Drumnadrochit H08	Support for the non-preferred status of H8 as it helps maintain the green finger between Lewiston and Drumnadrochit.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0943/1/006	Drumnadrochit H08	Supports non-preference of site H8. Site is in appropriate for development as it would change the characteristic and distinctive settlement pattern already eroded by recent housing development on the northern side.Supports the retention of the land as open space.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/006	Drumnadrochit MU01	Glen Urquhart Community Council supports the Councils non preference of these sites.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/045	Drumnadrochit MU01	SEPA support the Council's non-preferred status of this site. The site should be removed from the Plan unless further information is submitted prior to adoption to demonstrate site suitability and unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/026	Drumnadrochit MU02	Concerns that site may have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Urquhart Bay Wood SAC via River Enrick connectivity. Fears that increased run-off from site would affect the water regime within the SAC and "export" invasive, non-native species to the designation area. Reports that there is already a problem with non-native invasive species.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/010	Drumnadrochit MU02	Glenurquhart Community Council support part of the MU2 site between the old High School and Enrick Crescent for housing with a significant proportion of affordable homes. They consider that the site layout should recognise the scope for future expansion in this area. Glenurquhart Community Council have consulted on whether MU3 or MU2 should be preferred. The business community prefer MU3 and Glenurquhart Community Council support this decision but consider it important that it is phased as as to provide local employment over an extended period, meet the community priorities and provide a high quality rural development. They seek early development of the A82 access point, facilitated movement of Scot Mid to a new location, and sheltered housing in the vicinity of the Care Centre, and pedestrian links from Kilmore to the schools and surgery.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/046	Drumnadrochit MU02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text to be modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application and allocation should state that no development can take place within functional floodplain.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Drumnadrochit	Mr Alan Bell(00623)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0623/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU02	Prefers MU3 as it adjoins existing settlement and provides an opportunity to meet community's aspirations for a new medical centre and sheltered housing.	
Drumnadrochit	Mr Alan Bell(00623)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0623/1/002	Drumnadrochit MU02	Concerned about housing development at MU3 as it is valued agricultural land and potential problems with access onto the A82.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Drumnadrochit	Janet Bell(00624)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0624/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU02	Prefers MU3 for any development due to proximity to Kilmore housing and care centre.	
Drumnadrochit	Drumnadrochit Chamber Of Commerce & Tourist Association(00688)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0688/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU02	Objects to site MU2 as traffic congestion in the vicinity is already a problem and the site, along with The Green, maintains the rural character of the village. Respondent prefers site MU3 over site MU2.	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/008	Drumnadrochit MU02	Consideration should be given to the visual amenity and openness of this part of the village. Development on this site should make provision for a safe walking/cycling route along the north boundary of the site connecting to the village centre.	Developer requirement for pedestrian/cycle route connecting site MU2 to the village centre.
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0943/1/008	Drumnadrochit MU02	Objects to site MU2 for following reasons:- development would be incongruous to landscape pattern of settlement and would affect views of the setting of Drumnadrochit. Thin strip of open space along A82 is not sufficient.- There are key views north and south over the site. An alternative smaller development area between the old school and Enrick Crescent would follow the linear pattern of development within the area while maintaining views from the west and A82.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0288/1/010	Drumnadrochit MU03	Glenurquhart Community Council support part of the MU2 site between the old High School and Enrick Crescent for housing with a significant proportion of affordable homes. They consider that the site layout should recognise the scope for future expansion in this area. Glenurquhart Community Council have consulted on whether MU3 or MU2 should be preferred. The business community prefer MU3 and Glenurquhart Community Council support this decision but consider it important that it is phased as as to provide local employment over an extended period, meet the community priorities and provide a high quality rural development. They seek early development of the A82 access point, facilitated movement of Scot Mid to a new location, and sheltered housing in the vicinity of the Care Centre, and pedestrian links from Kilmore to the schools and surgery.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/290	Drumnadrochit MU03	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Janet Bell(00624)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0624/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU03	Prefers MU3 for any development due to proximity to Kilmore housing and care centre.	
Drumnadrochit	Drumnadrochit Chamber Of Commerce & Tourist Association(00688)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0688/1/002	Drumnadrochit MU03	Supports site MU3. Would welcome the inclusion of a new (relocated) supermarket on this site. Prefers site MU3 over MU2.	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/009	Drumnadrochit MU03	Supports the development of site MU3 over MU2 but green buffer to A82 should be maintained and pedestrian/cycle route through or around the development should be provided.	Developer requirements for retention of green buffer to the A82 and provision of pedestrian/cycle route around or through site MU3.
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0943/1/009	Drumnadrochit MU03	Objects to site MU3 for following reasons:- Development incongruous to settlement character and landscape pattern, especially distinction between Lewiston and Drumnadrochit which is already eroded.- Would impinge on views from the A82, affecting sense of arrival and perceived character of Drumnadrochit. Thin strip of open space on southern and eastern sides of MU3 and MU5 would not be sufficient to protect these qualities.- Distinction of character is important in elevated views of settlement from hills around.	
Drumnadrochit	Loch Ness Homes Ltd(01022)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01022/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU03	Considers part of MU5 should be allocated for a new health centre and possibly a pharmacy.	Allocation of MU3 for housing, commercial and open space. Allocation of MU5 for new health centre and possibly pharmacy.
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/290	Drumnadrochit MU04	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0917/1/010	Drumnadrochit MU04	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of site MU4 as it helps maintain the green finger between Drumnadrochit and Lewiston.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0943/1/010	Drumnadrochit MU04	Supports non-preference of sites MU4 and MU5 for following reasons:- Development incongruous to settlement character and landscape pattern, especially distinction between Lewiston and Drumnadrochit which is already eroded.- Would impinge on views from the A82, affecting sense of arrival and perceived character of Drumnadrochit. Thin strip of open space on southern and eastern sides of MU3 and MU5 would not be sufficient to protect these qualities.- Distinction of character is important in elevated views of settlement from hills around.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/013	Drumnadrochit MU04	Supports non-preference of sites MU4 and MU5 for following reasons:- Development incongruous to settlement character and landscape pattern, especially distinction between Lewiston and Drumnadrochit which is already eroded.- Would impinge on views from the A82, affecting sense of arrival and perceived character of Drumnadrochit. Thin strip of open space on southern and eastern sides of MU3 and MU5 would not be sufficient to protect these qualities.- Distinction of character is important in elevated views of settlement from hills around.	
Drumnadrochit	Loch Ness Homes Ltd(01022)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01022/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU04	Considers part of MU5 should be allocated for a new health centre and possibly a pharmacy.	Allocation of MU3 for housing, commercial and open space. Allocation of MU5 for new health centre and possibly pharmacy.
Drumnadrochit	Mr John PM Fraser(00245)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00245/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU05	Considers MU5 should be allocated for retail, business, community and housing uses (including potential for new health centre) as this would have significant community benefits; is in a central location within walking distance of other village facilities and access is viable from adjacent development site. Welcomes green corridors and screening to future development sites.	Allocation of MU5 for retail, business, community and housing uses in Proposed Plan.
Drumnadrochit	Mr John PM Fraser(00245)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00245/2/001	Drumnadrochit MU05	Considers all or part of MU5 should be allocated for a new Health Centre, parking and associated services such a pharmacy units. Explains that respondents families off to gift land for a new health centre is independent and unconditional on any other planning issue. Considers MU5 is ideal location for new health centre. Expect NHS will be in touch to discuss further with planning department.	Allocation of all or part of MU5 for health centre, parking and associated services.
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/011	Drumnadrochit MU05	Glenurquhart Community Council support limited development for a Health Centre and associated facilities such as a stand alone pharmacy. They consider this should be a high quality single storey building with good landscaping and parking.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/290	Drumnadrochit MU05	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00917/1/011	Drumnadrochit MU05	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of site MU5 as it helps maintain the green finger between Drumnadrochit and Lewiston.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/010	Drumnadrochit MU05	Supports non-preference of sites MU4 and MU5 for following reasons:- Development incongruous to settlement character and landscape pattern, especially distinction between Lewiston and Drumnadrochit which is already eroded.- Would impinge on views from the A82, affecting sense of arrival and perceived character of Drumnadrochit. Thin strip of open space on southern and eastern sides of MU3 and MU5 would not be sufficient to protect these qualities.- Distinction of character is important in elevated views of settlement from hills around.	
Drumnadrochit	Loch Ness Homes Ltd(01022)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01022/1/001	Drumnadrochit MU05	Considers part of MU5 should be allocated for a new health centre and possibly a pharmacy.	Allocation of MU3 for housing, commercial and open space. Allocation of MU5 for new health centre and possibly pharmacy.
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/012	Drumnadrochit MU06	Glenurquhart Community Council support this sites allocation as long as the existing building is demolished and replaced with a building that fits sensitively into its surroundings.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/011	Drumnadrochit MU06	Supports MU6 especially demolition and reconstruction of shop and improvement of car park layout. It could mitigate existing adverse impacts and benefit the character of the village.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/013	Drumnadrochit MU07	Glenurquhart Community Council support this site being allocated for housing.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/006	Drumnadrochit B01	Glen Urquhart Community Council supports the Councils non preference of these sites.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/289	Drumnadrochit B01	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glen Urquhart Greenspace Community Company(00917)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00917/1/001	Drumnadrochit B01	Supports the non-preferred status of B1.	
Drumnadrochit	Ms Caroline Stanton(00943)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00943/1/007	Drumnadrochit B01	Supports non-preference of site B1. Would be inappropriate development due to loss of woodland.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/006	Drumnadrochit B02	Glen Urquhart Community Council supports the Councils non preference of these sites.	
Drumnadrochit	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/289	Drumnadrochit B02	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/005	Drumnadrochit C01	Glenurquhart Community Council support the allocation of these sites for the purpose identified in the MIR.	
Drumnadrochit	Glenurquhart Community Council(00288)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00288/1/005	Drumnadrochit C02	Glenurquhart Community Council support the allocation of these sites for the purpose identified in the MIR.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inchmore	Mr Paul Whitefoot(00973)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0973/1/003	Inchmore General	The respondent considers that the settlement boundary in the SE cuts into the currently agricultural ground for no apparent reason. Settlement boundary should be ammended to reflect natural or existing manmade boundaries in the area.	Ammend south east settlement boundary.
Inchmore	Mr Paul Whitefoot(00973)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0973/1/007	Inchmore General	The respondent also considers that the amenity ground (the old school playing field) to the north of the old school should be allocated as public open space to preserve some playing space.	Allocation of amenity ground (the old school playing field) to the north of the old school as public open space.
Inchmore	Mr And Mrs R Ross(01050)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/1050/1/003	Inchmore General	Respondent considers that the old football pitch next to the school could be developed to create a play/games area.	Respondent would like the old football pitch to be identified as an open space allocation.
Inchmore	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0165/1/006	Inchmore H01	Objects to the non-preferred status of H1 for the following reasons:- it is a natural extension to the village on the northern side and line up with the boundary on the south side of the road;- close proximity to the village amenities;- access to the site would be from the B9164 road to Kirkhill and compared to other proposed housing sites in Inchmore, this would provide safer links to Kirkhill school for children - due to wet/heavy nature of the soil it is not the best agricultural land- services are readily available- development on both sides of the B9164 would give a more built up appearance at the junction and this would have a traffic claming influence.	Allocation of H1 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Inchmore	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/006	Inchmore H01	Support the non-preferred status of this site.	
Inchmore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/047	Inchmore H01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inchmore	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/007	Inchmore H02	Agree with recommendation for development of housing on the lower slope.	
Inchmore	Mr & Mrs Mike MacMillan(00686)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0686/1/001	Inchmore H02	Respondent seeks the expansion of H2 to the west as it is considered to be logistical extension to the site. Site has direct access from the Newtonhill public road. (Map included)	Allocation of H2 for housing including expansion to the west in the Proposed Plan.
Inchmore	Mr And Mrs R Ross(01050)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/1050/1/002	Inchmore H02	Respondent supports the allocation of this land for housing for the following reasons- it would create a balanced village- keeps development close to the centre, and helps create a centre	
Inchmore	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/008	Inchmore H03	Would only support development on the area as contained within the adopted Inverness Local Plan 2006, this would restrict the number of units that could be built on site.	Reduce area of H3 to reflect current allocation in Inverness Local Plan.
Inchmore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/048	Inchmore H03	SEPA object to the inclusion of this site unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or the allocation should be removed from Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inchmore	Mr Paul Whitefoot(00973)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0973/1/002	Inchmore H03	Concerned about the potential allocation of H3 for the following reasons:- creation of ribbon style development before the centre of Inchmore is infilled through the development of H2 and H5;- creation of asymmetric development and unbalanced feel when entering Inchmore from Inverness;- Existing allocation in the Inverness Local Plan is more appropriate as it is a more balanced arrangement and resolves the eyesore of the old garage;- would create a precedent for development H4 despite it being non-preferred in the MIR	Reduce area of H3 to reflect site ref 1 in the Inverness Local Plan.
Inchmore	Mr And Mrs R Ross(01050)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/1050/1/001	Inchmore H03	Respondent objects to the allocation of this land for housing for the following reasons - it would unbalance the village by allowing ribbon development outwith the current village boundary - it would allow development close to a dangerous bend in the road	Non-allocation of H3 in the Proposed Plan
Inchmore	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/009	Inchmore H04	Support the Councils non-preferred status for this site, this is good qulaity land and sits too far outwith the settlement.	
Inchmore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/049	Inchmore H04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inchmore	Mr And Mrs Young(01066)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/1066/1/001	Inchmore H04	Objects to H4 not being included within area scheduled for development.	Assume allocation of H4 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Inchmore	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/010	Inchmore H05	Planning permission already granted for this site.	
Inchmore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/050	Inchmore H05	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inchmore	Mr And Mrs R Ross(01050)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01050/1/002	Inchmore H05	Respondent supports the allocation of this land for housing for the following reasons- it would create a balanced village- keeps development close to the centre, and helps create a centre	
Inchmore	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/011	Inchmore B01	Supports the Council's preference for business use on this site	
Fort Augustus	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/031	Fort Augustus General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0285/1/001	Fort Augustus General	Employment opportunities within the community is poor, mostly seasonal work available. Tourism being the major industry.- Larger housing developments of over 15/20 homes would need to be in conjunction with increased employment ie. New businesses and or industrial unit developments. A substantial increase in population with the current poor employment prospects would not be in the interests of the community growth.- Initial development should be restricted to 20 homes or less. The arrangement for 25% social housing in developments should be maintained.- Currently there is a need for some social housing for local needs.- The existing infrastructure of water and sewage would not be capable of meeting a large housing development. It is expected that the water supply to the Auchteraw area will be requested in the next Scottish Water capital programme 2014/15. - The community would benefit from extending the car and coach parking availability. Support for some small industrial and business units to move to the area. These initiatives should help the community to grow and develop.- restrict the development for housing to plots consisting of 15 houses or less. - phase the building of housing developments with a 3 year interval between builds. - employment daily commute to the Inverness area is very costly in both time and money, community based developments, library, swimming pool and visitor centre would help develop the area.- Some minor alterations to the Site Options identified within the local proposal would allow community to grow whilst maintaining local amenity ground. The proposed changes would allow for housing development of 40+ houses over a phased 9 year period.- Sites are also available for the opportunity for growth in tourism, businesses, car parking and community development.	
Fort Augustus	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0957/1/008	Fort Augustus General	An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.	
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0285/1/002	Fort Augustus H01	Reduce the housing site to an area between the rear of the Gondilier Building and the canal. This would have the advantage of being close to the village centre and amenities. The area would provide at least two plots of 15 houses, possibly more for the longer term whilst retaining some green space in the area.	
Fort Augustus	D Turnbull(01124)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01124/1/001	Fort Augustus H01	Supports H1. Land will be available for development as required.	
Fort Augustus	Ms Laura Bridges(01154)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01154/1/001	Fort Augustus H01	Reaffirms desire to release part of site as landowner. Believes whole site is still suitable for development because: market circumstances may change; planning permissions have already been granted for parts of the site; site is allocated in the adopted local plan and much effort has been made to promote a coordinated approach through the development brief, and; further development will help retain and enhance village facilities.	
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0285/1/003	Fort Augustus H03	Should be retained as local amenity ground. This site is adjacent to the Covent Wood which has some historic value to the community and has protected wildlife species in the area. The site is regularly used by the members of the community, it is one of few remaining open green sites in the village and a very popular local walking area.	
Fort Augustus	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/051	Fort Augustus H03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Fort Augustus	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/029	Fort Augustus MU01	Requests developer requirements for bat survey and protection plan and tree retention.	Developer requirements for bat survey and protection plan and tree retention.
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0285/1/004	Fort Augustus MU01	The playing field is existing amenity ground, currently used as a cricket pitch. This is the only cricket facility between Inverness and Fort William.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Fort Augustus	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/052	Fort Augustus MU01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site must be carried out in accordance with the principles of SPP, either avoiding areas at risk of flooding, or, if mitigation measures implemented, must be accompanied by compensatory flood storage arrangements in line with the conditions of previous planning consents on the site. FRA has already been carried out but may need to be updated.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Fort Augustus	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/020	Fort Augustus MU01	The allocation is centred around the Category A listed Fort Augustus Abbey, Church Monastery and School (HB no. 1862). Historic Scotland look forward to continuing to work with the Council and all stakeholders in the delivery of this allocation.	
Fort Augustus	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/030	Fort Augustus MU02	Concerns that development of site would result in loss of semi natural woodland contrary to policy and should only be allowed if there are over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, tree loss in minimised, prior species surveys are undertaken and a high standard of compensatory planting is secured.	
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00285/1/005	Fort Augustus MU02	The area to the rear of the car park is ideally suited to extend the car parking facility. An extension to the car park is required to enable growth to happen within the community. It has an excellent village centre location.	
Fort Augustus	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/053	Fort Augustus MU02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00285/1/008	Fort Augustus B01	The British Waterways Scotland proposal for a Visitor Centre would benefit greatly from support from the Highland Council and the Development Plan. The proposal includes up to 8 small business units. Ideal for community growth.	
Fort Augustus	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/054	Fort Augustus B01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Fort Augustus	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/003	Fort Augustus B01	Supports preference for B1, may also include small retail element. Fort Augustus key stop over point on the Great Glen Way/Canoe Trail - huge demand for camping. Scottish Canals is investigating opportunities for camping and additional mooring locations on and around the canal, asks the plan supports this.	Support need to identify locations for additional camping and mooring sites at Fort Augustus
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00285/1/006	Fort Augustus C01	Support the proposed option for site in the plan.	
Fort Augustus	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/004	Fort Augustus C01	Canalside sites, request Scottish Canals is consulted at earliest possible stage to ensure impact upon Scheduled Monument and canal-side setting is considered appropriately. Canal may provide opportunity for sustainable drainage.	
Fort Augustus	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00165/1/001	Fort Augustus C02	If the site is to be associated with the school then the allocation for community use will be acceptable. However if not, then respondent feels the site should be retained as its existing allocation of housing and mixed use as this would be of more interest to a developer and more than one developer could be involved which would accelerate the development of the site.	
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00285/1/007	Fort Augustus C02	Support the proposed option for site in the plan	
Fort Augustus	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/004	Fort Augustus C02	Canalside sites, request Scottish Canals is consulted at earliest possible stage to ensure impact upon Scheduled Monument and canal-side setting is considered appropriately. Canal may provide opportunity for sustainable drainage.	
Fort Augustus	Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council(00285)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00285/1/009	Fort Augustus I01	This site may be in the wrong location, consideration should be given to areas beyond Fire Station for Industrial units/site.	
Kiltarlity	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/032	Kiltarlity General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).
Kiltarlity	Kiltarlity Community Council(00299)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00299/4/002	Kiltarlity General	Respondent supports Key Development Issues for Kiltarlity . Agrees with the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements.	
Kiltarlity	Mr Hamish D Maclennan(01080)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/001	Kiltarlity General	Respondent questions if Kiltarlity is to become a dormitory for Inverness and still a small village. Respondent considers Kiltarlity should not grow too fast.Respondent considers small scale commercial units would not occur in Kiltarlity as Beaully and Inverness are close by.Respondent considers there should be a small area for workshops.Considers a new road running from Allarburn Drive north through H1 should be provided to allow access to shinty pitch area and Balgate Drive	Allocation of area for small workshopsInclusion of new path network as cross-settlement developer requirement



ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Kiltarlity	Mr Hamish D Maclennan(01080)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/007	Kiltarlity General	Considers area to east of C1 should be allocated for housing .	Allocate area to east of C1 for housing
Kiltarlity	Mr Hamish D Maclennan(01080)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/008	Kiltarlity General	Respondent notes that church yard requires extension.	Allocate land for extension to church yard
Kiltarlity	Mr Hamish D Maclennan(01080)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/006	Kiltarlity H01	Respondent supports housing on site H1 subject to trees to all boundaries of H1 to be protected and enhanced.	Allocate site H1 for housing with developer requirements related to tree protection and enhancement and new road north from Allarburn Drive.
Kiltarlity	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/3/001	Kiltarlity H02	Supports site H2 as a housing allocation. The site already has planning permission for residential development. Respondent notes one of the cons listed against H2 is loss of further woodland and wishes to highlight that the approved development proposals do not result in the loss of any woodland and hence this con is incorrect. The proposal incorporates significant tree planting. NOTE: Rep provides info on planning permissions. Rep also assesses allocation against key development issues listed in MIR.	
Kiltarlity	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00165/1/005	Kiltarlity H03	Objects to the business use allocation as it is believed that housing is more appropriate for the following reasons:- access is poor and would suit low density housing more than commercial traffic;- land adjacent to the site is zoned for housing which would make restrict the opportunity to further expansion of the business area;- it is a "brownfield site which is better suited to siting a few houses rather than a possible large industrial unit";- housing would accommodate the existing trees in the area better than business use;- if business land is needed it would be better sited on the outer edge of the village to reduce the impact from commercial traffic.	Allocate B1 for housing in Proposed Plan
Kiltarlity	Kiltarlity Community Council(00299)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00299/4/005	Kiltarlity H03	Objects to non-preference of site H3 as they think it is sustainable.	Allocate H3 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Kiltarlity	Mr Iain Stewart(00109)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00109/1/001	Kiltarlity H04	The Council has not preferred the site for development, citing access difficulties. However the respondent owns the site and has provided a plan showing the exiting access closed off, with a new access shown on the north east boundary on to an existing access, which is felt gives a more suitable access to the public road.	Allocation of H4 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Kiltarlity	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/055	Kiltarlity H04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA if development is close to the watercourse and that all development will avoid the functional floodplain. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application if close to watercourse or includes crossings.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Kiltarlity	Mr Hamish D Maclennan(01080)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/003	Kiltarlity H04	Respondent supports housing on site H4	Allocate site H4 for housing
Kiltarlity	Kiltarlity Community Council(00299)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00299/4/006	Kiltarlity H05	Respondent supports site H5 but would like to see it used for sheltered housing.	Restrict H5 to sheltered housing in Proposed Plan.
Kiltarlity	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/056	Kiltarlity H05	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA if development is close to the watercourse and that all development will avoid the functional floodplain. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application if close to watercourse or includes crossings.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Kiltarlity	Kiltarlity Community Council(00299)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00299/4/007	Kiltarlity H07	Assume respondent supports allocation of land for housing.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Kiltarlity	Alan Roxburgh(00501)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00501/4/001	Kiltarlity H07	The respondent disagrees with the Council's stated preference for development on this site. If more housing development is required in the settlement in addition to the other preferred sites and the consented sites, the part of Site H8 alongside the village spine road (a site non-preferred by the Council) would be better to accommodate it. The reasons given are:- Development of Site H7 would have an adverse effect on the respondent's property, the Old Manse, which is a Category B listed building, and on the sightline between it and the church at Tomnacross to which it once belonged;- Development of Site H7 would be generally detrimental to the appearance of the village (through the creation of a dense housing block) and to the outlook of neighbouring houses, including those expected to be built on the neighbouring Site H6;- Development of Site H7 would impose a further burden on the narrow lane leading to Tomnacross, additional to the traffic from Site H6;- The Council's statement of disadvantages of Site H8 is questioned, in terms of whether archaeological interest presents a significant obstacle to development, whether incursion into open fields need necessarily be unacceptable if development is limited to just part of the site and whether a precedent is necessarily set if the Council has good grounds to limit further expansion.Limited and carefully planned development of part of Site H8 would be substantially less deleterious overall than development of Site H7. The Council should reconsider its stated preference for Site H7.	Non allocation of H7 in Proposed Plan
Kiltarlity	Alan Roxburgh(00501)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00501/4/002	Kiltarlity H08	The Council's statement of disadvantages of Site H8 is questioned, in terms of whether archaeological interest presents a significant obstacle to development, whether incursion into open fields need necessarily be unacceptable if development is limited to just part of the site and whether a precedent is necessarily set if the Council has good grounds to limit further expansion.If more housing development is required in the settlement in addition to the preferred sites (except Site H7) and the consented sites, the part of Site H8 alongside the village spine road would be better to accommodate it than would Site H7.	
Kiltarlity	Mr Hamish D Maclennan(01080)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/004	Kiltarlity H08	H8 should not be developed as to leave open the views to the Church and School. Respondent considers Allarburn Drive to the north has poor parking and questions how much traffic the road can take. Respondent considers junction to school would require improvement.	
Kiltarlity	Mr And Mrs G Fraser(01316)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01316/1/001	Kiltarlity H08	The respondent objects to the non preferred status of this site and submits a revised site for mixed use development of just over 3 hectares, and for the following reasons supports its suitability as such: - the site is flat and developable land, has good access to village spine road (although some widening may be necessary to this and some side roads, alongside better footpath provision), and it lies close village facilities (whose marginal nature could be enhanced)- it will have limited impact on the landscape, is south facing and trees provide some shelter and is considered to be a natural extension to the village rounding off preferred MU1, H6 and H7- it will not negatively impact on cultural or built heritage (with the new boundary excluding land to the east where this archaeological interest lies)- it is not prime farmland, is only used for grazing, and is of a similar quality to other MIR preferred sites- it is well positioned for public transport, within walking distance of the primary school (which has significant spare capacity), and as part of developer contributions a footpath to the school could be provided- whilst there is a secondary school capacity issue this needs to be reviewed by the Council and should not be used to hold back future development- there are no contamination issues and water and waste connections should be straightforward although sewerage capacity will need to be increased- it is not within SEPA flood map areas at risk of flooding- if developed there would be a high quality designed landscaped, and planted boundary to the east which could provide an attractive gateway and preclude against future development further east- as a mixed use site it could help provide opportunity for businesses.	Allocation of H8 reduced in size for mixed use
Kiltarlity	Mr Hamish D Maclennan(01080)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01080/1/005	Kiltarlity MU01	Respondent considers a bus layby is required on site MU1	Developer requirement to provide bus layby on site MU1.
Kiltarlity	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00165/1/005	Kiltarlity B01	Objects to the business use allocation as it is believed that housing is more appropriate for the following reasons:- access is poor and would suit low density housing more than commercial traffic;- land adjacent to the site is zoned for housing which would make restrict the opportunity to further expansion of the business area;- it is a "brownfield site which is better suited to siting a few houses rather than a possible large industrial unit";- housing would accommodate the existing trees in the area better than business use;- if business land is needed it would be better sited on the outer edge of the village to reduce the impact from commercial traffic.	Allocate B1 for housing in Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/033	Kirkhill General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Kirkhill	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/034	Kirkhill General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0665/1/001	Kirkhill General	The village boundary currently shown runs directly through the middle of the respondents property at East Lodge Achngairn. This property occupies all of the land between the B9164, Achngairn Farm, Achngairn estate access and stops approximately 20m short of the spur access road to the Achngairn housing development (unfinished - Zone H6). The respondent considers that the village boundary should be amended to include the whole of their property.	Extend SDA to include East Lodge, Achngairn.
Kirkhill	Mr Paul Whitefoot(00973)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0973/1/001	Kirkhill General	Respondent seeks allocation of field adjoining old school canteen as public open space . Respodent considers this to have amenity value as an informal playing pitch and is also used by charitable fetes.	Allocation of field adjoining old school canteen as public open space in Proposed Plan .
Kirkhill	Colin MacMillan And Sons(01307)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01307/1/001	Kirkhill General	NEW SITE - Respondent wishes to suggest the former Clunes House site to be within the settlement boundary and allocated for housing because it:- was once an integral part of the Kirkhill community- is fully serviced except for the existing farm track access which would need upgrading- has been an eye sore for many years and it currently overgrown and its development would be a visual and practical improvement- has the potential to provide 3/4 houses or houses and holiday chalets.	Allocation of former Clunes House site for housing in Proposed Plan Respondent wishes to suggest the former Clunes House site to be within the settlement boundary and allocated for housing
Kirkhill	Reynolds Architecture Ltd(00165)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0165/1/004	Kirkhill H01	Objects to the non-preferred status for the following reasons:- Considerable demand for houses in the area due to the proximity to Inverness;- The site is close enough to the village to support local amenities;- The development will not be high density but rather the plots will be large enough (6 plots over 14 acres) to provide space for a paddock (for horse ownership), support sustainable properties (energy and fresh food) and allow retention of existing good tree specimens. The large plots will also allow for drainage from the houses to be fully contained within the site;- Although not in the village boundary it is adjacent to the houses lining the road into Kirkhill;- Potential for road improvements, including safer accss to the village (approx 200m) and traffic calming measures;	Allocation of H1 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/012	Kirkhill H01	Support the Councils non-preferred status on this site.	
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0665/1/002	Kirkhill H01	The respondent supports the Council's non preference of H1 & H2. The respondent considers that these sites should be removed from the plan on the following basis: - the site is prime pastureland and forms part of the character of the hilltop prominent in approach to the village - the site has clay soil and offers no convenient watercourses for overflow meaning SUDS drainage will be unsuccessful and could cause flooding - the site requires pumping of wastewater to reach the sewerage system which is not sustainable particularly when there are alternatives - the site is used as a valued amenity area by dog walkers, horse riders and strollers - the land is traversed by a high voltage pylons making it unattractive,- that significant development on this side of the village would leave the village unbalanced.	
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0665/1/008	Kirkhill H01	The respondent considers that a small area of H1 at the eastern end and the smiddy site could be zoned for business use in the hope that this could provide a business premises as a source of employment. The site should be large enough to allow access away from the road junction with the B9164.	Allocation of part of H1for business use
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/013	Kirkhill H02	Support the Councils non-preferred status on this site.	
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0665/1/002	Kirkhill H02	The respondent supports the Council's non preference of H1 & H2. The respondent considers that these sites should be removed from the plan on the following basis: - the site is prime pastureland and forms part of the character of the hilltop prominent in approach to the village - the site has clay soil and offers no convenient watercourses for overflow meaning SUDS drainage will be unsuccessful and could cause flooding - the site requires pumping of wastewater to reach the sewerage system which is not sustainable particularly when there are alternatives - the site is used as a valued amenity area by dog walkers, horse riders and strollers - the land is traversed by a high voltage pylons making it unattractive,- that significant development on this side of the village would leave the village unbalanced.	
Kirkhill	Lovat Estates(01253)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01253/1/001	Kirkhill H02	Disputes non-preferral of site because it is: a logical termination of the village; at the side of a principal road; easily serviced; capable of being masterplanned in such a way that respects its gateway nature and incorporates appropriate landscaping and open space; large enough to allow a set back from the overhead lines; within easy walking distance of village facilities, and; in a location that would allow a balanced, concentric expansion of the village.	Allocation of H2 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/014	Kirkhill H03	Object to inclusion of this site, liable to flood risk.	Non allocation of H3 in the Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/015	Kirkhill H04	Object to inclusion of this site, liable to flood risk.	Non allocation of H4 in Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Mr Erik Lundberg(01189)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01189/1/001	Kirkhill H04	Respondent objects to the allocation of this land for housing for the following reasons- loss of croft land and prime farmland- history of flooding at south east end of this field- the access as Wardlaw Road junction does not have the capacity and the proposal to close off Wardlaw road (which includes the access to graveyard) for vehicles and make a new connection with Mansfield park is not supported due to traffic impact on this estate.- a new access from Mansfield park would involve removal of several substantial trees within the grounds of Lantern cottage and on field boundary to Wardlaw road- there is a flooding/road drainage issue on Wardlaw road and although the Roads Department is developing a technical solution a way forward and timescale has not been agreed. There should be no further development here until this is resolved.- considers that there are other easier sites to develop in Kirkhill some already with planning permission and that the availability of H6,7,8,10, the site of the former steading at Fingask Farm, and MU1 offers sufficient opportunity for housing development without requiring H4.	Non allocation of H4 in Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Mr Archie Prentice(01212)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01212/1/003	Kirkhill H04	Objects to the Council's preference for H4 to be allocated for housing for the following reasons:-Parts of site are prone to flooding;-Parts of access road are prone to flooding, during such times children have to take alternative routes to school, which are often also flooded;-Road access is unsuitable as it is single track with several blind spots;-Taking an alternative access from Mansfield Park would result in road safety issues, removal of substantial trees and parts of this road are already subject to flooding; and- There are a sufficient number of housing sites with planning permission and allocated in Kirkhill, many of which are either unsold, unfinished or yet to begin, to provide more than enough provision of housing land for the life of the next Local Plan.	Non-allocation of H4 in the Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Mr Robin Gardner(01214)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01214/1/001	Kirkhill H04	Objects to the Council's preference for H4 to be allocated for housing for the following reasons:-Parts of site are prone to flooding;-Parts of access road are prone to flooding, during such times children have to take alternative routes to school, which are often also flooded;-Road access is unsuitable as it is single track with several blind spots;-Taking an alternative access from Mansfield Park would result in road safety issues, removal of substantial trees and parts of this road are already subject to flooding; and- There are a sufficient number of housing sites with planning permission and allocated in Kirkhill, many of which are either unsold, unfinished or yet to begin, to provide more than enough provision of housing land for the life of the next Local Plan.	Non-allocation of H4 in the Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Mr And Mrs Hamilton(01269)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01269/1/001	Kirkhill H04	The respondent objects to the Council's preference of this site for housing development for the following reasons- the local road network pedestrian footways are not suitable- there is insufficient shops/facilities in the village - there is insufficient demand for houses in this location	Non allocation of H4 in the Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/037	Kirkhill H05	Supports non preference of site because of long established natural heritage woodland interest.	
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/016	Kirkhill H05	Support the Councils non-preferred status of this site, feel it is too distant from the village.	
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0665/1/003	Kirkhill H05	The Respondent considers that H5 should be subject to tight control for development but that if this is not possible it should not be shown in the Proposed Plan. The respondent considers there to be some sense in continuing a ribbon development along the south side of the B9164 linking Kirkhill with the ribbon development starting at West Lodge. The Respondent considers that the estate beech hedge, mature trees and peripheral strips of immature trees would have to be maintained to preserve the wooded character of the former Achnagairn estate, and the use for walkers, horse riders etc should be maintained. It is also reflected that the site has a Tree Protection Order and that the number of houses should be limited and well spaced to maintain the wooded character of the site.	The Respondent considers that H5 should be subject to tight control for development but that if this is not possible it should not be shown in the Proposed Plan.
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/017	Kirkhill H06	Support Council preferred status of these sites, some already benefit from partial planning permission.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00665/1/004	Kirkhill H06	The respondent considers that H6 should be designated as a special priority site for development for the following reasons:- unfinished properties have become a magnet for intruders;- unfinished properties are deteriorating with sections of roofing material becoming detached and flapping about;- unclear whether the unfinished electrics accessible about the site are safe;- untended site has become extremely untidy and is becoming a blight on the village;- large, dead trees untended along the new access road will become dangerous if left;- Japanese knotweed has appeared along the new access road which needs immediate attention before it spreads; and- developers have already informed the administrators that the unfinished buildings cannot be adopted for completion and sale as there are insufficient construction records to obtain the appropriate House Builders insurances.	Designated H6 as priority site for development.
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00302/1/017	Kirkhill H07	Support Council preferred status of these sites, some already benefit from partial planning permission.	
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00665/1/005	Kirkhill H07	The respondent considers that this site should be extended to take in Achnagairn Farm which is derelict and becoming a ruin.	Extend H7 to include Achnagairn Farm
Kirkhill	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/035	Kirkhill H08	Reports that development of site may have an adverse effect on Inner Moray Firth SPA integrity and therefore should be part of HRA because of connectivity.	Adequate developer requirement mitigation text if HRA reveals any connectivity issue.
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00302/1/017	Kirkhill H08	Support Council preferred status of these sites, some already benefit from partial planning permission.	
Kirkhill	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/036	Kirkhill H09	Requests bat survey and if necessary mitigation as a developer requirement of the site.	Bat survey and if necessary mitigation developer requirement.
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00302/1/017	Kirkhill H09	Support Council preferred status of these sites, some already benefit from partial planning permission.	
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00302/1/017	Kirkhill H10	Support Council preferred status of these sites, some already benefit from partial planning permission.	
Kirkhill	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/035	Kirkhill MU01	Reports that development of site may have an adverse effect on Inner Moray Firth SPA integrity and therefore should be part of HRA because of connectivity.	Adequate developer requirement mitigation text if HRA reveals any connectivity issue.
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00302/1/018	Kirkhill MU01	Object to the preferred status of this site, lies outwith the village area for the provision of retail and community use, also access could prove difficult. Also would incur loss of good farming land.	Non allocation of MU1 in Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Mr Ian Weir(00612)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00612/1/001	Kirkhill MU01	It is noted from the MIR that road access constraints are noted as a possible concern for Site MU1. The respondent (the site owner) confirms however that:- The principal site access is noted via Newton Park and the site owner has ownership of all land required to extend the existing 5.5m wide road (with footpaths both sides) into the site;- A secondary access is available via the site currently under development by Tulloch Homes Ltd and again the site owner has access rights to accommodate this.A Concept Masterplan Drawing is provided to illustrate these points.It is further pointed out that Site MU1 can easily access the foul sewer which runs to the North and has adequate capacity in the treatment plant. Treatment of surface water is also easily accommodated as all land to the North of the site is in the same ownership.	
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00665/1/007	Kirkhill MU01	The respondent considers the site to be well located but is concerned that the site will draw an unacceptable additional level of traffic along St Mary's Rd and past the primary school with specific concern about the capacity of the St. Marys Rd/B9164/Wardlaw Rd junction. The respondent considers that access should be by Newton Park or if this is not practicable and new access is required it should be taken directly from the B9164.	Stipulation access must be taken from Newton Park
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00302/1/019	Kirkhill B01	Support the potential for development for business use on this site.	
Kirkhill	Alistair And Hayley Muir(00665)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00665/1/006	Kirkhill B01	The respondent considers that this site should be predicated on the inclusion of a village shop because it is considered to be the ideal central location for the rest of the village and easily accesible by traffic from the main 89164 thoroughfare, and because there are no other properly suitable sites.	Allocate B1 for mixed use including convenience retail
Kirkhill	3A Partnership Ltd(01034)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01034/1/001	Kirkhill B01	Requests change in use to housing and mixed uses because: the outcome of the LDP workshop was to support retail and housing uses; it is surrounded by existing housing; a direct village spine road access is available; the cost of decontamination and lack of business and industrial demand makes housing the most feasible use; housing and retail would be more compatible with the amenity of houses adjacent; Plan shouldn't be too prescriptive and allow market opportunities such as homeworking and a village shop to be explored, and; environmental renewal will only occur with feasible development package.	Allocation of B1 for housing and mixed use in Proposed Plan
Kirkhill	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/036	Kirkhill B02	Requests bat survey and if necessary mitigation as a developer requirement of the site.	Bat survey and if necessary mitigation developer requirement.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Kirkhill	Kirkhill & Bunchrew Community Council(00302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0302/1/019	Kirkhill B02	Support the potential for development for business use on this site.	
Tomatin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/039	Tomatin General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/017	Tomatin General	SEPA note the settlement boundary takes in a large area of forestry with no allocations proposed within this area. Given the current waste water drainage constraints within Tomatin we request that this area and the adjacent moorland are excluded from the settlement boundary.	Contraction of settlement boundary to exclude forestry/woodland area.
Tomatin	Susan Watt(00644)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0644/1/001	Tomatin General	All sites within Tomatin will require red squirrel and bat surveys to be undertaken.	
Tomatin	Susan Watt(00644)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0644/1/004	Tomatin General	The area of land between the school and the bonded warehouses should be set aside as open space as it is valuable for biodiversity, containing heath, juniper Scots Pine etc.	
Tomatin	Susan Watt(00644)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0644/1/005	Tomatin General	Any loss of Scots Pine should be fully compensated.	
Tomatin	Mrs Pam Hardwick(00653)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0653/1/003	Tomatin General	The respondent is hopeful that the LDP can help secure affordable housing and new amenities, and also improve local employment prospects.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0908/1/005	Tomatin General	Strathdearn Community Council support SDA and protected green space of Distillaery Wood, north and south ends of village protected. With A9(T) transport links duelled by 2025, this will make Strathdearn just 15 minutes away by car and an appropriate increase in Strathdearn could provide benefits in sustaining local services.	
Tomatin	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0957/1/009	Tomatin General	An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with TS. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/1255/1/001	Tomatin General	Asserts that developer contributions should be reasonable and past the tests outlined in Circular 1/2010. Also believes that contributions should be set at a level that doesn't inhibit development or where wider community benefits would result from a development. Requests that Plan should be used to apply pressure on Scottish Water and SEPA to provide improved sewerage capacity within the wider village. Requests more details on timing, management, amount of and boundaries to be used in determination of developer contributions. Estate will cooperate with local community and Council if requirements reasonable and realistic.	
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0523/1/057	Tomatin H01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Also reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0908/1/009	Tomatin H01	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/038	Tomatin H02	Concerns that development of site would result in loss of semi natural woodland contrary to policy and should only be allowed if there are over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, tree loss in minimised, prior species surveys are undertaken and a high standard of compensatory planting is secured. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.	Non-retention of site or adequate mitigation. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.
Tomatin	Susan Watt(00644)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0644/1/003	Tomatin H02	We have progressively been losing areas of Scots Pine over the last 10 years in Tomatin. Site H2 is already being felled but there may be areas of Scots Pine in H6 and H7 that require to be surveyed for bats, crossbill and red squirrels prior to any development.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0908/1/009	Tomatin H02	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Mrs Molly Noble(01096)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/1096/1/001	Tomatin H02	Objects to H2 being used for housing. Access is only by tracks and would mean disruption to existing houses and water and sewage facilities are already stretched.	
Tomatin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0204/1/040	Tomatin H03	Supports non prefferal of site because of long established natural heritage woodland interest.	
Tomatin	Mr George Macleod(00620)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/0620/1/001	Tomatin H03	Object to the non-preferred status of this site within the Main Issues Report. This site has previously been recommended for approval but refused at committee. The reasons given within the MIR as "Significant Cons" to the inclusion of the site relate to difficulty in forming an access and also to the loss of woodland, neither of which are correct. As part of the consideration of the aforementioned application an agreed access solution was agreed with TECS; also the development area lies on open ground along with the remains of the old water reservoir/associated ex-water filtration buildings. I attach a copy of the committee report that recommeneded approval of a development proposals on this site and also supporting information regarding amenity issues and the development proposal in general.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tomatin	Mr And Mrs Alexander And Margaret Sutherland(00669)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00669/1/001	Tomatin H03	Concerned about any future development accessed by the track road lying to the south of the garden boundary of Tannay as there has already been damage done to the respondent's boundary fence by vehicles accessing the forest. The track has also been inaccessible on occasions due to heavy snowfall. The respondent feels that unless the track is widened and upgraded it will cause a problem to traffic and pedestrians due to the existing blind bend.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/006	Tomatin H03	Strathdearn Community Council supports the Councils non preference of this site, because this is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Mrs Molly Noble(01096)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01096/1/002	Tomatin H03	Supports non-preference of site H3 for housing. Access is only by tracks and would mean disruption to existing houses and water and sewage facilities are already stretched.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/007	Tomatin H04	Strathdearn Community Council object 'behind green church too steep'	
Tomatin	Mrs Molly Noble(01096)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01096/1/003	Tomatin H04	Objects to site H4. Church would be unusable during building and would end up being surrounded by housing.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/002	Tomatin H04	Supports housing use. Queries green notation on site. Accepts that road access connection is steep but believes it feasible. Landscape and rail line proximity concerns can be overcome by careful layout and planting.	
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/058	Tomatin H05	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state public sewer connection still required.	Inclusion of reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin H05	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/003	Tomatin H05	Supports allocation for housing as it will consolidate the centre of the village and is close to village facilities.	
Tomatin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/038	Tomatin H06	Concerns that development of site would result in loss of semi natural woodland contrary to policy and should only be allowed if there are over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, tree loss in minimised, prior species surveys are undertaken and a high standard of compensatory planting is secured. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.	Non-retention of site or adequate mitigation. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/059	Tomatin H06	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state public sewer connection still required.	Inclusion of reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Susan Watt(00644)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00644/1/003	Tomatin H06	We have progressively been losing areas of Scots Pine over the last 10 years in Tomatin. Site H2 is already being felled but there may be areas of Scots Pine in H6 and H7 that require to be surveyed for bats, crossbill and red squirrels prior to any development.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin H06	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/004	Tomatin H06	Supports site for housing because it would consolidate the central part of the village and that the woodland to be removed is only of commercial value.	
Tomatin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/038	Tomatin H07	Concerns that development of site would result in loss of semi natural woodland contrary to policy and should only be allowed if there are over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, tree loss in minimised, prior species surveys are undertaken and a high standard of compensatory planting is secured. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.	Non-retention of site or adequate mitigation. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/060	Tomatin H07	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state public sewer connection still required.	Inclusion of reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Susan Watt(00644)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00644/1/003	Tomatin H07	We have progressively been losing areas of Scots Pine over the last 10 years in Tomatin. Site H2 is already being felled but there may be areas of Scots Pine in H6 and H7 that require to be surveyed for bats, crossbill and red squirrels prior to any development.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/008	Tomatin H07	Strathdearn Community Council object to this being allocated for housing "as it is already mixed use MU3"	
Tomatin	Mrs Molly Noble(01096)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01096/1/004	Tomatin H07	Supports non-preference of H7. It is full of bogs and heavily wooded. Development here would change the whole aspect of Tomatin and turn it into an offshoot of Inverness. There are already no facilities for any more houses.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/005	Tomatin H07	Supports housing use for site because feasibility work has been undertaken, the site is allocated for housing in the adopted local plan, there are other business sites available in the village, an alternative site has been identified for playing field use, and the woodland to be removed is only a commercial plantation.	Retention of site for housing use only.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/061	Tomatin H08	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA if development is close to the watercourse and that all development will avoid the functional floodplain. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application if close to watercourse or includes crossings. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Also reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/010	Tomatin H08	Strathdearn Community Council do not support this site because of the wet woodland between Station Road and Free Burn. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Mrs Molly Noble(01096)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01096/1/005	Tomatin H08	Objects to H8. It is full of bogs and heavily wooded. Development here would change the whole aspect of Tomatin and turn it into an offshoot of Inverness. There are already no facilities for any more houses.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/006	Tomatin H08	Does not support allocation of site at present although it may be suitable for housing use in the longer term.	Non-retention of site within Proposed Plan.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin MU01	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin MU02	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/010	Tomatin MU02	Supports site for mixed use because a feasibility for an affordable housing development on part of it is at an advanced stage and the balance could be used for other uses.	
Tomatin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/038	Tomatin MU03	Concerns that development of site would result in loss of semi natural woodland contrary to policy and should only be allowed if there are over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, tree loss in minimised, prior species surveys are undertaken and a high standard of compensatory planting is secured. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.	Non-retention of site or adequate mitigation. Additional mitigation should be offered in terms of woodland management and recreational access.
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/062	Tomatin MU03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application. Public sewer connection still required.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin MU03	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/005	Tomatin MU03	Supports housing use for site because feasibility work has been undertaken, the site is allocated for housing in the adopted local plan, there are other business sites available in the village, an alternative site has been identified for playing field use, and the woodland to be removed is only a commercial plantation.	Retention of site for housing use only.
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/063	Tomatin MU04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Also reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin MU04	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/021	Tomatin B01	Site B1 should be reserved for a rail halt, even if this is a longer term ambition rather than a short term probability.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin B01	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	



ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tomatin	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/010	Tomatin B01	TS has overall responsibility for the rail network on behalf of the Scottish Ministers. The SPP position on the provision of any new rail infrastructure is to maximise the use of the existing services and existing stations before considering any possible need for new infrastructure. In considering these options, it is necessary to take into account a number of factors, including the need for a positive business case; engineering and operational feasibility issues; whether a high level of demand is deliverable in terms of timetabling; the terminal station capacity and also the overall track capacity. These issues must be balanced against taking account of value for money and other Scottish Government strategic priorities. Where new railway station options are to be considered as part of a transport appraisal, these factors should be fully explored in that appraisal work. The operation of an additional station on the rail network would also require a change to the ScotRail Franchise Agreement. The Franchise operator would require to take a commercial view on the extent to which additional stops would adversely impact on the journey times for other users and therefore impact on the commercial operations of the service. This decision would be undertaken in the framework provided by the Scottish Governments' policies and the commercial operation of the ScotRail Franchise Agreement. Site B1 is identified as a location for a potential rail halt. Until appropriate transport appraisal work has been undertaken for the Tomatin area, which identifies a railway station as a preferred option and where a positive business case is produced then TS will not be in position to support this proposal. On this basis, the station should not be shown in the Proposed Plan.	
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/064	Tomatin B02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Also reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin B02	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/065	Tomatin B03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Also reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin B03	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/009	Tomatin B03	Supports business use of site.	
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/066	Tomatin B04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Also reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Mrs Pam Hardwick(00653)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00653/1/002	Tomatin B04	Supports this site for commercial use as it will benefit the local economy.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin B04	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/067	Tomatin C01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Also reference to requirement for public sewer connection.
Tomatin	Susan Watt(00644)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00644/1/002	Tomatin C01	This area could be important for archaeology and biodiversity.	
Tomatin	Mrs Pam Hardwick(00653)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00653/1/001	Tomatin C01	Supports C1 for a designated sports field.	
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin C01	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/007	Tomatin C01	Supports the principle of the community pursuing a playing field proposal on this land provided this negates the adopted plan requirement for such provision on site H7. Requests further discussion on the detail of this arrangement.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tomatin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/068	Tomatin I01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in the Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by an FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the area available or development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tomatin	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/009	Tomatin I01	Strathdearn Community Council supports this allocation. This is the community choice.	
Tomatin	Tomatin Estate(01255)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01255/1/008	Tomatin I01	Supports new waste water treatment plant to serve north end of village but feels a site closer to River Findhorn may be more suitable. Suggests further discussion.	
Inverness Airport	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00266/2/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of T1 and T2 at Inverness Airport due to:- it being an inappropriate use next to a key gateway into the area- the impact of noise on the travelling people from the airport- consultation being required with the travelling community to determine mutually acceptable sites - alternative sites may include at the community woodland at Whiteness access road and Black Castle Quarry.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2 at Inverness Airport.
Inverness Airport	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/018	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	SEPA note that MU1 is included within the settlement boundary but that B1 is excluded. Given the large infrastructure requirements that these developments will have we would welcome clarification as to whether this difference in settlement boundary will have any policy impacts.	
Inverness Airport	Ms Emma Linn(01000)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01000/1/002	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	Respondent considers the Council has not accorded with Section 17(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 as reasonable alternatives have not been identified to the traveller temporary stop sites. The respondent considers that the main issues report is inaccurate as it states that sites T1 and T2 are identified for the same use in a previous local plan or Highland-wide Local Development Plan, which was not the case.	Inclusion of reasonable alternatives to be identified to Traveller sites T1 and T2 and clarification that T1 and T2 were not previously identified for temporary stop sites in a previous Local Plan or LDP.
Inverness Airport	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/011	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	If Inverness airport is expected to develop into a major international hub then housing nearby should not be considered.	Non-allocation of mixed use allocation at Tornagrain in Proposed Plan.
Inverness Airport	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/062	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport B01	Requests developer requirements / safeguards in terms of woodland safeguard for 40 ha area of long established plantation origin woodland within boundary. Also survey / mitigation requirements for badgers, red squirrels and reptiles.	Seeks inclusion of developer requirements / safeguards in terms of woodland safeguard for 40 ha area of long established plantation origin woodland within boundary. Also survey / mitigation requirements for badgers, red squirrels and reptiles.
Inverness Airport	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/148	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport B01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that each phase should be supported by a FRA and developed in accordance with any FRA recommendations. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of each phase's planning application. A tributary of Ardersier Burn runs through the site. The water body is designated as a heavily modified waterbody and is currently at moderate ecological potential. The whole of the watercourse is highly impacted by morphological pressure including a long culvert under the airport and high impact realignment elsewhere. Development of this site will severely limit future opportunities for restoration which may include diverting the watercourse near the A96 so that it can follow its original course westwards. There is the possibility of significant improvement to this burn either as a large scale realignment or as restoration of the high impact realignment section running through the site. The options should be thoroughly considered during the planning of any development on the site. This is likely to include consultation with neighbouring stakeholders including the airport.	
Inverness Airport	Scottish Prison Service(00662)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00662/1/005	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport B01	Considering site at B1 for prison, landowner is lukewarm, however Scottish Prison Service does not consider this site a preferred location.	Inclusion of potential for site as new prison location.
Inverness Airport	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/010	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport B01	Supports B1 for business and industry but concerns about uses as the respondent believes that hotels and offices would not be suitable.	
Inverness Airport	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/005	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport B01	Considers a better site could be found at Tornagrain side of wood (B1), as this site would be much more pleasant for travellers.	Inclusion of allocation of travellers site at B1 rather than T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00266/2/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of T1 and T2 at Inverness Airport due to:- it being an inappropriate use next to a key gateway into the area- the impact of noise on the travelling people from the airport- consultation being required with the travelling community to determine mutually acceptable sites - alternative sites may include at the community woodland at Whiteness access road and Black Castle Quarry.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2 at Inverness Airport.
Inverness Airport	Helen Ross(00621)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00621/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Objects to travellers site at T1 T2 due to close proximity to the airport (a gateway to Inverness) and concerns about security, waste and general hygiene associated with proposed land use.	Non-allocation of T1 T2 allocation

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness Airport	Rosalyn Grant(00626)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00626/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Object to sites T1 and T2. Residents of nearby Ardersier and businesses would need to increase their security. Having travellers sites beside Inverness Airport would put tourists off the area due to all the rubbish that would be left.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Alistair Bennie(00627)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00627/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Objects to sites T1 and T2 as it would not be good to visitors to see when arriving at the airport and people living locally would need to increase the security on their houses.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Francis Way(00628)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00628/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Objects to site T1 and T2 as everything becomes unsafe when travellers are in the area. It could also create a health risk as travellers generally leave rubbish behind when they leave.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Mr Kevin Kinsella(00664)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00664/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Respondent has had previous experience of sites T1 and T2 being used illegally by travellers. Therefore objects to sites T1 and T2 for the following reasons:- Children running around beside operating industrial machinery is dangerous.- Illegal bonfires.- Fly tipping and general mess.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Jill And Callum Clark(00668)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00668/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Object to both potential traveller sites because: believe they have never be used by travellers; adverse impact on local businesses and airport; adverse impact on tourist route; additional uncontrolled refuse generated; adverse human health impact; cost of increased security requirements; more sites will just generate more demand; overflying of site; adverse visual impact for air travellers and consequent loss in trade; poor access along Mains of Connage farm road; sitting tenant on one of sites; existing site at Longman should be used instead.	Non-retention of site options T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/011	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Supports non-preferred status as there were issues when it was a non-offical site and creating an official would likely impact on tenants of industrial estate and airport users.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Ms Emma Linn(01000)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01000/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Respondent recognises the need for temporary stop sites but consider sites T1 and T2 inappropriate locations as they:are contrary to the provisions of the noise sensitive area as identified in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework and the expansion of the airport, airport runway and airport busines park as identified in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework and Higland-wide Local Development Plan;there is a risk of debris from the sites interfering with aircraft movements to and from the airport including operational safety;allocation of these sites would lead to a loss of industrial, employment generating land.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2 .
Inverness Airport	Ismail And Denise Vince Koprulu(01051)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01051/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Objects to sites T1 and T2 for the following reasons:- Tourism is important and a travellers site immediately visible on arrival to Inverness Airport would not create the appropriate "ambassadorial impression".- Concerned about close proximity to small manufacturing businesses at Dalcross who would need to increase security and may encourage them to relocate thereby decreasing local employment opportunities.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/005	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Considers a better site could be found at Tornagrain side of wood (B1), as this site would be much more pleasant for travellers.	Inclusion of allocation of travellers site at B1 rather than T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Ms Anne Maree(01223)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01223/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Highland Joinery and Glazing contractors who rent their main workshop from the Highland Council on the Industrial Estate object to these sites being identified for a Travellers site for the following reasons- there were social/police issues which negatively effected the running of their business including the stealing of fuel- the current economic climate makes it difficult to cope with this effect- they consider that the travellers should have to pay rent - they will need to reconsider their future in the estate due to extra funding needed to cover 24 hour security	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	PDG Helicopters(01266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01266/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	Respondent acknowledges the requirement on the Council to identify land to meet the needs of gypsies/travellers.To the knowledge of the respondent, Site T1 has never been used by travellers Within the context of the policy in the HwLDP the respondent does not consider that a specific need has been identified for Gypsy/Traveller provision through the HNDA or Highland Housing Strategy, therefore respondent considers the need does not exist.Respondent acknowledges that the sites T1 and T2 offers reasonable access to services and the main road network and could be argues that given the industrial nature of the area the proposed use would not have an adverse impact on the character of appearance of the area, respondent considers that the sites would be incompatible with the existing established adjoining uses.Respondent considers that while Site T2 has previously been used by travellers this was to serious detrimental effect. A diary of events is attached to the response.Respondent considers that there may be health and safety issues with regard to the incompatibility of the land uses. Information on the operations manual with regard to safe operation is attached to the response. A map is attached to the submission showing the location of the respondents business in relation to sites T1 and T2.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2
Inverness Airport	Cllr Kate Stephen(01348)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01348/1/007	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T01	The respondent objects to the Council preference of this site as a temporary Travellers site because of its vicinity to high levels of noise.	Non-allocation of site T1.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness Airport	Ardersier And Petty Community Council(00266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00266/2/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of T1 and T2 at Inverness Airport due to:- it being an inappropriate use next to a key gateway into the area- the impact of noise on the travelling people from the airport- consultation being required with the travelling community to determine mutually acceptable sites - alternative sites may include at the community woodland at Whiteness access road and Black Castle Quarry.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2 at Inverness Airport.
Inverness Airport	Helen Ross(00621)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00621/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Objects to travellers site at T1 T2 due to close proximity to the airport (a gateway to Inverness) and concerns about security, waste and general hygiene associated with proposed land use.	Non-allocation of T1 T2 allocation
Inverness Airport	Rosalyn Grant(00626)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00626/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Object to sites T1 and T2. Residents of nearby Ardersier and businesses would need to increase their security. Having travellers sites beside Inverness Airport would put tourists off the area due to all the rubbish that would be left.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Alistair Bennie(00627)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00627/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Objects to sites T1 and T2 as it would not be good to visitors to see when arriving at the airport and people living locally would need to increase the security on their houses.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Francis Way(00628)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00628/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Objects to site T1 and T2 as everything becomes unsafe when travellers are in the area. It could also create a health risk as travellers generally leave rubbish behind when they leave.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Mr Kevin Kinsella(00664)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00664/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Respondent has had previous experience of sites T1 and T2 being used illegally by travellers. Therefore objects to sites T1 and T2 for the following reasons:- Children running around beside operating industrial machinery is dangerous.- Illegal bonfires.- Fly tipping and general mess.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Jill And Callum Clark(00668)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00668/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Object to both potential traveller sites because: believe they have never be used by travellers; adverse impact on local businesses and airport; adverse impact on tourist route; additional uncontrolled refuse generated; adverse human health impact; cost of increased security requirements; more sites will just generate more demand; overflying of site; adverse visual impact for air travellers and consequent loss in trade; poor access along Mains of Connage farm road; sitting tenant on one of sites; existing site at Longman should be used instead.	Non-retention of site options T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/011	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Supports non-preferred status as there were issues when it was a non-offical site and creating an official would likely impact on tenants of industrial estate and airport users.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Ms Emma Linn(01000)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01000/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Respondent recognises the need for temporary stop sites but consider sites T1 and T2 inappropriate locations as they:are contrary to the provisions of the noise sensitive area as identified in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework and the expansion of the airport, airport runway and airport busines park as identified in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework and Higland-wide Local Development Plan;there is a risk of debris from the sites interfering with aircraft movements to and from the airport including operational safety;allocation of these sites would lead to a loss of industrial, employment generating land.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2 .
Inverness Airport	Ismail And Denise Vince Koprulu(01051)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01051/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Objects to sites T1 and T2 for the following reasons:- Tourism is important and a travellers site immediately visible on arrival to Inverness Airport would not create the appropriate "ambassadorial impression".- Concerned about close proximity to small manufacturing businesses at Dalcross who would need to increase security and may encourage them to relocate thereby decreasing local employment opportunities.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Ms Irene Ross(01159)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01159/1/005	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Considers a better site could be found at Tornagrain side of wood (B1), as this site would be much more pleasant for travellers.	Inclusion of allocation of travellers site at B1 rather than T1 and T2.
Inverness Airport	Ms Anne Maree(01223)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01223/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Highland Joinery and Glazing contractors who rent their main workshop from the Highland Council on the Industrial Estate object to these sites being identified for a Travellers site for the following reasons- there were social/police issues which negatively effected the running of their business including the stealing of fuel- the current economic climate makes it difficult to cope with this effect- they consider that the travellers should have to pay rent - they will need to reconsider their future in the estate due to extra funding needed to cover 24 hour security	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness Airport	PDG Helicopters(01266)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01266/1/001	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	Respondent acknowledges the requirement on the Council to identify land to meet the needs of gypsies/travellers.To the knowledge of the respondent, Site T1 has never been used by travellers Within the context of the policy in the HwLDP the respondent does not consider that a specific need has been identified for Gypsy/Traveller provision through the HNDA or Highland Housing Strategy, therefore respondent considers the need does not exist.Respondent acknowledges that the sites T1 and T2 offers reasonable access to services and the main road network and could be argues that given the industrial nature of the area the proposed use would not have an adverse impact on the character of appearance of the area, respondent considers that the sites would be incompatible with the existing established adjoining uses.Respondent considers that while Site T2 has previously been used by travellers this was to serious detrimental effect. A diary of events is attached to the response.Respondent considers that there may be health and safety issues with regard to the incompatibility of the land uses. Information on the operations manual with regard to safe operation is attached to the response. A map is attached to the submission showing the location of the respondents business in relation to sites T1 and T2.	Non-allocation of sites T1 and T2
Inverness Airport	Cllr Kate Stephen(01348)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01348/1/007	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport T02	The respondent objects to the Council preference of this site as a temporary Travellers site because of its vicinity to high levels of noise.	Non-allocation of site T1.
Inverness Airport	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/001		B1 is shown in the table as being allocated in the HwLDP/Adopted Local Plan, however considers this to be incorrect as the boundaries reflect the planning permission rather than the boundaries shown in the Inverness Local Plan. Considers Council has an interest in the site giving rise to further doubt about Councils integrity by misleading readers.	Clarification on extent of Economic Development Area.
Tornagrain	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/016	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	Respondent supports development and MU1 and considers this development to be innovative and original.	
Tornagrain	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/007	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	The proposed new settlement at Tornagrain should be deleted. As noted in the Main Issues Report this is good quality farmland, which is a resource that should be preserved and we do not believe that intensifying residential uses so close to an airport is appropriate or that this development can be regarded as being in conformance to the Highland-wide Development Plan Policy 30 Physical Constraints and Policy 71 Pollution. New settlements, however well planned, divert resources from other areas as all infrastructure is required to be provided anew.	
Tornagrain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/019	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	SEPA note that MU1 is included within the settlement boundary but that B1 is excluded. Given the large infrastructure requirements that these developments will have we would welcome clarification as to whether this difference in settlement boundary will have any policy impacts.	
Tornagrain	Donald Boyd - Collective Response(01351)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01351/1/003	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport General	Westhill, Croy, Smithton, Inverness South, Balloch, and Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Councils have prepared a collective response.The collective Community Council's express major concern about this proposal for the following reasons- preference is for Tornagrain to remain as agricultural land as they are concerned about future food shortages - there is a concern about designating large greenfield sites that may result in piecemeal development- it is preferred that significant housing development should be focussed across other Highland communities where it can be accompanied by sufficient infrastructure and services	Removal of MU1 Allocation at Tornagrain
Tornagrain	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/061	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Requests same safeguards and developer requirements as set out in HwLDP. In particular wants developer requirement safeguards for; Loch Flemington SPA, Kildrummie SSSI, badgers, red squirrels, great crested newts, retention and enhancement of green networks including woodland. Wants same content in IMFLDP as in HwLDP.	Same safeguards, developer requirements and mapped content as set out in HwLDP.
Tornagrain	Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council(00273)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00273/1/005	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Would prefer Tornagrain to remain as agricultural land and development focused on Inverness.	Non allocation of development site at Tornagrain.
Tornagrain	Cawdor & West Nairnshire Community Council(00273)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00273/1/006	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Would prefer Tornagrain to remain as agricultural land and development focused on Inverness.	Non allocation of development site at Tornagrain.
Tornagrain	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/016	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Respondent supports development and MU1 and considers this development to be innovative and original.	
Tornagrain	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/011	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Lack of clarity regarding MU1. The settlement boundary is drawn around the new town but omits the existing settlement of Tornagrain. Requests that any new development should not be allowed to take the name 'Tornagrain'. Scale of development proposed is not consistent with the general policy concerning scale of new settlements in the HwLDP.	Rename Tornagrain; ensure scale of development is consistent with new settlements policy in HwLDP
Tornagrain	Alison Lowe And Michael Hutcheson(00520)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00520/1/006	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Concerned about proximity between Croy and Tornagrain, would like a much larger/wider land barrier between the two communities. Danger that successful village of Croy will be subsumed by Tornagrain and lose all identity and sense of community.	Modify MU1 to increase proximity from Croy .

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tornagrain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/147	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	SEPA will not object although text should state that each phase should be supported by a FRA and developed in accordance with any FRA recommendations. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of each phase's planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tornagrain	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/009	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Objects to MU1 due to the close proximity to the airport. Residents will be affected by noise and there will be conflict between needs of residents and the airport.	Removal of/reduction in size of allocation MU1
Tornagrain	Moray Estates(01039)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01039/1/002	Tornagrain/Inverness Airport MU01	Supports preference for MU1 to be allocated for mixed uses. Notes site is allocated in HwLDP and is subject of an application for planning permission in principle. States that Moray Estates remain fully committed to the implementation of Tornagrain. First phase is in detailed design process. Agreement has been reached with Scottish Gas Networks to relocate gas pipeline and necessary permissions are in place to cross the GPSS oil pipeline. Discussion at advanced stage with Scottish Water about the delivery of a strategic waste water solution for the centre of the A96 Corridor.	
Tornagrain	Network Rail(00438)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00438/1/002		Request requirements regarding Dalcross level crossing in the HwLDP should be replicated in the plan against MU1 in Tornagrain. Note that Network Rail are currently exploring the closure of the level crossing with the Highland Council and have an aspiration for it to be closed before Tornagrain is built out.	Inclusion of requirement for developer to discuss a long term solution to the safety issues associated with level crossing at Dalcross (as in HwLDP)
Castle Stewart	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/004	Morayhill/Castle Stuart MU01	Indicates that proposed development likely to have a significant effect on European natural heritage site. Also that site may also raise significant natural heritage issues in terms of impact on landscape character.	Inclusion of developer requirement for appropriate mitigation in Proposed Plan draft.
Castle Stewart	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/063	Morayhill/Castle Stuart MU01	SNH raise serious concerns about possible adverse impact of site's development on Inner Moray Firth SPA (either individually or collectively with other coastal sites / proposals). Important roost sites exist in Castle Stuart Bay. Believes site should only be retained if shown to be HRA compliant. Other survey / mitigation requirements in terms of badgers, great crested newts, reptiles, and landscape character impact.	Deletion of site unless shown to be HRA compliant. Survey / mitigation requirements in terms of badgers, great crested newts, reptiles, and landscape character impact. Possible reduction in scale of proposal.
Castle Stewart	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/023	Morayhill/Castle Stuart MU01	No allocation should be made as this would in all probability increase the need to travel for living, work, and leisure. Development directly related to the golf course should be made in the context of other policies regarding the development of the economy and protection of the environment.	Non-allocation of site within Proposed Plan.
Castle Stewart	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/012	Morayhill/Castle Stuart MU01	Concerned about loss of what may be Class 2 farm land at this site.	
Castle Stewart	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/149	Morayhill/Castle Stuart MU01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state FRA required to support any development and outcome may adversely affect the developable area or development options on the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Morayhill	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/030	Morayhill/Castle Stuart MU01	The western section of this allocation contains the scheduled monument Newton of Petty, settlement 350m WNW of (Index no. 11835). Historic Scotland (HS) Seek inclusion of developer requirement tfor the involvement of Historic Scotland in consideration of the scheduled monument Newton of Petty.	Inclusion of developer requirement tfor the involvement of Historic Scotland in consideration of the scheduled monument Newton of Petty.
Castle Stewart	Moray Estates(01039)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01039/1/004	Morayhill/Castle Stuart MU01	It is intended that MU1 will provide additional ownership holiday/fractional ownership accommodation potential and enable adjustments to the boundary of the second course at Castle Stuart Golf Links to provide additional parking and other facilities. Proposal will contribute to potential of establishing a prestigious leisure development for the region. The allocation area is of marginal agricultural quality; offers opportunity for improvements to biodiversity and environmental quality; traffic movements will be much lower than similar scale of private housing. Improvements to local road network to mitigate transport impact can be undertaken where necessary and progress has been made for a strategic solution foul drainage to serve the golf course, Inverness Airport, Inverness Airport Business Park and Tornagrain.	
Morayhill	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/022	Morayhill/Castle Stuart I01	No allocation should be made as this would in all probability increase the need to travel for living, work, and leisure.	
Morayhill	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/150	Morayhill/Castle Stuart I01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required. With regard to sewerage, should connect into existing drainage system provided capacity available.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. Connection to existing drainage if capacity exists.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
<b>Morayhill</b>	Moray Estates(01039)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01039/1/003	Morayhill/Castle Stuart I01	Supports preference for I1 to be allocated for industrial use for the following reasons:-Additional traffic could be accommodated via existing Norbord Junction;-Potential for site to be served by new strategic foul drainage solution for wider A96 Corridor, though equally could be served by an onsite solution;- Potential contamination risk considered low given sites current use as a sand and gravel pit and therefore capable of remediation; and -Offers excellent opportunity for the sustainable expansion of an existing commercial use or the development of new potential opportunities in the industrial or renewables sphere.	
<b>Whiteness</b>	Mr Tony Kell(01025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01025/1/004	Whiteness General	Considers alternative traveller's site could be at the former Ardersier rig construction yard.	Non-allocation of T3 and allocation of travellers site at former Ardersier rig construction yard.
<b>Whiteness</b>	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/065	Whiteness MU01	Supports non-preferred of site because of individual and cumulative impacts on SPA and SAC.	Non-retention of site option.
<b>Whiteness</b>	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/013	Whiteness MU01	Concerned about significant loss of woodland	
<b>Whiteness</b>	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/151	Whiteness MU01	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or the allocation is removed from Plan. Removal of site unless the allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
<b>Whiteness</b>	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/005	Whiteness MU01	RSPB consider that all mixed use and industrial sites within Whiteness have the potential to impact on the Inner Moray Firth SPA and should be assessed as outlined in SPP1 and SOEnD Circular 6/1995 (amended June 2000).	Consideration of impact on Moray Firth SPA
<b>Whiteness</b>	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/064	Whiteness I02	Requests same environmental safeguard content as HwLDP. Suggests additional HRA check on in-combination effects with other projects such as Nigg. Surveys and mitigation should concentrate on effects on birds, seals, dolphins, other cetaceans, sandbanks, otters, porpoise, reptiles and rare lichens.	Same environmental safeguard content as HwLDP plus additional HRA check on in-combination effects with other projects such as Nigg. Surveys and mitigation should concentrate on effects on birds, seals, dolphins, other cetaceans, sandbanks, otters, porpoise, reptiles and rare lichens.
<b>Whiteness</b>	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/024	Whiteness I02	Allocation at this site should not be made and any proposals that may come forward may then be considered in the context of other local and national policies.	
<b>Whiteness</b>	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/152	Whiteness I02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should recommend FRA updated as detailed proposals come forward to ensure proposals in line with previous recommendations. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
<b>Whiteness</b>	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/005	Whiteness I02	RSPB consider that all mixed use and industrial sites within Whiteness have the potential to impact on the Inner Moray Firth SPA and should be assessed as outlined in SPP1 and SOEnD Circular 6/1995 (amended June 2000).	Consideration of impact on Moray Firth SPA