

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/041	Inverness General	Comments that many City periphery / fringe sites have badger activity. Concerns that if all site options are developed badger social groups will be lost causing badger welfare issues. Requests strategic approach to minimise and manage badger impacts. Suggests the solution is via the retention and creation of adequate green networks. However, a new badger survey is required to establish how territories have changed with recent development.	Adequate strategic badger mitigation including requirement for new badger survey.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/042	Inverness General	Concerns that many preferred sites are used by wild deer. Adverse impacts may occur in terms of deer welfare, public safety and impacts by deer. Suggests mitigation in terms of developer requirement for sustainable deer management i line with national Code.	Mitigation in terms of developer requirement for sustainable deer management in line with national Code.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/043	Inverness General	All development sites containing a water body should include a developer requirement for great crested newt survey.	All development sites containing a water body should include a developer requirement for great crested newt survey.
Inverness	Culcabock & Drakies Community Council(00279)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00279/1/004	Inverness General	Objects to the proposals for the East Link as it is not needed or wanted. The uncertainty is affecting properties and businesses. More necessary and effective improvements would be improvements to Raigmore Interchange and Inshes Roundabout.	
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/001	Inverness General	Supports safeguarded from development, green open space notation on Craig Dunain Community Woodland area because the area is a prominent wooded ridge, skylines from many parts of the City and offers a valuable public amenity resource.	Retention of green safeguarding designation on Dunain Community Woodland area.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/001	Inverness General	Respondent sets out that all their comments have been considered on the basis that road, water, sewerage provision is required to deliver specific development and would be addressed in detail by a planning application on the site and without these being addressed development could not proceed.	
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/012	Inverness General	Respondent considers land beside Lochardil Stores should be safeguarded as open space. The Respondent has provided planning history of the site in their response.	Land next to Lochardil Stores to be safeguarded as open space.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/013	Inverness General	The line of the A9/A96 link should be shown as it is important to the development of the area	Indicative line of A9/A96 link to be shown in Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/014	Inverness General	Respondent considers the line of the Inverness West Link Road is too close to the river and cros the land zoned for housing.	Bring in the Inverness West Link Road away from the flood plain.
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/007	Inverness General	West link imposed against overwhelming public objections, it's effects on the adjoining road system needs to be addressed and is a deficiency of the plan. The IMFLDP proposes increased residential accommodation in Kinmylies/ Leachkin, increased tourist traffic on the A82 and news housing areas at Holm and Ness-side being routed across the river onto Glenurquhart Road. Glenurquhart Road/ Tomnahurich Street/Young Street/ Kenneth Street barely function currently during rush hours and in the height of Summer. They are obviously incapable of taking the additional traffic planned and it is difficult to envisage how this can be resolved. Clearly, locals will use roads in Ballifeary and Dalneigh as rat runs to avoid the congestion, which is already happening. This will cause problems for local residents but will not resolve the main artery congestion problems.	Inclusion of information on the west link road in Proposed Plan, in particular how it will address transport issues
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/009	Inverness General	MCC did not sign the collective CC response, however are broadly in accord with its contents. Believe:- Inverness has more than enough existing retail accommodation;- there should be a slow down in housing estate sprawl;- more effort should be made to dissipate housing into surrounding towns and communities; and - Efforts should be concentrated in catching up on the provision of community, leisure, amenity and services, utilities and transport infrastructure deficiencies within the City.	Assume removal of allocations for retail, less housing sites in Inverness and more housing sites in towns surrounding Inverness. Provision of adequate community, leisure, amenity and services, utilities and transport infrastructure.
Inverness	Raigmore Community Council(00314)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00314/1/007	Inverness General	Believes that there is a real danger that Inverness is becoming the only employment hub in the Inner Moray Firth area and all the surrounding towns will become dormitory towns. Respondent also thinks that the IMF LDP is in danger of repeating past mistakes where new proposed developments lack the adequate infrastructure particularly at the appropriate time. Raigmore Community Council recognise the need for additional housing but emphasise the need for expansion of roads, water, sewerage, waste disposal as well as schools, community/day centres, appropriate levels of greenspace, and local retailers. These features need to be developed from the beginning to create a sense of community.	Less focus as Inverness as the only employment hub in the region.
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/001	Inverness General	Respondent supports gypsy/traveller short stay site provision but it should be supported by local by-law forbidding unofficial sites.	
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/004	Inverness General	Respondent considers new development in East Inverness should be supported by a stringent flood prevention scheme and accompanied by additional flood management infrastructure.	Developer requirement for delivery of flood management infrastructure at all sites in East Inverness
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/005	Inverness General	Respondent considers no further retail development should be outwith Inverness and Inshes Retail Park.	Remove all retail allocations outwith Inverness and Inshes Retail Parks and Inverness City Centre.
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/006	Inverness General	Respondent considers additional efforts should be made to maintain greenspace, historic trees and links to culloden battlefield.	Additional greenspace allocated

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/007	Inverness General	The Respondent supports the development of an Energy from Waste Plant in Inverness	
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/008	Inverness General	Respondent considers that High speed broadband infrastructure improvements are needed to support commercial development in the east of Inverness.	Cross Settlement issue to be added to require the upgrade of Culloden Telephone exchange for high speed broadband.
Inverness	Strathnairn Community Council(00320)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00320/2/001	Inverness General	Supports the preferred open space allocation of woodland in Strathnairn, in particular the setting by Inverarie Farm. However concerned this will not prevent removal of trees previously protected by a Tree Retention condition. Request plan includes the importance of any Tree Retention conditions and associated requirements.	Proposed Plan include importance of any Tree Retention conditions and associated requirements.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/002	Inverness General	Would like to see the following provisions from the Inverness LP (2006) carried forward into the IMFLDP:- Para 107 "6.2 hectares for a district park".- Para 108 "the Council will encourage community-led initiatives" to establish a local park etc.- Para 2.24 "Advantage should be taken of the rail network to improve transport choices for commuters".- Para 2.24 "Securing the farm and woodlands adjoining the A9, A96 and B9006 is vital to the setting and separation of neighbourhoods, coalescence of the wider built-up area, access to recreational resources and protection for strategic pipelines".	Provisions from Inverness LP taken forward into IMF LDP
Inverness	Mr William Boyd(00332)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00332/2/002	Inverness General	General support for sites and uses preferred within Ballifeary. Notes the Community Council intends to proactively consider planning applications for such sites when they come forward.Discussion focussed on West Link and its impact upon the area. Accept that decision has been made to support West Link route option 6, however concerns raised regarding this option due to environmental, recreational, social and financial considerations. An area of exceptional beauty and recreational importance is being put at risk that contains features of local and national importance. Amenities including Ness Islands, Whin Park, Canal Park, Boating Park, rugby pitches and other amenities will be adversely affected by traffic pollution and noise. Design is not aesthetically pleasing; inappropriate for 7 roundabouts, 2 swing bridges, fixed bridge and road in such a small area currently used for recreation.Concern that once road is complete it will become a main artery for traffic from the north, east and south, bringing high concentrations of traffic into recreational areas and too close to the city centre. Consider new road could be located further out.	Assume reconsideration of West Link route
Inverness	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/015	Inverness General	Concerned about apparent lack of connections between deciding the route for West Link road and the development plan. Preferred approach would have been to draw attention to SPP and its requirement to be consistent with the Local Transport Strategy, including any planned road development and brought forward the consultation on the road options at the same time as the LDP consultation. Consider this approach would have removed the constraints of carrying forward land allocations at the same time as trying to make the best of what land remained in terms of land availability for a road route.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/016	Inverness General	SEPA note that Inverness Settlement Development Area takes in a number of areas below Mean High Water Springs which would be at flood risk. SEPA are unclear why these areas are included and would be likely to object should any development which did not meet the exceptions within the SPP flood risk policy. SEPA request that the settlement boundary excludes these areas to provide a clearer guide as to where development would be generally acceptable.	Changes to the settlement development area
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/001	Inverness General	Caledonian Canal plays a huge role in the Highlands, 15 businesses are on the canal, including 70 hire boats; it generates approximately £4m to the Highland economy. Canal nearly at operating capacity in terms of places to stop-off on boat and also in terms of meeting new commercial opportunities. Looking to facilitate further opportunities for living, mooring and commercial opportunities on the Canal. Scottish Canals Water Space Consultation Strategy highlights the opportunity to promote this, sites at Seaport Marine (Muirtown), Neptune's Staircase, Banavie and Gairloch are suggested.	Facilitation of further opportunities for living, mooring and commerce on the Caledonian Canal

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/008	Inverness General	Scottish Canals has had pre-application discussions with the Council regarding a site at Clachnacharry Road (former quarry directly north of Clachnharry Care Home). Consider site should be allocated for housing for the following reasons:- The site is in the ownership of Scottish Canals and can be brought forward for development;- The site has been vacant for a number of years;- The developable part of the site does not provide a high quality of greenspace;- The development of the site with well-designed houses would help meet the overall demand for housing in the Plan area;- Scottish Canals has done some initial feasibility and layout plans for the site (plan enclosed) which shows that development of the site is possible;- Development of the site could help consolidate an existing residential area; and- Development of the site will help frame the approach to the canal and Muirtown Basin.Appreciate that there are other issues and constraints to be overcome to bring this site forward for development but on balance site could be sensitively developed to help contribute to the need for housing in the area and also complement Scottish Canal's regeneration and tourism development ambitions at Muirtown Basin.	Allocation of former quarry site at Clachnacharry Road for housing
Inverness	Scottish Prison Service(00662)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00662/1/001	Inverness General	Scottish Prison Service (SPS) identified 12 potential prison sites within the Inverness area. Preferred location is at Beechwood but no agreement reached with landowners (HIE). SPS is also interested in land at Bogbain and Inverness Airport Business Park.SPS supports identification of Key Development Issues. Those particularly relevant to the development of a new prison are the need for more employment land as the prison would provide permanent/long term employment opportunities, spin off opportunities and 'difficult neighbour' uses. A prison could fall within Use Class 8 and is not listed as a bad neighbour development. The prison should be regarded as a modern facility of high quality design in a safe and secure environment and could successfully be located within a community. The existing Porterfield site is an example of this.	
Inverness	Mr Martin MacRae(00706)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00706/1/001	Inverness General	The respondent (land owner) objects to an area of land at 2 Ness Side being preferred open space as respondent would like it allocated for housing, the reasons for this are:- the development of adjacent land at Ness Side (H9) will not allow the land to be farmed any longer as it would be encroached upon by housing - once development takes place respondents land will be used as an unofficial play area for new residents- respondent would be responsible for the upkeep and management of land without being able to farm it	Allocation of land at 2 Ness Side for housing
Inverness	Simpson's Garden Centre(00780)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00780/1/002	Inverness General	Respondent proposes two development options for Mixed Use or Business/Tourism for expansion at an unallocated site at Simpson's Garden Centre. Following justifications given for including the site as an allocation: - Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) highlights growth East of Inverness and site in close proximity to this and can accommodate growth. Would support infrastructure improvement.- HwLDP policies 34 and 28 relevant in terms of acceptable development within a defined settlement development area.- HwLDP policy 40 criteria suggests site is suitable as an established business and would not impact on vitality or viability of Inverness. - Good transport provision; HwLDP policy 56 relevant.Inverness Local Plan shows site outwith settlement boundary in a green wedge. However expansion of site would include appropriate proposals i.E. Bunding and planting, animal petting area, overspill carparking. Supports proposal to remove the green wedge.Supports revision to Inverness boundary.	Respondent proposes two development options for Mixed Use or Business/Tourism for expansion at an unallocated site at Simpson's Garden Centre. Supports revision to Inverness boundary.
Inverness	Simpson's Garden Centre(00780)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00780/1/003	Inverness General	Supports the 6th key development objective listed at 7.11 in the MIR.	
Inverness	Simpson's Garden Centre(00780)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00780/1/004	Inverness General	Supports first bullet point in key development issues to consolidate city of Inverness but also to allow more ad hoc, peripheral development on the city fringe. Supports second bullet point in key development issues to remove the green wedge.Supports Council's identification of a number of proposals in East Inverness/Raigmore areas it reflects general support for long term growth of the city. In an easterly direction.	
Inverness	Mrs Mary Coonan(00859)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00859/1/001	Inverness General	Respondent , who part owns land at 2 Ness Side, wants it reallocated for housing rather than open space as the land will not be viable for agricultural purposes due to its proximity to the proposed West Link. Due to the timescale for the West Link the respondent requests that it forms part of the IMF LDP.	Reallocation from open space to housing of land at 2 Ness Side, Inverness.
Inverness	Mrs Mary Coonan(00859)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00859/2/001	Inverness General	Considers land at 2 Ness Side should be allocated for housing and not open space as the new west link road will traverse site meaning the site will no longer be suitable for crops or livestock due to increased presence of dogs, litter etc. Proposed roundabout will allow for access to residential areas while the existing access road and properties at Ness Side will form a barrier which will protect continued agriculture to the south of Ness Side.	Allocate land for housing at 2 Ness Side

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr John Glendinning(00996)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00996/1/001	Inverness General	Would like an area of woodland (9 acres) at Inshes Wood near Inverness included for development either as low cost housing accessed from the existing Birchwood development or as private housing accessed from the old A9 or a combination of both. Reasons: - good extension to Birchwood and all services are nearby. - Is part of Lower Muckovie Farm however since housing development at Birchwood was completed the land cannot be used by the farm as members of the public keep destroying fences to use the land for dog walking, riding motorbikes etc. - Planning permission for two houses on the on the site was refused in 2001. The respondent feels that this was mainly due to misinformation conveyed to the Committee by a Councillor who said that Birchwood housing estate had no play facilities for older children so erection of housing on this site would only shift the problem elsewhere. Respondent feels that in effect the Councillor was designating privately owned land as a play area for council tenenats.	
Inverness	Mackay(01005)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01005/1/001	Inverness General	Objects to all housing development being allocated within large scale sites within Inverness City boundary. Respondent suggests that some level of housing development should be allowed outwith the immediate city boundary. Although the majority of mainstream housing will be created within the central city area a substantial number of people would prefer to live in small scale housing developments than housing estates created by mainstream deveopers.	Removal of all large-scale housing sites from plan.
Inverness	3A Partnership Ltd(01034)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01034/2/001	Inverness General	Requests new site at old A9 new A9 junction for mixed tourism uses (visitor centre, specialist retailing, accommodation lodges, touring caravan site and amenities) because: it lies at principal city gateway; it lies within the city boundary as identified within MIR; uses complementary to adjoining Drumossie Hotel; good northerly outlook; it would not break skyline and is not visually prominent; of existing landscaped framework which provides visual containment and shelter; it fits with surrounding heritage and tourism uses (both existing and planned); chalet accommodation was previously on land adjoining Drumossie Hotel; a green network could be maintained through and past the site; it would provide a tourist facility on the connection to the Culloden Battlefield road enhancing the connection as a tourist route; this gateway location has unique commercial (visibility and accessibility) advantages to a tourism operator; an A9 set-back could be incorporated into the layout and to the A9 junction to safeguard any visual impact concerns; iconic architecture could be used; it is connected by public transport, and; any archaeological impacts could be mitigated.	Requests newsite at old A9 new A9 junction for mixed tourism uses (visitor centre, specialist retailing, accommodation lodges, touring caravan site and amenities).
Inverness	Highland And Island Enterprise(01035)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01035/1/005	Inverness General	Suggests that preferred open space at Raigmore west of A9 (and possibly land to south east of East Link) should be included within B8 allocation because: alternative public open space will be delivered as part of wider campus site, and; leaving everything within a single allocation will allow more flexibility.	Suggests that preferred open space at Raigmore west of A9 (and possibly land to south east of East Link) should be included within B8 allocation.
Inverness	Inverness Civic Trust(01064)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01064/2/001	Inverness General	Not clear what is shown on the Inverness map – whether it is the city only or the city and city fringe. Request this is clearly defined in future. Concerned about lack of green open spaces within Inverness – request additional green spaces area created rather than erode those existing at present. Should made clear whether green wedges are still recognised and public should know where they are. New traffic management survey for Inverness is essential before final conclusions are reached; study should be based on best outcome, not necessarily the cheapest. To improve east/west transport, consideration should be given to the upgrading of the road from Leanach Cottage crossroads as far as Forest Cottage, and new section constructed to link with the Bogbain underpass on the A9; then a new by-pass route would follow the existing road to Milton of Leys; take a route to the south of the existing settlement and between it and B7, and then continue westwards above Leys Castle, traverse Knocknagael Farm and proceed south of Ness Castle development and Torbreck to link with the existing Dores road at MU5. Questions raised in City Centre Development Brief, the Flood Prevention Schemes and IMFLDP should be co-ordinated so that one of conclusion is reached.	Request clearer map of Inverness, additional greenspace allocations and traffic improvements.
Inverness	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/001	Inverness General	Supports the continued designation of Longman Industrial Estate as an area which is safeguarded for business and industry uses including Class 4, 5 and 6 uses with support for associated ancillary uses.	
Inverness	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/002	Inverness General	Respondent supports the continued designation of Carse Industrial Estate as an area which is safeguarded for business and industry uses including Class 4, 5 and 6 uses with support for associated ancillary uses.	
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/002	Inverness General	Brownfield sites and re-development within Inverness should be exhausted before using greenfield sites. Land at the Glebe could provide space for two housing developments similar to those at Falconer Court.	Assumed reallocation of B3 to housing
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/004	Inverness General	Suspend sale of land or assets belonging to the Council or the Common Good Fund. Leases should be used instead.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/005	Inverness General	Inverness High School and grounds should only be used for education purposes	
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/008	Inverness General	Encourage more use of Inverness Town Hall by the City Council. Investigate ways of generating electricity from the River Ness.	
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/009	Inverness General	Reconsider a high level bridge or tunnel across the canal at Ness Side rather than destroying Bught Park amenities.	Reconsider a high level bridge or tunnel across the canal at Ness Side rather than destroying Bught Park amenities.
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/010	Inverness General	Restore two-way traffic over railway bridge at Clachnaharry.	
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/014	Inverness General	The requirement for temporary sites for travellers requires more research to quantify and resolve the problem of the permanent site being occupied by travellers who do not travel.	
Inverness	Mrs Sheena Robertson(01143)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01143/1/001	Inverness General	Disagrees with choice of Option 6, ahead of Option 7 of a bypass, for West Link road proposal because: innovative engineering techniques could overcome any technical issues; a bypass would be better long term solution and; traffic levels will increase on Glenurquhart Road, Tomnahurich Street and Kenneth Street. Believes health provision capacity has not been properly assessed in allocating so much housing land for development around the city.	Amended West Link routing from Option 6 to Route 7 and consequential land use allocation amendments . Deletion of several housing allocations or increase in health facility / personnel provision .
Inverness	Mr Allan Hunter(01152)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01152/1/001	Inverness General	Respondent questions the use of temporary classroom accomodation at schools.	
Inverness	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/004	Inverness General	RSPB consider that all mixed use and industrial sites within Inverness 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
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/005	Inverness General	Appreciates that Inverness will have to grow but has concerns over the scale of expansion supported in the MIR, considers it is not in accordance with a more sustainable model of development. Notes it is important that the character, strong links with nature and amenities are maintained in Inverness. Would prefer if constrains were shown on the MIR maps, for example SSSIs, TPOs and the flood plain. Flood plain area of the River Ness should not be allocated as it is not suitable for development. Does not consider the proposed West Link Route represents a long term traffic solution once development at Ness Castle and Kymilies takes place. Will also adversely affect the environmental amenity of the important Whin Park/Aquadome area and lies within the flood plain. Feels option 7 should be reconsidered.	General reduction in the scale of development supported by the IMF LDP.
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/006	Inverness General	Considers green space adjacent to Lochardil Stores should be mapped as green and allocated for community use as it is an open space immensely valued by Lochairdil school users.	Allocation of green space adjacent to Lochardil Stores for green space and community use.
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/002	Inverness General	Various development proposals in Inverness will impact adversely upon existing areas of open space; this is contrary to the HwLDP, particularly in terms of alternative provision. Audit of areas available for public space before and after proposals should be provided. If Canal Park is not required for the west link road land could be used as an extension to the Whin Island Park and should allocated as open space on the plan along with remaining open space in the Bught area. Proposals do not demonstrate adequate alternative provision has been made as regards the areas of public open space which will be lost when the west link road is developed. Areas for additional parking should be identified on the west side of river in the city centre.	Allocation of parking area on west side of the river in city centre
Inverness	Mr Robert M Phillips(01230)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01230/1/001	Inverness General	Respondent proposes that a walkway/bridge for cyclists/pedestrians should be constructed to enable better links between Holm Mills/Ness side (grid points suggested)The respondent considers- that this bridge could be in keeping with existing iron bridges if technologies/requirements allow for it. - that this bridge could offer a more immediate return than the west link proposals- and that the bridge would help encourages active travel, and opens up both sides to more recreational use.	Respondent proposes that a walkway/bridge for cyclists/pedestrians should be constructed to enable better links between Holm Mills/Ness side
Inverness	Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group - Holm Mills(01254)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01254/1/002	Inverness General	The area around the Edinburgh Woollen Mill should be classed as a Commerce Centre and recognised in the retail hierarchy of Inverness City with scope for redevelopment and expansion.	Inclusion of the area around the Edinburgh Woollen Mill should be classed as a Commerce Centre and recognised in the retail hierarchy of Inverness City with scope for redevelopment and expansion.
Inverness	Dr And Mrs Pumford(01282)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01282/1/001	Inverness General	Believe sufficient development land already allocated and with permission. Large new developments would only become soulless places without sufficient amenities better to finish sites that have already been started. Agree that land is required for affordable housing. Building on recreational and good farm land should be minimised. Agree with concept of green corridors not green belts but want these identified and safeguarded. Don't agree East Link is justified except to open up more development land. Instead improvement to Inshes Roundabout should be the priority.	Non retention of all Inverness City housing sites unless they are allocated in approved plans and/or have an extant planning permission. IMF LDP requires specific identification of existing housing sites for affordable housing, protection of green corridors for City and specific proposal for upgrade of Inshes Roundabout. Removal of East Link proposals.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Cllr Kate Stephen(01348)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01348/1/004	Inverness General	Considers that the old Nairn road should be developed as a coastal path for pedestrians and cyclists to facilitate access to the coast and to observe bird / sea life in the SSS1.The respondent would also like to see tree preservation orders in place for some of the ancient trees along this route and for the surrounding strip of land o be developed for bird watching etc and as an natural asset/amenity for the city of Inverness.	Coastal path along Old Nairn Road.
Inverness	Donald Boyd - Collective Response(01351)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01351/1/001	Inverness General	Westhill, Croy, Smithton, Inverness South, Balloch, and Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Councils have prepared a collective response.The collective Community Council's object to the Plan's proposals for expanding Inverness's urban extent to the South and East of the city - including the Stratton Farm development and further retail development (given that expansion of the existing Retail Park has still to proceed)- are generally opposed to the proposed scale of development preferred in South and East Inverness- object to including any housing/or large scale retail development on the South of the city other than those "on the cards"- there is support for Ashton Farm being preferred as open space and there is a preference for East Inverness to remain as agricultural land and also to be used to provide public open space- consider that the focus should be on provision of comprehensive infrastructure to serve recent housing developments- prefer that significant housing development should be focussed across other Highland communities where it can be accompanied by sufficient infrastructure and services- considers that the A96/A9 link at the Raigmore Interchange needs upgraded and that this could facilitate the UHI dedicated and upgraded slip road currently under consideration. It is considered that because the entrance to the campus will no longer be served from it there is now no requirement for the trunk road link. - considers that the Inshes roundabout requires a review which takes account of existing and future traffic flows (such as from development at Beechwood, resiting of Raigmore hospital etc, and the A96/A9 link road)- and considersthat the West link proposals need to be reconsidered and re-evaluated	
Inverness	Donald Boyd - Collective Response(01351)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01351/1/002	Inverness General	Westhill, Croy, Smithton, Inverness South, Balloch, and Kirkhill and Bunchrew Community Councils have prepared a collective response. The collective Community Council's object to proposals for expanding Inverness to the South and East because:- expansion of the existing Retail Park has still to proceed- the proposed scale of development preferred in South and East Inverness- development will not accompanied by sufficient infrastructure and services- issues of the road network capacity - the loss of valuable agricultural land with concern about future food shortages- by strengthening Inverness's role as a honeypot the probable consequence will be draining people, jobs and infrastructure investment from elsewhere in the Highlands. Prefer that significant housing development should be focussed across other Highland communities where it can be accompanied by sufficient infrastructure and services- concern about designating large greenfield sites as this may result in piecemeal development - concern about potential for flooding particularly at Inverness East and relief- because it will result in loss of Bogbain wood- there is support for Ashton Farm being preferred as open space and there is a preference for East Inverness to remain as agricultural land and also to be used to provide public open space- the focus should be on provision of comprehensive infrastructure to serve recent housing developments- considers that the A96/A9 link at the Raigmore Interchange needs upgraded and that this could facilitate the UHI dedicated and upgraded slip road currently under consideration. It is considered that because the entrance to the campus will no longer be served from it there is now no requirement for the trunk road link. - considers that the Inshes roundabout requires a review which takes account of existing and future traffic flows (such as from development at Beechwood, resiting of Raigmore hospital etc, and the A96/A9 link road)- and considers that the We8sà`l0c p%8sØú	Removal of development sites on the east of Inverness.
Inverness	Richard Crawford - Collective Response(01352)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01352/1/002	Inverness General	Believe Inverness' infrastructure is inadequate for both existing and proposed development. Disagree East Link is needed because it is only justified to open up new development areas for which there is no need or demand. Believe Inshes roundabout will only get worse with committed developments and urge Council to promote solution. Congestion will reduce the attractiveness of Inverness and the Croy road to tourists. Also believe broadband network too poor to attract business growth and this needs improvement before allocated of further expansion areas. Schools, health care, water and sewerage and other facilities should be in place prior to development. Existing facilities are inadequate for existing development. Surface water drainage facilities are inadequate and responsibility blurred and further development will only make surface water flooding worse.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr John West(01713)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01713/2/003	Inverness General	"Welcome principle of development and appreciate need for strategic thinking. However concerned about the implementation of development as the quality of some developments in Inverness leave much to be desired, as such wish to reserve position on individual developments. Concerned about paucity of green spaces in Inverness and effect of the proposed flood prevention measure above the main bridge and the effect this could have in Inverness."	
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/003	Inverness H01A	Note H1a and H1b are not preferred for development, no further comments on these sites at this stage.	
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/003	Inverness H01A	Requests clarification in Plan that no significant development will be allowed on this site prior to completion of the West Link because of pressure on existing canal crossings.	Developer requirement that no significant development will be allowed on the site prior to completion of West Link.
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/001	Inverness H01A	Support the preference for open space and non-preference of H1(a), H1(b), B1(a) and B1(b). Supportive of Dunain Community Woodland and concerned regarding recent lack of co-operation from Robertson Homes and their attempts to alter and extend their existing permission to develop the former NHS site. Original planning consent was the result of extensive negotiations and compromise involving many parties, to develop a sensitive and high amenity site, which was in public ownership. Inappropriate that any further concessions should be made which were not deemed appropriate in the original permission, and reflected in the original financial agreement. Any substantial amendment to the planning permission, involving any additional capacity, should be subject to a substantial additional payment to the public purse by the developer.	Seeks additional developer contributions for any further amendments to the planning application.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/004	Inverness H01A	Craigphadrig is an asset to the city, as such its environs should be protected.	
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/003	Inverness H01ABCD	Requests clarification in Plan that no significant development will be allowed on this site prior to completion of the West Link because of pressure on existing canal crossings.	Developer requirement that no significant development will be allowed on the site prior to completion of West Link.
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/002	Inverness H01ABCD	Respondent considers there is much development already planned for the area and these sites will impact on the landscape and areas for walking.	
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/003	Inverness H01B	Note H1a and H1b are not preferred for development, no further comments on these sites at this stage.	
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/001	Inverness H01B	Support the preference for open space and non-preference of H1(a), H1(b), B1(a) and B1(b). Supportive of Dunain Community Woodland and concerned regarding recent lack of co-operation from Robertson Homes and their attempts to alter and extend their existing permission to develop the former NHS site. Original planning consent was the result of extensive negotiations and compromise involving many parties, to develop a sensitive and high amenity site, which was in public ownership. Inappropriate that any further concessions should be made which were not deemed appropriate in the original permission, and reflected in the original financial agreement. Any substantial amendment to the planning permission, involving any additional capacity, should be subject to a substantial additional payment to the public purse by the developer.	Seeks additional developer contributions for any further amendments to the planning application.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/004	Inverness H01B	Craigphadrig is an asset to the city, as such its environs should be protected.	
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/002	Inverness H01C	H1c is non-preferred for housing development, however a large part of the site falls within a wider area that got outline consent in 2005. Only a small, western portion of the site lies outwith that outline consent and the associated masterplan, assume only this area is not preferred for development and the existing consented area will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Plan.	Allocate the part of H1c that benefits from planning permission for housing development.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/004	Inverness H01C	Craigphadrig is an asset to the city, as such its environs should be protected.	
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/005	Inverness H01D	Craigphadrig is an asset to the city, as such its environs should be protected.	Assume non-allocation of H01D for housing in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr And Mrs William Macbeath(00006)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00006/1/001	Inverness H02	Respondent objects to the non preference of site H2 for the following reasons:- the land has an attractive outlook.- Very few trees would need to be removed.- Road access has already been discussed with various parties and does not seem to be an issue.- Land is secluded so housing would not be visible.- Houses could be in keeping with the location e.G. Environmentally friendly.	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/045	Inverness H02	Supports non-retention of site because of potential adverse impacts on woodland, species, habitat and recreation.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/002	Inverness H02	Support non-preference of H2 due to concerns regarding the following:- Impact on and overlooking of existing houses- Access- Disturbance of existing groundwater with potential for destabilising the site and adjoining developments- Removal of vegetation causing significant detriment to the visual impact of the whole hillside and potentially result in windfall damage to the forest behind	
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/003	Inverness H02	Craigphadrig is an asset to the city, as such its environs should be protected.	
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/002	Inverness H02	Respondent considers there is much development already planned for the area and these sites will impact on the landscape and areas for walking.	
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/001	Inverness H03A	Support identification of sites MU1, MU2 and H3a as 'preferred' sites for mixed use/residential development. Support the Council's aspiration to locate a community/neighbourhood centre in this area to serve the western part of the city, the nature of which should be properly considered through a masterplanning approach for the Westercraigs/Charleston area. Concerned that development potential of sites MU2 and H3a may be constrained if insufficient road access is provided. Discussions between the respondent and the Council's traffic engineers have suggested that a through road would be required (i.e. Two connections to the public road network) and the design and geometry of the road would have to meet certain minimum standards. One access can be provided from Leachkin Road. A second access is more challenging, however believe that this is critical for the potential of these sites to be stymied. Concerned if no second access were to be provided as result of the proposed link road and golf course re-design. Believes there is scope for a properly planned solution which satisfies all of the Council's aspirations.	Proposed Plan should contain requirement for through road and masterplan for Westercraigs/Charleston area.
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/003	Inverness H03ABC	Requests clarification in Plan that no significant development will be allowed on this site prior to completion of the West Link because of pressure on existing canal crossings.	Developer requirement that no significant development will be allowed on the site prior to completion of West Link.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/069	Inverness H04A	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.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/005	Inverness H04A	No objection in principle. Proposals should respect canal-side setting of Scheduled Monument and canal embankments. H4A and H5 may provide opportunity to utilise canal as a receptor for surface water.	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/021	Inverness H04A	Seek a developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.	Developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/070	Inverness H04B	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.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application.
Inverness	Mr John Paterson(00900)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00900/1/001	Inverness H04B	Objects to this site because:- of its important green space use, and the potential impact on peacefulness and on residents enjoyment. - area adds to the sense of openness and space locally and that other open space further afield belongs to the school and the golf course and is therefore not accessible to the general public. - Highland greenspace audit, PAN65 and SPP 11 state the importance of our greenspace resource and considers that this space provides for a variety of activities. In addition to provision of green space with new development the respondent considers that there is equally a need to protect the areas provided in the past referring to PAN 65 which states that "Development plans should safeguard important open spaces from development in the long term."	Non-retention of H4B
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/003	Inverness H05	Continue to object to development on site H5. It is a high amenity site, adjacent to the Caledonian Canal and Tomnahurich Cemetery, is at a major tourist gateway to Inverness. Consider high density, relatively high rise housing development, is totally inappropriate at this sensitive location.	Non-allocation of site H5 in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/005	Inverness H05	No objection in principle. Proposals should respect canal-side setting of Scheduled Monument and canal embankments. H4A and H5 may provide opportunity to utilise canal as a receptor for surface water.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/009	Inverness H05	Supports preference for C2, H5 and MU4. Sites form part of the Torvean and Ness-side Charette area which Scottish Canals is keen to support. Scottish Canal's vision for the area would see the canal play a role in a major recreational and tourist hub here. Opportunity to investigate the creation of additional waterspace within the existing landscape setting to help create an impressive western gateway into the City. May be a unique opportunity to create a water based recreational hub comprising an off-line basin for moorings and other water-based uses on part of the existing golf course. Would also provide a crucial strategic role for the wider canal network. Would take advantage of existing recreational facilities in the area. Inverness Rowing Club would like to expand their existing activities and Scottish Canals are in communication with Jacobite Cruises and Caley Cruises about their existing and future needs. The proposed second canal bridge crossing at Torvean will have implications for how this section of the canal is used both operationally and commercially. Supports Council's desire for a development brief for the area and welcomes the opportunity to set out some of the canal-related, strategic context and potential opportunities at the forthcoming charrette. Keen to ensure that changes to this area facilitate opportunities for existing and new canal-related businesses and also that the role and setting of the canal is understood and respected. Keen to explore this further with stakeholders at the charrette and happy to assist with any preparatory work, introductory presentations or workshop input as required.	
Inverness	Ms Rebekah Morris(00952)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00952/1/001	Inverness H05	Objects to the allocation of these sites for development because of the impact this would have on recreation for locals and on tourism.	Removal of site for proposed plan.
Inverness	Ms Jemimah Morris(00953)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00953/1/002	Inverness H05	Objects to the allocation of these sites as it is considered that their development would have a negative impact on the landscape and views, and on the tourist industry.	Removal of sites H5 and H6 from the Plan.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/001	Inverness H05	Canal area should be protected from development as it used for a lot of recreation including walking and boating and is an important tourist feature.	Assume non-allocation of H5 and H7 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/021	Inverness H05	Seek a developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.	Developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/003	Inverness H05	Opposed to development on the banks of the Caledonian Canal as it is a unique feature of this area that enhances lifestyle and attracts tourists.	Removal of sites H5 and H7 from the Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/005	Inverness H06	No objection in principle. Proposals should respect canal-side setting of Scheduled Monument and canal embankments. H4A and H5 may provide opportunity to utilise canal as a receptor for surface water.	
Inverness	Ms Rebekah Morris(00952)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00952/1/002	Inverness H06	Supports the Councils non preference of this site for development because of the impact this would have on recreation for locals and on tourism.	
Inverness	Ms Jemimah Morris(00953)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00953/1/003	Inverness H06	Supports the Councils non preference of this site as it is considered that their development would have a negative impact on the landscape and views, and on the tourist industry.	
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/008	Inverness H06	Canal area should be protected from development as it used for a lot of recreation including walking and boating and is an important tourist feature.	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/038	Inverness H06	Histoic Scotland welcome the recognition of the potential impact of this allocation on the setting the Caledonian Canal and note that the site is not preferred by the Council.	
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/004	Inverness H06	Respondent opposed to development on the banks of the Caledonian Calal as it is a unique feature of this area that enhances lifestyle and attracts tourists.	
Inverness	Ms Rebekah Morris(00952)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00952/1/001	Inverness H07	Objects to the allocation of these sites for development because of the impact this would have on recreation for locals and on tourism.	Removal of site for proposed plan.
Inverness	Ms Jemimah Morris(00953)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00953/1/002	Inverness H07	Objects to the allocation of these sites as it is considered that their development would have a negative impact on the landscape and views, and on the tourist industry.	Removal of sites H5 and H6 from the Plan.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/001	Inverness H07	Canal area should be protected from development as it used for a lot of recreation including walking and boating and is an important tourist feature.	Assume non-allocation of H5 and H7 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/021	Inverness H07	Seek a developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.	Developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/003	Inverness H07	Opposed to development on the banks of the Caledonian Canal as it is a unique feature of this area that enhances lifestyle and attracts tourists.	Removal of sites H5 and H7 from the Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/071	Inverness 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 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.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/006	Inverness H08	River and canal and beautiful and have great use and further potential to draw tourism to the area, should be protected along with views around them.	
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/005	Inverness H08	Not opposed to development on these sites but believes that any development needs to be sympathetic to the natural environment and a large strip of greenspace is protected along the banks fo the River Ness.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd(01209)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01209/1/001	Inverness H08	Landowner supports the allocation of these sites for housing.The landowner has the following comments to make about their commitment to delivery of these sites- they submitted a pre application inquiry in 2010 - the only reason they have not progressed to submission of a planning application has been based on the Council's advice on prematurity prior to the West Link road and the request for an overall masterplanned approach for the wider Ness-side area (which is not fully in this landowners control).The landowner makes the following additional comments- the area excluded from H8 appears to be the area identified as being at risk of fluvial flooding on SEPA's flood map, and given the buffer necessary from the road they have no objection to the suggested split (residential and open space)- they state their preference for a direct access into their land off Dores Road- they consider that with option 6 selected for the West link road this removes an obstacle to the development of this land- they consider with Council progress on a design charette then this will remove the other obstacle - they are committed to working with the Council to ensure this residential development can be delivered within the lifetime of the IMFLDP	
Inverness	Tulloch Homes Ltd(00393)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00393/1/003	Inverness H09	Supports inclusion of thier land for development and considers that given it is a priority to unlock the development potential of this area that other means of realeassign this land should be considered prior to delivery of the Inverness West Link Road as the timetable for this is uncertain. Request the Council should be mindful of the economic climate and facilitate a pragmatic approach to phasing and infrastructure of this land to allow H9 to be released in the short to medium term.	Phase site H9 in the proposed plan as a short to medium term site and not stagnate development in this area due to the lack of the West Link Road.
Inverness	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/016	Inverness H09	Does not support H9 for housing development	Non-allocation of H9 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/072	Inverness H09	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.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/007	Inverness H09	River and canal and beautiful and have great use and further potential to draw tourism to the area, should be protected along with views around them.	Assume non-allocation of H9 and H11 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/005	Inverness H09	Not opposed to development on these sites but believes that any development needs to be sympathetic to the natural environment and a large strip of greenspace is protected along the banks fo the River Ness.	
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/007	Inverness H09	Area of H9 should be reduced to enable the roundabout on Dores Road to be the starting point for a by-pass on to the A82, corridor for such a by-pass should be reserved at this stage.	Reduce area of H9 in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/047	Inverness H10	Concerns regarding potential badger, great crested newt and woodland impacts. Suggests outweighing public benefits should be explained, lack of alternatives demonstrated, tree loss minimised, pre-determination species surveys undertaken, and high standard of compensatory planting undertaken.	Developer requirement mitigation to cover potential badger, great crested newt and woodland impacts.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/073	Inverness H10	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.
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/023	Inverness H10	While lying outwith the allocation to the north-west Historic Scotland (HS) would ask that developer requirements recognise the need to consider the setting of the scheduled monument Holme Mains, motte 210m SE of (Index no. 3078) in this area.	Requests a developer requirement to consider the setting of scheduled monument Holme Mains, Mottee 210 m SE.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/074	Inverness H11	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.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/007	Inverness H11	River and canal and beautiful and have great use and further potential to draw tourism to the area, should be protected along with views around them.	Assume non-allocation of H9 and H11 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/005	Inverness H11	Not opposed to development on these sites but believes that any development needs to be sympathetic to the natural environment and a large strip of greenspace is protected along the banks fo the River Ness.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Burt Boulton Holdings Ltd(01209)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01209/1/001	Inverness H11	Landowner supports the allocation of these sites for housing.The landowner has the following comments to make about their commitment to delivery of these sites- they submitted a pre application inquiry in 2010 - the only reason they have not progressed to submission of a planning application has been based on the Council's advice on prematurity prior to the West Link road and the request for an overall masterplanned approach for the wider Ness-side area (which is not fully in this landowners control).The landowner makes the following additional comments- the area excluded from H8 appears to be the area identified as being at risk of fluvial flooding on SEPA's flood map, and given the buffer necessary from the road they have no objection to the suggested split (residential and open space)- they state their preference for a direct access into their land off Dores Road- they consider that with option 6 selected for the West link road this removes an obstacle to the development of this land- they consider with Council progress on a design charette then this will remove the other obstacle - they are committed to working with the Council to ensure this residential development can be delivered within the lifetime of the IMFLDP	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/075	Inverness H12A	H12a and H12c should be removed from plan.	Removal of H12 A and H12C from the plan.
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/001	Inverness H12A	Objects to the non-preference of H12a-c and H13 for housing development for following reasons:- Relatively small and unobtrusive areas of land within woodland and settlement development area;- Site is serviceable; existing active travel connections from Holm Dell and Ness Castle; foul drainage via an extension of the existing network to Allanfearn system which has sufficient capacity; water supply from the existing network and has sufficient capacity;- site constraints can be addressed: assessment would be carried out and buildings set back from the Holm Burn flood risk area; woodland protected would be retained in interest of integrating development with the landscape and maintaining local amenity; the listed Drumdevan House is well screened from the development areas by dense mature woodland; the Boar Stone site lies to the north east of the site however it was moved to the Highland Council Chamber building several years ago; site is not prime agricultural land;- Community benefits: proportion of affordable housing; education contributions; continuation of public access along the edge of the Holm Burn linking with Core Path routes; safeguarding and enabling provision of high quality open space; help meet demand for low density housing development in a high quality wooded landscape setting on the edge of the city (precedent already set in this area) reducing pressure on the open countryside or Hinterland around Inverness.- Inconsistent that H15 and H49 are preferred for development when H12a-c and H13 are not. Questions why additional housing sites, particularly H15 and H49, have been identified when Council stated in responses to the HwLDP that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". Considers that significant cons listed in MIR against H12a-c and H13 are equally applicable to H15 an H49 as they are both in the countryside and on land currently identified as green wedges in the Inverness Local Plan. Furthermore, both areas are active working farms outwith the urban edge and are large and potentially very obtrusive site thus having significant landscape and visual impacts.	Allocation of H12a-c and H13 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/003	Inverness H12ABC	Questions why additional housing sites, particularly H15 and H49, have been identified when Council stated in responses to the HwLDP that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". Inconsistent that H15 and H49 are preferred for development when H12a-c and H13 are not.Considers that significant cons listed in MIR against H12a-c and H13 are equally applicable to H15 an H49 as they are both in the countryside and on land currently identified as green wedges in the Inverness Local Plan. Furthermore, both areas are active working farms outwith the urban edge and are large and potentially very obtrusive site thus having significant landscape and visual impacts.Considers H12 and H13 are well contained in the landscape by their wooded margins and as such are very secluded and unobtrusive; do not intrude into open land; are not part of a working farm and would follow the precedent already set of allowing some development within this landscape without detriment to the setting of the urban edge. If the Council continues to support sites H15 and H49 in the Proposed Plan there is justification for including sites H12 and H13. However, in terms of their small scale and minimal impact on the setting of the urban edge of the city, sites H12 and H13 also stand on their own merits.	Allocation of H12a-c and H13 for housing in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/291	Inverness H12B	Text for H12B modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the development options for the site.	Flood Risk Assessment required for H12B in support of planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/001	Inverness H12B	Objects to the non-preference of H12a-c and H13 for housing development for following reasons:- Relatively small and unobtrusive areas of land within woodland and settlement development area;- Site is serviceable; existing active travel connections from Holm Dell and Ness Castle; foul drainage via an extension of the existing network to Allanfearn system which has sufficient capacity; water supply from the existing network and has sufficient capacity;- site constraints can be addressed: assessment would be carried out and buildings set back from the Holm Burn flood risk area; woodland protected would be retained in interest of integrating development with the landscape and maintaining local amenity; the listed Drumdevan House is well screened from the development areas by dense mature woodland; the Boar Stone site lies to the north east of the site however it was moved to the Highland Council Chamber building several years ago; site is not prime agricultural land;- Community benefits: proportion of affordable housing; education contributions; continuation of public access along the edge of the Holm Burn linking with Core Path routes; safeguarding and enabling provision of high quality open space; help meet demand for low density housing development in a high quality wooded landscape setting on the edge of the city (precedent already set in this area) reducing pressure on the open countryside or Hinterland around Inverness.- Inconsistent that H15 and H49 are preferred for development when H12a-c and H13 are not. Questions why additional housing sites, particularly H15 and H49, have been identified when Council stated in responses to the HwLDP that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". Considers that significant cons listed in MIR against H12a-c and H13 are equally applicable to H15 an H49 as they are both in the countryside and on land currently identified as green wedges in the Inverness Local Plan. Furthermore, both areas are active working farms outwith the urban edge and are large and potentially very obtrusive site thus having significant landscape and visual impacts.	Allocation of H12a-c and H13 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/075	Inverness H12C	H12a and H12c should be removed from plan.	Removal of H12 A and H12C from the plan.
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/001	Inverness H12C	Objects to the non-preference of H12a-c and H13 for housing development for following reasons:- Relatively small and unobtrusive areas of land within woodland and settlement development area;- Site is serviceable; existing active travel connections from Holm Dell and Ness Castle; foul drainage via an extension of the existing network to Allanfearn system which has sufficient capacity; water supply from the existing network and has sufficient capacity;- site constraints can be addressed: assessment would be carried out and buildings set back from the Holm Burn flood risk area; woodland protected would be retained in interest of integrating development with the landscape and maintaining local amenity; the listed Drumdevan House is well screened from the development areas by dense mature woodland; the Boar Stone site lies to the north east of the site however it was moved to the Highland Council Chamber building several years ago; site is not prime agricultural land;- Community benefits: proportion of affordable housing; education contributions; continuation of public access along the edge of the Holm Burn linking with Core Path routes; safeguarding and enabling provision of high quality open space; help meet demand for low density housing development in a high quality wooded landscape setting on the edge of the city (precedent already set in this area) reducing pressure on the open countryside or Hinterland around Inverness.- Inconsistent that H15 and H49 are preferred for development when H12a-c and H13 are not. Questions why additional housing sites, particularly H15 and H49, have been identified when Council stated in responses to the HwLDP that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". Considers that significant cons listed in MIR against H12a-c and H13 are equally applicable to H15 an H49 as they are both in the countryside and on land currently identified as green wedges in the Inverness Local Plan. Furthermore, both areas are active working farms outwith the urban edge and are large and potentially very obtrusive site thus having significant landscape and visual impacts.	Allocation of H12a-c and H13 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/007	Inverness H13	Supports non-preferred status of H13 and supports Preferred status of C4. Respondent considers that all land south of the road would be better utilised for allotments as proposed to housing.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/001	Inverness H13	Objects to the non-preference of H12a-c and H13 for housing development for following reasons:- Relatively small and unobtrusive areas of land within woodland and settlement development area;- Site is serviceable; existing active travel connections from Holm Dell and Ness Castle; foul drainage via an extension of the existing network to Allanfearn system which has sufficient capacity; water supply from the existing network and has sufficient capacity;- site constraints can be addressed: assessment would be carried out and buildings set back from the Holm Burn flood risk area; woodland protected would be retained in interest of integrating development with the landscape and maintaining local amenity; the listed Drumdevan House is well screened from the development areas by dense mature woodland; the Boar Stone site lies to the north east of the site however it was moved to the Highland Council Chamber building several years ago; site is not prime agricultural land;- Community benefits: proportion of affordable housing; education contributions; continuation of public access along the edge of the Holm Burn linking with Core Path routes; safeguarding and enabling provision of high quality open space; help meet demand for low density housing development in a high quality wooded landscape setting on the edge of the city (precedent already set in this area) reducing pressure on the open countryside or Hinterland around Inverness.- Inconsistent that H15 and H49 are preferred for development when H12a-c and H13 are not. Questions why additional housing sites, particularly H15 and H49, have been identified when Council stated in responses to the HwLDP that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". Considers that significant cons listed in MIR against H12a-c and H13 are equally applicable to H15 an H49 as they are both in the countryside and on land currently identified as green wedges in the Inverness Local Plan. Furthermore, both areas are active working farms outwith the urban edge and are large and potentially very obtrusive site thus having significant landscape and visual impacts.	Allocation of H12a-c and H13 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/002	Inverness H13	Unacceptable that C4 is preferred for community/allotments without land owner consultation and as a spurious extension of larger designation on opposite side of Essich Road. Consider preference for allotments is ill-conceived and possibly a knee-jerk reaction only because of its relative proximity to the Knocknagael part of site C4.	Allocation of C4 for housing rather than community use in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/048	Inverness H14	Concerns regarding potential badger and woodland impacts. Suggests mitigation is required.	Developer requirements for badger and woodland mitigation.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/006	Inverness H14	Supports development at site H15 as it is recognised that the Flood Relief Channel will make the site difficult to farm - similar to C4 and it will round off development in this area of Inverness. A Green Wedge running from site H14 through this site should be maintained.	Developer Requirement on site H15 that green corridor from H14 is maintained.
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/006	Inverness H14	Respondent concerned that green wedges from the previous Inverness Local Plan are being lost. These sites seem to be filling up greenspaces rather than preserving them.	
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/009	Inverness H14	Notes site is bull farm. Considers housing on this site is excessive in addition to Ness Castle, also makes reference to allotments.	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/048	Inverness H15	Concerns regarding potential badger and woodland impacts. Suggests mitigation is required.	Developer requirements for badger and woodland mitigation.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/006	Inverness H15	Supports development at site H15 as it is recognised that the Flood Relief Channel will make the site difficult to farm - similar to C4 and it will round off development in this area of Inverness. A Green Wedge running from site H14 through this site should be maintained.	Developer Requirement on site H15 that green corridor from H14 is maintained.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00942)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00942/1/001	Inverness H15	The Scottish Government (SG) supports preferred status of C4 and H15 . In support of proposals they have submitted a site boundary plan, a series of drawings, a development framework, a statement on the background of Knocknageal Farm and the modernisation programme, a transport paper, and an ecological report. SG propose around 190 house development, and lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C4. Reasons given for the development:- receipts will be reinvested in the modernisation of the National Bull Stud Farm which avoids the need for taxpayers funding. -will make a significant contribution to an effective and marketable housing land supply, complementing delivery of expansion areas and contributing towards the balance of required sites mentioned in the HwLDP as "wider Inverness HMA and windfall." -Consider site to be effective, free from infrastructure constraints of a deliverable scale, and providing choice. -crucial to identify sufficient smaller scale more easily delivered sites with larger sites to the east and west of the city -the Council needs to account for the difficulties faced by the house builders gaining project finance and the impact this will have on build rates. -transport paper demonstrates how suitable connections can be made, and that there is capacity in the local road network-housing proposed could provide a natural rounding off of the settlement by the topography-through structure planting and that the transition from urban to rural can be softened by integrating wildlife, woodland and housing-sustainable location, accessed by a choice of transport options and within easy walking distance of local facilities-considers this land to be surplus to the farms operational requirements.-potential for some form of small scale hydroelectric scheme outwith the site within the Big Burn-Over one third of the site has been reserved for open space and landscaping	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00942)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00942/1/002	Inverness H15	The Scottish Government (SG) object to non-preferred status of H16. In support of proposals they have submitted a site boundary plan, a series of drawings, a development framework, a statement on the background of Knocknageal Farm and the modernisation programme, a transport paper, and an ecological report. SG propose around 190 house development, and lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C4. Reasons given for the development:- receipts will be reinvested in the modernisation of the National Bull Stud Farm which avoids the need for taxpayers funding. -will make a significant contribution to an effective and marketable housing land supply, complementing delivery of expansion areas and contributing towards the balance of required sites mentioned in the HwLDP as "wider Inverness HMA and windfall." -Consider site to be effective, free from infrastructure constraints of a deliverable scale, and providing choice. -crucial to identify sufficient smaller scale more easily delivered sites with larger sites to the east and west of the city -the Council needs to account for the difficulties faced by the house builders gaining project finance and the impact this will have on build rates. -transport paper demonstrates how suitable connections can be made, and that there is capacity in the local road network-housing proposed could provide a natural rounding off of the settlement by the topography-through structure planting and that the transition from urban to rural can be softened by integrating wildlife, woodland and housing-sustainable location, accessed by a choice of transport options and within easy walking distance of local facilities-considers this land to be surplus to the farms operational requirements.-potential for some form of small scale hydroelectric scheme outwith the site within the Big Burn-Over one third of the site has been reserved for open space and landscaping.	SG support these C4, H15 and H16 for a circa 190 house development, with a notional 140 to the north, and a notional 50 in a lower density area to the south. SG suggest a lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C or the wider C4. SG consider H16 to be suitable for housing with an area of landscaping/woodland planting to create the green edge to the development.
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/006	Inverness H15	Respondent concerned that green wedges from the previous Inverness Local Plan are being lost. These sites seem to be filling up greenspaces rather than preserving them.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/003	Inverness H15	Questions why additional housing sites, particularly H15 and H49, have been identified when Council stated in responses to the HwLDP that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". Inconsistent that H15 and H49 are preferred for development when H12a-c and H13 are not. Considers that significant cons listed in MIR against H12a-c and H13 are equally applicable to H15 and H49 as they are both in the countryside and on land currently identified as green wedges in the Inverness Local Plan. Furthermore, both areas are active working farms outwith the urban edge and are large and potentially very obtrusive sites thus having significant landscape and visual impacts. Considers H12 and H13 are well contained in the landscape by their wooded margins and as such are very secluded and unobtrusive; do not intrude into open land; are not part of a working farm and would follow the precedent already set of allowing some development within this landscape without detriment to the setting of the urban edge. If the Council continues to support sites H15 and H49 in the Proposed Plan there is justification for including sites H12 and H13. However, in terms of their small scale and minimal impact on the setting of the urban edge of the city, sites H12 and H13 also stand on their own merits.	Allocation of H12a-c and H13 for housing in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Cardrona Charitable Trust(00988)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00988/1/002	Inverness H15	Objects to Preferred status of H15 as: - Council argued at HwLDP Examination that there was no shortfall in the housing land supply for the City; - it is part of designated green wedge; - it is part of a working farm; - the Leys site suffers from visual prominence and poor microclimate due to higher elevation, and; - the site is not close to and will not therefore support a neighbourhood/district centre	Non-retention of H15 and H49 in Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/010	Inverness H15	H15 should include some green networks	H15 should include some green networks
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00942)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00942/1/002	Inverness H16	The Scottish Government (SG) object to non-preferred status of H16. In support of proposals they have submitted a site boundary plan, a series of drawings, a development framework, a statement on the background of Knocknagael Farm and the modernisation programme, a transport paper, and an ecological report. SG propose around 190 house development, and lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C4. Reasons given for the development:- receipts will be reinvested in the modernisation of the National Bull Stud Farm which avoids the need for taxpayers funding. -will make a significant contribution to an effective and marketable housing land supply, complementing delivery of expansion areas and contributing towards the balance of required sites mentioned in the HwLDP as "wider Inverness HMA and windfall." -Consider site to be effective, free from infrastructure constraints of a deliverable scale, and providing choice. -crucial to identify sufficient smaller scale more easily delivered sites with larger sites to the east and west of the city -the Council needs to account for the difficulties faced by the house builders gaining project finance and the impact this will have on build rates. -transport paper demonstrates how suitable connections can be made, and that there is capacity in the local road network-housing proposed could provide a natural rounding off of the settlement by the topography-through structure planting and that the transition from urban to rural can be softened by integrating wildlife, woodland and housing-sustainable location, accessed by a choice of transport options and within easy walking distance of local facilities-considers this land to be surplus to the farms operational requirements.-potential for some form of small scale hydroelectric scheme outwith the site within the Big Burn-Over one third of the site has been reserved for open space and landscaping.	SG support these C4, H15 and H16 for a circa 190 house development, with a notional 140 to the north, and a notional 50 in a lower density area to the south. SG suggest a lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C or the wider C4. SG consider H16 to be suitable for housing with an area of landscaping/woodland planting to create the green edge to the development.
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/006	Inverness H16	Respondent concerned that green wedges from the previous Inverness Local Plan are being lost. These sites seem to be filling up greenspaces rather than preserving them.	
Inverness	Locharil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/003	Inverness H17	Supports development on site H17 with conversion of the building to flats if the retention of office use is not possible. Development in the grounds should be low density and preserve the trees. Improvement of visibility splays at existing access would be required. The land at the west of the site is covered by a TPO and should be classed as open space.	Area at H17 covered by TPO should be designated as open space.
Inverness	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/017	Inverness H17	Concerns about the potential for inappropriately high density housing in this area given that the Scottish Agricultural College requires monies from the development of this site to invest in their new Beechwood Campus building.	
Inverness	Mr Clive Richardson(00683)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00683/1/001	Inverness H17	Respondent supports site H17 for housing as it will allow the Scottish Agricultural College to re-invest funds into the Inverness Campus at Beechwood. The respondent confirms that density and the protection of the listed house have been factored into early masterplan studies of the site.	
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/008	Inverness H17	Scottish Agricultural College, supports some development on the site provided the valuable woodland is preserved.	Woodland must be protected from any development.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/006	Inverness H18	H18 should be extended to include the former B Q store car park	Extend H18 to include former B Q car park
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/076	Inverness H18	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.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/077	Inverness H19	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.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/053	Inverness H20	Supports non-preferred of site because of intrusion into local nature reserve.	Non-retention of site option.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/078	Inverness H20	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.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/079	Inverness H21	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.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/080	Inverness H22	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan, Text should be modified to state that an FRA required to demonstrate that the site is protected to an adequate standard, given the nature of the accommodation proposed. The outcome of the FRA may adversely affect the developable area or site-layout options. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Scottish Prison Service(00662)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00662/1/004	Inverness H23	Support identification of H23 as a future brownfield redevelopment site for housing following relocation of prison. Consider residential use is appropriate due to sites central location within the city and location within residential area. Options for the site may include high to medium residential use, community use or specific needs housing, for example for the aging population. Considers new prison proposal and development of housing on existing prison site is consistent with the Vision and Spatial Strategy of the HwLDP and IMFLDP MIR, particularly in terms of strengthening the economy, accessibility and growth in East Inverness. Redevelopment of brownfield site would reduce reassurance on greenfield sites. Note significant pros in MIR, however consider these can be overcome by identifying suitable mitigation in a Transport Assessment and demolition will be carefully controlled.	
Inverness	Culcabock & Drakies Community Council(00279)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00279/1/003	Inverness H25	Supports the housing allocation of H25 but wishes to see it safeguarded for exclusively housing for the elderly.	Requirement of elderly housing use only.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/081	Inverness H25	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan, Text should be modified to state that an FRA required to demonstrate that the site is protected to an adequate standard, given the nature of the accommodation proposed. The outcome of the FRA may adversely affect the developable area or site-layout options. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Hilton, Milton And Castle Heather Community Council(00290)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00290/1/001	Inverness H27	Respondent supports the allocation of H27, however considers more parking is required.	Increased parking provision to be required on site H27
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/011	Inverness H27	H27 appears a valuable community green space in an area with limited space.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/082	Inverness H28	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and all development will avoid the functional floodplain. May affect the development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness H29	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness H30	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness H31	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness H32	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness H33	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness H34	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape
Inverness	Mr Jim Savage(00034)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00034/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	L Mackay(00036)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00036/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00037)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00037/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00038)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00038/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00039)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00039/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Mr T Rooney(00040)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00040/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00041)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00041/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00042)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00042/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	To The Occupier(00043)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00043/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00044)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00044/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00045)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00045/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00046)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00046/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Khaleb Elsapah(00047)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00047/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00048)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00048/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Mr Trevor Martin(00049)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00049/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35 A B C, particularly due to the removal of woodland without planning permission.	
Inverness	Mr Trevor Martin(00049)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00049/2/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00050)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00050/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00051)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00051/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	M. O'Connor(00052)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00052/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	D. MacLellan(00053)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00053/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00054)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00054/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Mary Richmond(00055)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00055/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00056)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00056/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00057)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00057/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00059/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Vicki Fraser(00060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00060/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00062)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00062/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00063)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00063/1/002	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	To The Occupier(00064)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00064/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Valerie Grant(00065)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00065/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00066)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00066/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Mr Brian Ashman(00067)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00067/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00068/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00069)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00069/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	G. Mackie(00070)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00070/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00071/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00072)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00072/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Stuart Mackenzie(00073)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00073/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Derek Adams(00074)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00074/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00075)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00075/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00076)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00076/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(00077)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00077/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/049	Inverness H35ABC	Supports non preference for site because of badger habitat and woodland constraints.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/083	Inverness H35ABC	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that development should be set-back from the watercourse. Drainage considerations to prevent increased risk from inadequate drainage off-site, and no increase in flows to watercourse in light of FPS, in consultation with Highland Council. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application if development encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Mr John Richmond(00898)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00898/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preference of site H35a, b and c as it would take away existing recreational land, disturb established trees and detract from the view of existing properties	
Inverness	Inverness Civic Trust(01064)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01064/2/002	Inverness H35ABC	Support Council's preference for non-allocation of H35 a,b c	
Inverness	Ms Paule Mackay(01109)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01109/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(01118)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01118/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	
Inverness	To The Occupier(01122)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01122/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H35A, B and C for the following reasons:- the residents of Slackbuie Way bought their houses on the clear understanding the golf course would continue to be a golf course. Many owners were charged more for golf course views.- it should remain as allocated leisure land use as it is an important open space- residents are concerned as Fairways Leisure have already undertaken works without planning consent.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Dr And Mrs Pumford(01282)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01282/1/003	Inverness H35ABC	Supports non-preference of sites because development will: cause severance to the golf course; undermine its playability and ultimately its existence as a golf course; lead to a further erosion of this green corridor which is used by deer, birdlife and hares; undermine one of only two significant greenspaces on this flank of the City; undermine the recreational and amenity value of the golf course area; reduce land available for flood storage and attenuation; not add to the range of tourist facilities in the area given chalets have already been approved here; turn Druid Temple Way into a through road when it was designed as a cul-de-sac, and; falsely justify the recent removal of access routes and trees.	
Inverness	Ms Jean Ferguson(01298)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01298/1/001	Inverness H35ABC	Respondent wishes to be informed of progress for these sites.	
Inverness	Fairways Leisure Group Ltd(01195)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01195/1/001	Inverness H35C	Object to H35c not being preferred for housing use in the MIR.Acknowledges cons listed in MIR. Notes the for sites submission split H35c into two sites – development area 1 and development area 2. Intention was for these sites to create small clusters of lodges distributed throughout a landscaped buffer as a holiday golf village. Would ensure the openness and wooded corridor of the Ault-na-skiach burn is maintained.Each development area would have a separate access and each lodge would have a golf cart to allow direct access to the course. Notes the sites lie within a green wedge however considers development that complements the golf course would help safeguard its future. Furthermore the development would enhance the depth of the service offered, provide additional financial security and local job opportunities.Application for planning permission in principle has been submitted for development area 1.	Allocation of H35c in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/049	Inverness H36	Supports non preference for site because of badger habitat and woodland constraints.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/084	Inverness H36	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. No FRA required provided development set back from watercourse in line with SG. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application if development encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Mr Dereck Mackenzie(00678)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00678/1/001	Inverness H36	Objects to non-preferral of site because: a feasible and suitable access can be formed through the Tulloch new housing development to the east; the proposed new access would also offer more pedestrian / cycle connectivity; a suitable connection with General Wade's Road could be formed; another access could be formed through Fairways golf course if the Council were minded to agree further development within it; badger impacts can be surveyed and mitigated and are not an over-riding constraint; existing woodland can be safeguarded by a 20m protection zone; open space can be provided within the site which does not form part of any functional green wedge; H49 is preferred despite its greater green wedge impact; it has an attractive outlook; it is close to expanding community and commercial facilities; it will add housing choice and help consolidate the city in keeping with the Plan's strategy, and; watercourse issues can be controlled at development management stage.	Retention of site for housing within Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/085	Inverness H38	SEPA will not object provided development set back from watercourse in line with SG. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application and if development encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/086	Inverness H40	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an adverse impact on the developable area or options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of a planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/088	Inverness H41	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan. Text 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 will be required in support of planning application if development encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/087	Inverness H43	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan. Text 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 will be required in support of planning application if development encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed.	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
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/089	Inverness H44	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan. Text 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 will be required in support of planning application if development encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Donald Macintosh(00502)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00502/4/001	Inverness H46	Objects to the non-preference of their land, Site H46, for housing.The respondent refers to pros and cons identified by the Council in respect of the site option, reading it that although the size of the site is treated as a positive it is deemed not to be in the Council's preferred areas as it is of itself too small to merit an allocation.The respondent wishes their site to be allocated for residential development. Reasons stated in support include:- the neighbouring fields have been zoned for housing and it would be appropriate to incorporate his land into that;- the new road to service these potential future developments is likely to run along the boundaries of his property (plan provided) which suggests that his land is even more suitable for development.	Allocation of Site H46 for housing development.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/090	Inverness H47	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. C	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Mr Allan Hunter(01152)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01152/1/003	Inverness H48	Questions what the status of H48 is in planning terms	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/050	Inverness H49	Concerns about adverse impacts in terms of badgers, woodland, loss of rural landscape character and loss of City setting. Suggests a masterplanning approach needs to be taken to address landscape character impact and to incorporate mitigation in terms of retention and creation of green networks.	Developer requirements for masterplanning process to address landscape character impacts and to retain and create green networks to address woodland, badger and other natural heritage interests.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/004	Inverness H49	Respondent considers development at H49 would have an adverse impact on the landscape. Development at H49 would be unsightly and detached from retail and recreational facilities.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/091	Inverness H49	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state that FRA required to ensure that the small watercourses will be managed within the site layout adequately, and that there will be no increase in flows downstream of the site as a result of any development. Careful management of surface water drainage required. 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.
Inverness	Welltown Farm(00768)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00768/1/001	Inverness H49	Llandowners support the preferred status of H49 and states that the other landowner wishes that the allocated area is adjusted to align with existing boundaries and ownership. It is envisaged that access can be taken from the existing roundabout, next to the overhead power lines at Milton of Leys.	The extension of site H49 to include ownership boundaries
Inverness	Mr Brian Grant(00769)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00769/3/001	Inverness H49	Landowners of Welltown Farm and Druid Temple Farm wish thier land to be allocated for development and seeks extension of the site boudary on the southern and eastern extents to align with their existing boundaries and ownership. Vehicular access expected from Milton of Leys from the existing roundabout. Considers allocation would reinforce the role of the south eastern part of Inverness as residential area which is well served by local amenities and which benefits from an attractive outlook. Consider that the location of this site beside 2 preferred sites for business and commerce to the east (B6 and B7) would assist with 2 key aims of the stated vision and spatial strategy i.E. Increased the number of jobs, people and facilities; and a growing city.Considered that this scale of land release would make a positive contribution to housing choice. The location beside proposed business and commercial areas is considered to have the potential to minimise the need to travel; with this assisting in targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.The 2 landowners of this site state that they are keen to work together and with the Council to ensure that this site is deliverable within the lifetime of the plan. The landowners would be happy to work with the Council to address access and any other infrastructure issues deemed necessary.	Allocation and extension of H49 in Proposed Plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Inverness Estates(00944)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00944/3/001	Inverness H49	Landowner seek the identification of H49 for future release (beyond the current LDP period) with the interim allocation for residential development of site B7 (and parts of B6) with the development of B7 providing an access route for the future development of part of H49. Landowner concerned about proper planning of the area as a whole, both on the scale and within the timescale envisaged which is the period of five years from the adoption of the LDP up to 2019/2020. Understands that identification of H49 is partly driven by the perceived 'need' to provide additional housing development opportunities to 'support' (or make viable) local shops and community facilities within the Milton of Leys area. It is submitted that the scale and nature of H49 is an inappropriate response to this 'need'. Inverness Estates consider that the proposed housing allocation within the Milton of Leys lands at B6 and B7 would represent a far more appropriate response. Concerned about the likely costs of the infrastructure, the proximity to the designed landscape, and that obtaining access would be a significant issue. Thinks that H49 offers no significant advantages over the sites which are being alternatively promoted (B6 and B7) in terms of proximity to the Milton of Leys neighbourhood centre.	Landowner seek the identification of H49 for future release (beyond the current LDP period) with the interim allocation for residential development of site B7 (and parts of B6) with the development of B7 providing an access route for the future development of part of H49.
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/025	Inverness H49	Historic Scotland state that developer requirements should note the need to consider the setting of Leys Castle and its designed landscape and the scheduled monument Druid Temple Farm, chambered cairn and stone circle 230m WSW of (Index no. 2417) in close proximity to northern boundary of allocation.	Developer requirements should note the need to consider historical features in surrounding area
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/003	Inverness H49	Questions why additional housing sites, particularly H15 and H49, have been identified when Council stated in responses to the HwLDP that "there is no shortfall of effective housing land within Inverness City". Inconsistent that H15 and H49 are preferred for development when H12a-c and H13 are not. Considers that significant cons listed in MIR against H12a-c and H13 are equally applicable to H15 and H49 as they are both in the countryside and on land currently identified as green wedges in the Inverness Local Plan. Furthermore, both areas are active working farms outwith the urban edge and are large and potentially very obtrusive site thus having significant landscape and visual impacts. Considers H12 and H13 are well contained in the landscape by their wooded margins and as such are very secluded and unobtrusive; do not intrude into open land; are not part of a working farm and would follow the precedent already set of allowing some development within this landscape without detriment to the setting of the urban edge. If the Council continues to support sites H15 and H49 in the Proposed Plan there is justification for including sites H12 and H13. However, in terms of their small scale and minimal impact on the setting of the urban edge of the city, sites H12 and H13 also stand on their own merits.	Allocation of H12a-c and H13 for housing in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Cardrona Charitable Trust(00988)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00988/1/002	Inverness H49	Objects to Preferred status of H15 as: - Council argued at HwLDP Examination that there was no shortfall in the housing land supply for the City; - it is part of designated green wedge; - it is part of a working farm; - the Leys site suffers from visual prominence and poor microclimate due to higher elevation, and; - the site is not close to and will not therefore support a neighbourhood/district centre	Non-retention of H15 and H49 in Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/012	Inverness H49	H49 seems unnecessary and too large considering the existing land available for development, that it is quite a high and prominent area in the city's landscape.	Non-allocation of H49 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Dr And Mrs Pumford(01282)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01282/1/002	Inverness H49	Object to allocation because it: is of excessive scale compared to Milton of Leys neighbourhood; is not needed given existing allocations and permissions; is presently greenfield; may cause flood risk problems which would necessitate the extension of the flood relief channel; would be a soulless place without proper amenities and facilities at least for an initial 10-15 year period like Milton of Leys, and; the existing road network cannot accommodate a public transport route.	Non retention of site within Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/011	Inverness H50	Supports non-preference of sites H50 and H51. Does not want this agricultural land used for housing and endorses significant cons listed in MIR.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/092	Inverness H50	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Cairnlaw Burn runs close to the boundary of the site. The water body is currently at moderate morphological status and is therefore a priority for restoration. Realignment, culverts and loss of riparian vegetation are the main pressures contributing to moderate status. The burn through the site and along the boundary does not appear to have been significantly modified. Development of the site should therefore allow for protection of the current watercourse and allow space for future development of natural processes.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/011	Inverness H51	Supports non-preference of sites H50 and H51. Does not want this agricultural land used for housing and endorses significant cons listed in MIR.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/093	Inverness H51	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text 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. Cairnlaw Burn runs through and along the boundary of the site. The water body is currently at moderate morphological status and is therefore a priority for restoration. Realignment, culverts and loss of riparian vegetation are the main pressures contributing to moderate status. The burn through the site and along the boundary does not appear to have been significantly modified. Development of the site should therefore allow for protection of the current watercourse and allow space for future development of natural processes.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Rizza(01006)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01006/1/001	Inverness H51	Objects to non-preferred status of H51 and requests that some level of housing land is allocated outwith the immediate city boundary and into the city fringes as some people do not wish to live within housing estates by mainstream developers. Appropriate for an allocation at H51 for 3 houses given the pattern and scale of existing developments within a 200m radius. Access and servicing is possible.	Allocation of site H51 for small scale housing development.
Inverness	Mr Michael Gillespie(01090)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01090/1/001	Inverness H51	Objects to non-preferred status of H51 because: a dense tree screen can be planted within the site on the A9 frontage to prevent any visibility or noise issues; houses would be fitted with triple glazing to mitigate noise issue; houses would be detached and therefore fit existing settlement pattern; the site would meet an unmet city demand for large detached houses on large plots, and; there is already a precedent for similar development in close proximity to the site.	Retention of site H51 within Proposed Plan for housing.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/008	Inverness H52A	Supports non-preferred status of H52A and H53. Does not want this agricultural land to be used for housing. Endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/009	Inverness H52B	Objects to non-preference of site H52b. Does not want this agricultural land to be used for housing. Endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/008	Inverness H53	Supports non-preferred status of H52A and H53. Does not want this agricultural land to be used for housing. Endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/012	Inverness H54	Objects to preferred status of H54. Does not want this agricultural land used for housing and endorses significant cons listed in MIR. Unclear why this area is not usable public open space as it appears to already be part of a larger open space/woodland.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/094	Inverness H55	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that a FRA has already been carried out for part of site but would need to be extended and development must be in accordance with FRA recommendations previously accepted. Cairnlaw Burn runs adjacent to the site. The waterbody is currently at moderate morphological status and is therefore a priority for restoration. There appears to be a buffer strip left between the site boundary and the water course. This is likely to be sufficient to allow for future restoration and development of natural processes but this should still be considered during planning of the development. There are also small historically straightened watercourses adjacent to the site boundary and running through the site. A buffer strip appears to have been left to the watercourse adjacent to the boundary which is likely to be sufficient to allow for restoration and development of natural processes. The developer requirements should seek to ensure that these buffers are maintained.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Mr And Mrs MacNeill(00935)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00935/1/002	Inverness H55	Support Council's preference for supporting housing development on H55 and H56 as they are on the east side of Inverness, don't appear to impinge upon existing local residents and are close to existing infrastructure and facilities.	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/028	Inverness H55	These allocations have the potential to impact on the scheduled monument Ashton Farm Cottages, ring ditch 415m SW and pit circles 460m WSW of (Index no. 11535). Historic Scotland (HS) would wish to continue to be involved in discussions with the Council, Transport Scotland and others stakeholder regarding the potential impacts on this site from development here and works associated with the A96. HS would therefore ask for the developer requirements to reflect this.	Seeks developer requirement to reflect that HS wish to continue to be involved in discussions with the Council, Transport Scotland and others stakeholder regarding the potential impacts on the scheduled monument Ashton farm Cottages
Inverness	Highland And Island Enterprise(01035)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01035/1/003	Inverness H55	Supports allocation for housing use but disagree with Council's cons list for this site. Believes loss of prime farmland not significant. Accepts East Link dependency but calls on Plan to help deliver road improvements in this area. Believes proximity to railway and East Link can be mitigated by good layout and design.	No significant farmland or road/rail setbacks in Proposed Plan. Action programme and Plan to indicate how East Link and associated roads will be delivered (all assumed).

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/095	Inverness H56	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state that development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on the developable area or layout options. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application. Cairnlaw Burn runs through and along the boundary of the site. The water body is currently at moderate morphological status and is therefore a priority for restoration. Realignment, culverts and loss of riparian vegetation are the main pressures contributing to moderate status. The burn through the site and along the boundary has been historically straightened. 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 quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also an historically straightened minor watercourse running along the boundary of the site. Restoration could be tied into restoration of the Cairnlaw Burn as part of the development but at the very least space should be allowed for restoration and development of natural processes in future.	
Inverness	Mr And Mrs MacNeill(00935)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00935/1/002	Inverness H56	Support Council's preference for supporting housing development on H55 and H56 as they are on the east side of Inverness, don't appear to impinge upon existing local residents and are close to existing infrastructure and facilities.	
Inverness	Mr Fraser Hutcheson(00986)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00986/1/001	Inverness H56	Supports preference for housing development on H56. Raises number of concerns regarding servicing and phasing of development relative to the provisions of the HwLDP and lack clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network in the area. Concerned about the route of the A9-A96 due to connectivity of H56 with adjoining development plan, its deliverability and the nature of major junctions with the A9 and A96. Not clear whether Strategic Link Road has to be completed in its entirety in advance of commencing Phase 2 of East Inverness. If this is the case, question if the section through Ashton Farm can be completed when it is identified as open space (C13) and likely to remain in agricultural use for the foreseeable future. In the consultation conducted by Transport Scotland on the east link in early 2012 there was an absence of detail about timing of provision of local road connections and improvements required to open up development land north of the railway at Cradlehall. Vital that this opportunity is not land-locked or hindered by the uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. Separate representations to Transport Scotland have been made about connectivity right across the East Inverness area. In the absence of clarity over access to the proposed trunk road link and local future local road network developers will be reluctant to show interest and commit to financial contributions to road proposals at H56. On the basis of Transport Scotland's draft options there are strong reservations about being involved in the development of the East Inverness area. Landowner seeks clarity about how H56 will be accessed for development purposes and therefore whether it is worth while making the site available for development. Transport Scotland has so far failed to do this. As such, call upon the Council to provide clear development guidance through the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.	Proposed Plan to provide clarity on A9-A96 link in terms of route, junctions, timing and level of developer contributions
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/001	Inverness H57	Objects to preference of MU29 and MU28, objects to non-preference of C13 and supports non-preference of site H57. Respondent objects to the expansion of East Inverness in particular these 4 sites and land to the north west of H57. Concerns raised in response to the HwLDP remain unchanged. Westhill, Resaurie, Smithton and Culloden are large predominately residential areas with very little "on the doorstep" accessible open space compared to other parts of Inverness. The plan needs to provide for a large public open space including parkland, an arboretum, playgrounds, allotments etc. The Council should establish this and not wait for developers' speculative proposals and timetables.	Removal of MU28 and MU29 and requests retention of C13.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/096	Inverness H57	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on developable area or layout options. Cairnlaw Burn runs along the boundary of the site. The water body is currently at moderate morphological status and is therefore a priority for restoration. Realignment, culverts and loss of riparian vegetation are the main pressures contributing to moderate status. At least part of the burn along the boundary has been historically straightened. 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 quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also an historically straightened minor watercourse running through the site. Restoration could be tied into restoration of the Cairnlaw Burn as part of the development but at the very least space should be allowed for restoration and development of natural processes in future.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Norah Munro(00600)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00600/1/001	Inverness H57	Objects to non-preferred status of H57. Differing view from the presentation given in the MIR of site options and preferences for Ashton Farm. The Executors remain committed to the development as outlined in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework with the mixed housing and commercial elements. They would wish to see future plans reflect this and to be within the phasing as outlined (in the framework) and are concerned that the current plans (MIR) have no allocation of development opportunities to the Ashton Farm site. The farm being surrounded by various developments (Inverness Retail Park, Beechwood Campus and Stratton mixed use) together with the planned trunk road alignment would make it impossible to continue both practically and profitably as a non-developed farming unit. Ensuring that the unit remains accessible, and part of a coherent phased development for the A96 Corridor remain key.	Allocate land at Ashton Farm for phased development of housing and commercial uses and ensure that access is maintained for the farming unit and for development.
Inverness	Mr And Mrs MacKintosh(00945)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00945/1/001	Inverness H57	The inclusion of development land at Seafield of Raigmore for development post 2031 conflicts with the A96 Corridor Development Framework. The land is considered by the landowner to be immediately available and puzzled that land in the heart of the East Inverness area is phased for later development. This late phasing will also adversely effect neighbouring land at Ashton Farm, with whom this land could be brought forward at an earlier date..	Change of phasing to make land available at an earlier date.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/008	Inverness H59	Large scale extension of Inverness to the east is not desirable, again diverting resources from other areas and producing along ribbon of development that will overburden infrastructure in this part of the region. We therefore we oppose allocations H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30 in Inverness, although the smaller 'infill' allocations can be supported.	Removal of site allocations at H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/097	Inverness H59	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the northern quarter of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on the developable area or layout options.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Macdonald Hotels(00985)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00985/1/001	Inverness H59	Landowner supports the continued allocation of Stratton Lodge land (H59 and MU29) as preferred sites but has some concerns:- Servicing and phasing of the development relative to the HwLDP provisions. A Significant Con of the site has been noted as its dependency on "local and trunk road network" and although the HwLDP states various provisions, the respondent has concerns that these depend on actions of others. As a result the restoration of Stratton Lodge Hotel (H59) will be delayed whilst the commitments are made. - Although the landowner accepts the requirement of the link between A9 and A96, they are concerned about its route, the connectivity between their land and adjoining development sites, its deliverability and the detail of the major junctions. Respondent unsure whether the Strategic Link Road has to be completed in its entirety in advance of Phase 2. If so, respondent questions the ability to deliver it through Ashton Farm as it is allocated as Open Space (C13) and is likely to remain in agricultural use for some time. - Main concern is the need to upgrade Barn Church Road in advance of respondent's land being developed. - H59 is indicated as Phase 1 in HwLDP but respondent concerned this may not be feasible without allowing access through the open part of their land as indicated in Phase 2. A preferred means of access is outlined in the attached map.- Lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network. The consultation in early 2012 was absent of detail about the timing of the provision of local connections and improvements required to open up land at Stratton. Respondent argues that this opportunity should not be land-locked or hindered by uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. As a result respondent would prefer the open part of land to be separated out (as it is in terms of ownership) from MU29 and shown as a housing site.	Respondent would prefer the open part of land to be separated out (as it is in terms of ownership) from MU29 and shown as a housing site.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/098	Inverness H60	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on developable area or layout options. FRA should also address drainage to ensure no impacts off-site.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/4/001	Inverness H62	Supports site H62 for housing development. Site has planning permission.	
Inverness	Mr W Macleod(00013)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00013/1/001	Inverness H63	Supports the Council's non-preference for development on sites H63 and H64 for the following reasons:- Encroachment into the hinterland;- Do not represent filling in or rounding off opportunities;- Culloden woods provides excellent natural boundary to built development;- Significant development would be out of keeping with surrounding area;- Difficulties of providing a safe access;- Poor drainage, particularly on site H64; and- Understand H63 lies within the Inventory Boundary for Culloden Battlefield which must be protected .	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/007	Inverness H63	Supports non-preference of sites H63 and H64 as they impact upon Culloden Muir. Endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/001	Inverness H63	Support non-preference of H63 and H64 for the following reasons:-Distance from existing community-Lack of facilities-Increase traffic on already busy road-Urban sprawl in the countryside-Use of good agricultural land-Close to or within battlefield area-Increase pressure on schools	
Inverness	Mr Jim Cockburn(00897)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00897/1/001	Inverness H63	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites and considers that nothing has happened that should alter the Council's opinion towards their suitability and that the issues remain the same, i.e. surface water drainage, and the road network. Also mentioned is the landscape impact as it is considered an intrusion into the countryside as these sites lie beyond the Culloden Forest which provides a natural separation from the urban development to the countryside. Also of concern to is that H63 lies within the revised Inventory boundary for Culloden Battlefield which needs to be protected.	
Inverness	Mrs J Mackinnon(00924)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00924/1/001	Inverness H63	Supports Council's preference for no housing development on H63 and H64 as the area already has serious flooding problems which would be made worse by development of the site and the narrow road to the battlefield is unsuitable.	
Inverness	Mr John McAuslane(00934)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00934/1/001	Inverness H63	Respondent endorses the points made in Mr J Cockburns and suggests that the Council opposes development on H63 and H64 despite proposals being for both sides of the Balloch/Culloden Road at Viewhill. Considers that development of any prime agricultural land within the extended boundary of Culloden Battlefield would be resisted anyway.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr And Mrs MacNeill(00935)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00935/1/001	Inverness H63	Support Council's preference to not support housing development on H63 and H64. Preference is for H63 and H64 to be retained as open space. Do not support housing development on H63 and H64 for the following reasons:-Negative impact upon current residents attractive rural outlook;-Agree with significant cons listed in MIR, particularly breach into open countryside and impact upon Culloden Battlefield- Additional cons are road safety for pedestrians and surface water drainage, an issues that has been raised in a recent nearby planning application	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/037	Inverness H63	These allocations all lie within or partly within the Culloden Inventory Battlefield site, Historic Scotland therefore welcome that these sites are not preferred by the Council.	
Inverness	Inverness Properties(01023)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01023/1/001	Inverness H63	Objects to the non-preferred status of H63, Inverness for the following reasons:- land has been identified as having 17ha of potential housing, 0.2ha of community space and 1.5ha for open space- Balloch has been identified as 'homogenous' in the Local Plan and needs housing mix and open space. The proposed development would provide a more sustainable neighbourhood by adding choice of housing while also providing community facilities, and public transport.- is part of Viewhill Farm that has been acquired for development.- More housing would help support local facilities and services- The development does not depend on major infrastructure investment- Has the potential to be linked to development site east of Culloden Road (Viewhill east) to give critical mass and as part of a integrated Masterplan- The site adjoins an existing urban neighbourhood and contribute to the A96 development corridor. As a result it is not likely to have any major impact on established movement patterns.- Access would be taken from C1028 and due to improved junction, increased visibility etc will result in the road becoming much safer.- The site can be appropriately serviced- Adjoins existing houses at Viewhill- Sporadic housing is common in the area and the juxtaposition of development either side of the forest is an asset rather than a constraint. - The land is not important in separating Balloch from existing neighbourhood, i.E. Coalescence- The site is well screened from the B9006 - Council and Historic Scotland's policy is not against development in principle on Culloden BattlefieldRespondent's additional submission outlines a larger, 24ha site and emphasises that the development of H63 would meet the urban structure and neighbourhood characteristics identified in the Local Plan.	Seeks that H63 is allocated for housing use.
Inverness	Mr W Macleod(00013)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00013/1/001	Inverness H64	Supports the Council's non-preference for development on sites H63 and H64 for the following reasons:- Encroachment into the hinterland;- Do not represent filling in or rounding off opportunities;- Culloden woods provides excellent natural boundary to built development;- Significant development would be out of keeping with surrounding area;- Difficulties of providing a safe access;- Poor drainage, particularly on site H64; and- Understand H63 lies within the Inventory Boundary for Culloden Battlefield which must be protected .	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/007	Inverness H64	Supports non-preference of sites H63 and H64 as they impact upon Culloden Muir. Endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/001	Inverness H64	Support non-preference of H63 and H64 for the following reasons:-Distance from existing community- Lack of facilities-Increase traffic on already busy road-Urban sprawl in the countryside-Use of good agricultural land-Close to or within battlefield area-Increase pressure on schools	
Inverness	Mr Jim Cockburn(00897)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00897/1/001	Inverness H64	Supports the Councils non preference of these sites and considers that nothing has happened that should alter the Council's opinion towards their suitability and that the issues remain the same, i.e. surface water drainage, and the road network. Also mentioned is the landscape impact as it is considered an intrusion into the countryside as these sites lie beyond the Culloden Froest which provides a natural separation from the urban development to the countryside. Also of concern to is that H63 lies within the revised Inventory boundary for Culloden Battlefield which needs to be protected.	
Inverness	Mrs J Mackinnon(00924)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00924/1/001	Inverness H64	Supports Council's preference for no housing development on H63 and H64 as the area already has serious flooding problems which would be made worse by development of the site and the narrow road to the battlefield is unsuitable.	
Inverness	Mr John McAuslane(00934)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00934/1/001	Inverness H64	Respondent endorses the points made in Mr J Cockburns and suggests that the Council opposes development on H63 and H64 despite proposals being for both sides of the Balloch/Culloden Road at Viewhill. Considers that development of any prime agricultural land within the extended boundary of Culloden Battlefield would be resisted anyway.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr And Mrs MacNeill(00935)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00935/1/001	Inverness H64	Support Council's preference to not support housing development on H63 and H64. Preference is for H63 and H64 to be retained as open space. Do not support housing development on H63 and H64 for the following reasons:-Negative impact upon current residents attractive rural outlook;-Agree with significant cons listed in MIR, particularly breach into open countryside and impact upon Culloden Battlefield- Additional cons are road safety for pedestrians and surface water drainage, an issues that has been raised in a recent nearby planning application	
Inverness	Mr W Cameron(01026)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01026/1/001	Inverness H64	Landownerto Open Space allocation for the following reasons- it has no purpose as open space being unremarkable and hardly visible and therefore insignificant in landscape terms - no overriding physical, infrastructure or amenity constraints - would be accessible to the city's services, employment and transport systems and to the evolving A96 economic development corridor- not likely to generate any significant change to the established patterns of movement; and is linked directly to the expanding network of Core Paths - close to existing development at Viewhill and is located in a setting that embraces sporadic housing, includes a strong treed edge to southern margin and is within city altitude limits- discrete in landscape terms outwith the Battlefield Inventory and not prominent either from the existing neighbourhood, recreation routes and attractions, or the road network - well outwith the Battlefield Conservation Area and the Proposed Conservation Area extension as referred in the Inverness Local Plan- could extend the supply of land for expansion of the City not dependent on major infrastructure investment, and support local education and community facilities and give critical mass along with H63 (although not dependent on H63) - would improve accessibility to facilities for a large part of the existing community at Balloch and would function with an established urban neighbourhood	Landowner seeks allocation of land for housing in Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Mr W Cameron(01026)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01026/1/002	Inverness H64	The Landowner's proposal - includes a commitment to providing an integrated masterplan, including landscape framework- would address deficiencies in the C1028 Culloden road including an improved junction arrangement, possibly localised widening/traffic management and improved pedestrian access to and from Balloch- involves the allocation of 4.5 ha. Of land for 45 dwellings with potential for allotment plots- retains the Call for Sites proposal as a preference, but considers that scope exists to consider a lower density of paddock/allotment plots - could help contribute towards a better balanced and address deficiency in housing mix through affordable provision	The landowner seeks the allocation of this land for housing preferring their call for sites proposal but offering 4.5 ha. Of land for 45 dwellings with potential for allotment plots.
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/037	Inverness H65	These allocations all lie within or partly within the Culloden Inventory Battlefield site, Historic Scotland therefore welcome that these sites are not preferred by the Council.	
Inverness	Mackay(01005)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01005/1/002	Inverness H65	Objects to the non-preferred status of H65. In response to the Significant Cons, although the respondent accepts that it is outwith the city boundary the site is attached to the existing settlement at Leanach crossroads which has over a dozen dwellings at present. The site would also benefit from- forming a balanced appearance on the main south west public road from Leanach;- being accessed and serviced without any cost to the Council;- being located within 200m walking distance of the Keppoch Inn and Restaurant which is extending its dining facility at present; and- easy walking distance to the Culloden Battlefield facility which operates a catering facility during the much quieter winter months.	Seeks H65 to be allocated for housing.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/099	Inverness H67	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on developable area or layout options. FRA should also address drainage to ensure no impacts off-site.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/005	Inverness H68	Supports non-preference of sites H68, H70, H71, H72 and H73. Supports settlement boundary not being breached and endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Marr(01007)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01007/1/001	Inverness H68	Objecting to the non-preference of the site H68 as well as objecting to it being shown as a housing allocation. The respondent suggested the site during the call for sites stage and requested it to be shown as a low-density high amenity holiday chalet development run in conjunction with the Tower and not main stream housing. Respondent feels the pros and cons listed are not accurate. For pros no mention is made of the existing services available on site including existing vehicular access onto the Culloden Road. For cons, the land has only flooded in the past when the burn has been blocked with debris from Upper Muckovie land and overspill water running through that farmland. The SEPA flood maps do not show any reference to the site. The land is planted along the south eastern boundary and natural cover along the other boundaries along with future boundary planting means there is not much key vista from the site. A limited vista from the public road is only available beyond the entrance to the land proposed for the chalet development and as that would be located on the higher part of the field any of the proposed development would have no effect on vista. The comment on local road capacity being limited is not understood by the respondent as other developments could have far larger vehicular traffic movements for example the development at site B11. The respondent feels that a small scale high quality chalet development run in conjunction with the Tower property as a small scale business development would not be out of place with the recently approved holiday development at the adjacent Easter Muckovie (site B11).	Retention of H68 as housing use (holiday lets)
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/004	Inverness H69	Supports non-preference of H69. Does not want this agricultural area used for housing. Endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Mr Mark Hornby(00414)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00414/1/001	Inverness H69	Supports non-preference of H69 for following reasons:- an intrusion into undeveloped fields which have been safeguarded from development by the Council through the Firthview-Woodside Development Brief (2003) particularly paragraph 6.18.- adverse visual impact on a designated Highland Tourist Route (B9006) to Culloden Battlefield and obstruct views towards Black Isle, Ben Wyvis and beyond.- Sufficient capacity for housing within existing Inverness city allocations and proposed A96 corridor to meet forecasted housing demand. Site is unnecessary and would further erode the green belt around Inverness.- Would not make "efficient use of available development land" therefore contrary to the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Development would be unrelated to the existing development pattern which is progressively less dense as you go up the hill ending in open fields.- Would not "demonstrate sensitive siting". Would have an adverse impact on landscape and scenery contrary to Policy 28 in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. Development would be exposed to the elements thus eschewing the energy efficient "passive design" promoted by the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Within the area covered by the Council's Badger Policy Guidance; development may damage and/or disturb badger setts and/or foraging areas. Inverness and Nairn Local Biodiversity Action Plan states that the area around Inverness city supports a significant population of badgers. Policies 59 and 60 Highland-wide Local Development Plan also relevant.- Would not conserve or enhance wider green network, contrary to the Council's Interim Supplementary Guidance on Green Networks and Scottish Planning Policy. Would set a precedent for further ad hoc development on city fringe and eroding green networks.	
Inverness	Councillor Jim Crawford(00556)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00556/1/001	Inverness H69	Respondent supports the non-preference of housing development on H69. Notes the four Councillors for Ward 20 requested area to be protected from development in the HwLDP. Respondent agrees with representation ref. 01141. Notes field east of H69 (assumed to be MU32) is causing great concern. Understands it is being promoted for housing. Have been attempts to establish the Culloden path through this field but understand the owners permission will be required, despite the existing indication from the Council that no development should take place. Understood the site impinges upon the Battlefield boundary and has contacted the Council's Conservation Officer to establish if the law permits development in such locations.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr Stephen And Beverley Chalmers(00700)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00700/1/001	Inverness H69	Supports non-preference of H69 for following reasons:- an intrusion into undeveloped fields which have been safeguarded from development by the Council through the Firthview-Woodside Development Brief (2003) particularly paragraph 6.18.- adverse visual impact on a designated Highland Tourist Route (B9006) to Culloden Battlefield and obstruct views towards Black Isle, Ben Wyvis and beyond.- Sufficient capacity for housing within existing Inverness city allocations and proposed A96 corridor to meet forecasted housing demand. Site is unnecessary and would further erode the green belt around Inverness.- Would not make "efficient use of available development land" therefore contrary to the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Development would be unrelated to the existing development pattern which is progressively less dense as you go up the hill ending in open fields.- Would not "demonstrate sensitive siting". Would have an adverse impact on landscape and scenery contrary to Policy 28 in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. Development would be exposed to the elements thus eschewing the energy efficient "passive design" promoted by the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Within the area covered by the Council's Badger Policy Guidance; development may damage and/or disturb badger setts and/or foraging areas. Inverness and Nairn Local Biodiversity Action Plan states that the area around Inverness city supports a significant population of badgers. Policies 59 and 60 Highland-wide Local Development Plan also relevant.- Would not conserve or enhance wider green network, contrary to the Council's Interim Supplementary Guidance on Green Networks and Scottish Planning Policy. Would set a precedent for further ad hoc development on city fringe and eroding green networks.	
Inverness	Mr And Mrs S Robertson(00928)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00928/1/001	Inverness H69	Supports the Council preference for no housing development on H69 for the following reasons:- Would be an intrusion into previously undeveloped fields;- The Council's Firthview-Woodside Development Brief presumes against development in this area to allow open views from the B9006;- Adverse visual impact on views Highland Tourist Route and views to Black Isle, Ben Wyvis and beyond;- Existing housing allocations on A96 corridor are more than sufficient to accommodate future housing needs;- Allocation of site contrary to the Council's Sustainable Design Guide as it would not make efficient use of available development land given scale of existing allocations and would be heavily exposed to the elements;- Development would be unrelated to existing development patterns;- Would not demonstrate sensitive siting contrary to HwLDP Policy 28;- Included within area of the Council's badger policy guidance, therefore may damage and/or disturb badger setts and/or badger foraging areas – development could be contrary to Biodiversity Action Plan and Policy 59 and 60 of the HwLDP;- Will not conserve or enhance the sites role within the wider green network, contrary to Council's SG on Green Networks and SPP, instead would lead to a significant loss of open, green space;- Would set a precedent for further ad-hoc developments along city fringe, eroding green networks and intruding into the protected hinterland of the city; and- Detrimental affect on exclusivity of Heights of Woodside housing estate and thus a very worrying negative impact on current housing valuations.	
Inverness	Dr Ken Oates(01011)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01011/1/001	Inverness H69	Supports the non-preferred status of site H69 for the following reasons:- development would be an intrusion into previously undeveloped land- development on site H69 would have an adverse visual impact on a designated tourist route and obstruct views towards the Black Isle, Ben Wyvis and beyond;- there is sufficient capacity to meet housing needs within existing allocations;- the site would not accord with the Highland Council's Sustainable Design Guide in terms of efficient use of available development land;- development on this site would not demonstrate sensitive siting and would not accord with Policy 28 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan;- development on this site may effect local badger populations and be contrary to the HC Badger Policy Guidance Note and Policy 59 and 60 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan;- development of the site would not contribute to the green network;-there is insufficient drainage infrastructure in the area and development of this site may lead to further flooding in east Inverness.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr And Mrs MacDougall(01140)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01140/1/001	Inverness H69	Supports non-preference of H69 for following reasons:- an intrusion into undeveloped fields which have been safeguarded from development by the Council through the Firthview-Woodside Development Brief (2003) particularly paragraph 6.18.- adverse visual impact on a designated Highland Tourist Route (B9006) to Culloden Battlefield and obstruct views towards Black Isle, Ben Wyvis and beyond.- Sufficient capacity for housing within existing Inverness city allocations and proposed A96 corridor to meet forecasted housing demand. Site is unnecessary and would further erode the green belt around Inverness.- Would not make "efficient use of available development land" therefore contrary to the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Development would be unrelated to the existing development pattern which is progressively less dense as you go up the hill ending in open fields.- Would not "demonstrate sensitive siting". Would have an adverse impact on landscape and scenery contrary to Policy 28 in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. Development would be exposed to the elements thus eschewing the energy efficient "passive design" promoted by the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Within the area covered by the Council's Badger Policy Guidance; development may damage and/or disturb badger setts and/or foraging areas. Inverness and Nairn Local Biodiversity Action Plan states that the area around Inverness city supports a significant population of badgers. Policies 59 and 60 Highland-wide Local Development Plan also relevant.- Would not conserve or enhance wider green network, contrary to the Council's Interim Supplementary Guidance on Green Networks and Scottish Planning Policy. Would set a precedent for further ad hoc development on city fringe and eroding green networks.	
Inverness	Mr Malcolm A Macleod(01141)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01141/1/001	Inverness H69	Supports non-preference of H69 for following reasons:- an intrusion into undeveloped fields which have been safeguarded from development by the Council through the Firthview-Woodside Development Brief (2003) particularly paragraph 6.18.- adverse visual impact on a designated Highland Tourist Route (B9006) to Culloden Battlefield and obstruct views towards Black Isle, Ben Wyvis and beyond.- Sufficient capacity for housing within existing Inverness city allocations and proposed A96 corridor to meet forecasted housing demand. Site is unnecessary and would further erode the green belt around Inverness.- Would not make "efficient use of available development land" therefore contrary to the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Development would be unrelated to the existing development pattern which is progressively less dense as you go up the hill ending in open fields.- Would not "demonstrate sensitive siting". Would have an adverse impact on landscape and scenery contrary to Policy 28 in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. Development would be exposed to the elements thus eschewing the energy efficient "passive design" promoted by the Council's Sustainable Design Guide: Interim Supplementary Guidance.- Within the area covered by the Council's Badger Policy Guidance; development may damage and/or disturb badger setts and/or foraging areas. Inverness and Nairn Local Biodiversity Action Plan states that the area around Inverness city supports a significant population of badgers. Policies 59 and 60 Highland-wide Local Development Plan also relevant.- Would not conserve or enhance wider green network, contrary to the Council's Interim Supplementary Guidance on Green Networks and Scottish Planning Policy. Would set a precedent for further ad hoc development on city fringe and eroding green networks.	
Inverness	Mr MacLean(01268)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01268/1/001	Inverness H69	Landowner objects to the non preferred status of H69 for the following reasons- whilst it is on the fringe of the city it is considered to be related to other housing to the north and west and represents a logical extension - despite a developemnt brief seeking to restrict development here to protect views, due to the presense of hedgegrows and trees there are limited views from this point- its development would not prejudice wider views either through design and layout of low density development and through retention of open space to the west, or through provision of green wedges to retain important vistas.- its development would provide the benefit of improved access and wider road at the section in from the B9006- the site is free from significant infrastructure and physical constraint, can be readily accessed, and is deliverable within the Plan period	Allocation of H69 in Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr And Mrs D Macdonald(01302)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01302/1/001	Inverness H69	Supports the Council's non preference of this land for housing for the following reasons- its development would be contrary to the Council's current safeguarding of this land in the Firthview- Woodside Development brief (2003) for visual and recreational amenity reasons- it would have an adverse visual impact on the Highland tourist route B9006 to Culloden Battlefield and obstruct important views towards the Black Isle, Ben Wyvis and beyond- there is sufficient capacity for housing elsewhere in Inverness and along A96 corridor so this allocation is not necessary- it would erode the green belt- it would disrupt the transition from urban to rural - it would not demonstrate sensitive siting in landscape terms or in terms of energy efficient passive design - it may impact on badgers- impact on the wider green network- it would set a precedent for further development along the city fringe	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/005	Inverness H70	Supports non-preference of sites H68, H70, H71, H72 and H73. Supports settlement boundary not being breached and endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Helena Ponty(00634)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00634/1/002	Inverness H70	Objects to Council's non preference of site H70 (marked incorrectly as site H71 in MIR). There is a well established need for further low density development within this area, similar to what is at Upper Myrtlefield and Muckovie. It would provide a consistent development pattern in keeping with the character of the area. There is currently one house on the site (currently used as a church) and another has been granted planning permission in garden ground. A further two houses would "round off" the group, without affecting the landscape character or existing views.	Allocation of H70 as a housing site in Proposed Plan.
Inverness	W A MacDonald Building Consultant(00177)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00177/1/001	Inverness H71	Respondent objects to the non preferred status of this site and supports its allocation in the Proposed Plan.	Requests H71 is allocated for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/005	Inverness H71	Supports non-preference of sites H68, H70, H71, H72 and H73. Supports settlement boundary not being breached and endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Robert Boardman(00033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/005	Inverness H72	Supports non-preference as sites lie beyond existing village boundary and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.	
Inverness	The Nairnside Estate(00214)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00214/5/002	Inverness H72	Disagrees with the judgement that the sites submitted for Cranmore and Blackton would set a precedent for ad hoc development because they are carefully designed to fit around the existing settlement pattern and would simply strengthen and define Cranmore and Blackton. Both sites are also considered to support and benefit from proposed infrastructure improvements in close proximity at Culloden.	Allocate sites H72 (a,b,c) and H73
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/005	Inverness H72	Supports non-preference of sites H68, H70, H71, H72 and H73. Supports settlement boundary not being breached and endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Ewan Meg Snedden(00379)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00379/1/001	Inverness H72	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of sites H72-H75 as they cannot be supported by local infrastructure of facilities.	
Inverness	Pamela And Alasdair Chambers(00977)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00977/1/001	Inverness H72	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites because they lie outwith the settlement boundary and it does not have community support.	
Inverness	Robert Boardman(00033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/005	Inverness H73	Supports non-preference as sites lie beyond existing village boundary and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.	
Inverness	The Nairnside Estate(00214)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00214/5/002	Inverness H73	Disagrees with the judgement that the sites submitted for Cranmore and Blackton would set a precedent for ad hoc development because they are carefully designed to fit around the existing settlement pattern and would simply strengthen and define Cranmore and Blackton. Both sites are also considered to support and benefit from proposed infrastructure improvements in close proximity at Culloden.	Allocate sites H72 (a,b,c) and H73
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/005	Inverness H73	Supports non-preference of sites H68, H70, H71, H72 and H73. Supports settlement boundary not being breached and endorses the significant cons listed in the MIR.	
Inverness	Ewan Meg Snedden(00379)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00379/1/001	Inverness H73	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of sites H72-H75 as they cannot be supported by local infrastructure of facilities.	
Inverness	Pamela And Alasdair Chambers(00977)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00977/1/001	Inverness H73	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites because they lie outwith the settlement boundary and it does not have community support.	
Inverness	Robert Boardman(00033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/005	Inverness H74A	Supports non-preference as sites lie beyond existing village boundary and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.	
Inverness	Ewan Meg Snedden(00379)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00379/1/001	Inverness H74A	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of sites H72-H75 as they cannot be supported by local infrastructure of facilities.	
Inverness	Pamela And Alasdair Chambers(00977)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00977/1/001	Inverness H74A	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites because they lie outwith the settlement boundary and it does not have community support.	
Inverness	Robert Boardman(00033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/005	Inverness H74ABC	Supports non-preference as sites lie beyond existing village boundary and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Clare Ross(00381)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00381/1/001	Inverness H74ABC	Support the non-preferred status of Sites H74a, H74b, H74c and H75 (four sites at Nairnside). Would have the following concerns at the prospect of the development suggested by the landowners:- Impact on the existing single track road access, given no intention to upgrade and no public transport;- Safety concerns, due to lack of footpaths and street lights;- Impact on current use of land for children's play and dog walking, given no intention to develop open play areas and limited alternatives;- Schooling in the area is already stretched;- Threat to the population of red squirrels in the area, being a protected species.Concerned that there are inaccuracies in the information submitted by the agents acting for the landowners who are seeking to promote the sites for allocation.	
Inverness	Pamela And Alasdair Chambers(00977)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00977/1/001	Inverness H74ABC	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites because they lie outwith the settlement boundary and it does not have community support.	
Inverness	Robert Boardman(00033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/005	Inverness H74B	Supports non-preference as sites lie beyond existing village boundary and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.	
Inverness	Ewan Meg Snedden(00379)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00379/1/001	Inverness H74B	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of sites H72-H75 as they cannot be supported by local infrastructure of facilities.	
Inverness	Pamela And Alasdair Chambers(00977)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00977/1/001	Inverness H74B	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites because they lie outwith the settlement boundary and it does not have community support.	
Inverness	Robert Boardman(00033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/005	Inverness H74C	Supports non-preference as sites lie beyond existing village boundary and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.	
Inverness	Ewan Meg Snedden(00379)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00379/1/001	Inverness H74C	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of sites H72-H75 as they cannot be supported by local infrastructure of facilities.	
Inverness	Pamela And Alasdair Chambers(00977)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00977/1/001	Inverness H74C	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites because they lie outwith the settlement boundary and it does not have community support.	
Inverness	Robert Boardman(00033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00033/1/005	Inverness H75	Supports non-preference as sites lie beyond existing village boundary and cannot be supported by existing infrastructure.	
Inverness	Ewan Meg Snedden(00379)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00379/1/001	Inverness H75	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of sites H72-H75 as they cannot be supported by local infrastructure of facilities.	
Inverness	Clare Ross(00381)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00381/1/001	Inverness H75	Support the non-preferred status of Sites H74a, H74b, H74c and H75 (four sites at Nairnside). Would have the following concerns at the prospect of the development suggested by the landowners:- Impact on the existing single track road access, given no intention to upgrade and no public transport;- Safety concerns, due to lack of footpaths and street lights;- Impact on current use of land for children's play and dog walking, given no intention to develop open play areas and limited alternatives;- Schooling in the area is already stretched;- Threat to the population of red squirrels in the area, being a protected species.Concerned that there are inaccuracies in the information submitted by the agents acting for the landowners who are seeking to promote the sites for allocation.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/100	Inverness H75	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Pamela And Alasdair Chambers(00977)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00977/1/001	Inverness H75	Supports the Council's non preference of these sites because they lie outwith the settlement boundary and it does not have community support.	
Inverness	Highland House Properties(01033)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01033/2/001	Inverness H76	Objects to non-preferred status of H76 because: it adjoins existing village and is in the only feasible direction that village can expand; it is a rounding off opportunity because existing houses lie opposite; it is within easy active travel distance of the community's facilities which would be underpinned by further development; it is outwith the quarry safeguarding distance - 700m from working face instead of 400m minimum; subsoils good for septic tank / soakaway drainage; no Transport Scotland objection to further use of A9 accesses; A9 visual proximity not an issue with other recent properties far closer; site could offer phased plot release in keeping with organic growth of settlement; meets all criteria within Other Settlements policy and is a named settlement within that policy, and; community council is understood to be supportive of proposal. Clarifies that overlapping site MU34 does not overlap H76 in terms of ownership.	Retention of site within Proposed Plan for housing development or enclosure of all of site within any settlement boundary drawn for Daviot linking to Other Settlements policy.
Inverness	Horne Properties(01004)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01004/1/001	Inverness H77	Objects to non-preferred of H77 because: small rural sites close to the City meet a defined demand in the housing market and offer choice for those not wanting to live in a housing estate in the urban area; only proposing a group of 3 houses close to a cluster of other houses; previously allocated for housing development in one of Council's previous local plans; the site is central to the Daviot East settlement; within a 10 minute walk of the hall, church and school at Daviot West and will help sustain those facilities; land has poor agricultural value, and; well located in the landscape with no visual prominence from key viewpoints such as A9.	Retention of H77 within Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/101	Inverness H78	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/102	Inverness H79	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required. Public sewer connection still required	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/103	Inverness H80	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text 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 unless development does not encroach on the watercourse or include crossings. Public sewer connection still required	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/104	Inverness H81	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required. Public sewer connection still required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/105	Inverness H82	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA should be taken into account through drainage arrangements in consultation with the Council. Historically straightened and partly culverted minor watercourse running through the site. Request de-culverting where appropriate and allow space for restoration and development of natural processes in future. The River Nairn is also near the site. Development of the site must take account of future river processes e.g. Erosion and planform change. This will require some morphological assessment. Public sewer connection still required	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/106	Inverness H83	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/107	Inverness H83	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. A Flood Risk Assessment is required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/108	Inverness H85	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text 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 will be required in support of planning application if development encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed. Private sewerage system likely to be acceptable here.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/001	Inverness MU01	Support identification of sites MU1, MU2 and H3a as 'preferred' sites for mixed use/residential development. Support the Council's aspiration to locate a community/neighbourhood centre in this area to serve the western part of the city, the nature of which should be properly considered through a masterplanning approach for the Westercraigs/Charleston area. Concerned that development potential of sites MU2 and H3a may be constrained if insufficient road access is provided. Discussions between the respondent and the Council's traffic engineers have suggested that a through road would be required (i.e. Two connections to the public road network) and the design and geometry of the road would have to meet certain minimum standards. One access can be provided from Leachkin Road. A second access is more challenging, however believe that this is critical for the potential of these sites to be stymied. Concerned if no second access were to be provided as result of the proposed link road and golf course re-design. Believes there is scope for a properly planned solution which satisfies all of the Council's aspirations.	Proposed Plan should contain requirement for through road and masterplan for Westercraigs/Charleston area.
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/003	Inverness MU01	Requests clarification in Plan that no significant development will be allowed on this site prior to completion of the West Link because of pressure on existing canal crossings.	Developer requirement that no significant development will be allowed on the site prior to completion of West Link.
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/001	Inverness MU02	Support identification of sites MU1, MU2 and H3a as 'preferred' sites for mixed use/residential development. Support the Council's aspiration to locate a community/neighbourhood centre in this area to serve the western part of the city, the nature of which should be properly considered through a masterplanning approach for the Westercraigs/Charleston area. Concerned that development potential of sites MU2 and H3a may be constrained if insufficient road access is provided. Discussions between the respondent and the Council's traffic engineers have suggested that a through road would be required (i.e. Two connections to the public road network) and the design and geometry of the road would have to meet certain minimum standards. One access can be provided from Leachkin Road. A second access is more challenging, however believe that this is critical for the potential of these sites to be stymied. Concerned if no second access were to be provided as result of the proposed link road and golf course re-design. Believes there is scope for a properly planned solution which satisfies all of the Council's aspirations.	Proposed Plan should contain requirement for through road and masterplan for Westercraigs/Charleston area.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/003	Inverness MU02	Requests clarification in Plan that no significant development will be allowed on this site prior to completion of the West Link because of pressure on existing canal crossings.	Developer requirement that no significant development will be allowed on the site prior to completion of West Link.
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/002	Inverness MU04	Site should be reserved for greenspace because it has always been in this use, is a natural continuation of the Torvean recreational area, provides an attractive gateway into the City, and could provide additional recreational opportunities.	MU4 should be reserved for green space, recreational uses only.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/008	Inverness MU04	Considers that site MU4 should become a public park rather than used as a park and ride.	MU4 to be designated as public open space
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/009	Inverness MU04	Supports preference for C2, H5 and MU4. Sites form part of the Torvean and Ness-side Charette area which Scottish Canals is keen to support. Scottish Canal's vision for the area would see the canal play a role in a major recreational and tourist hub here. Opportunity to investigate the creation of additional waterspace within the existing landscape setting to help create an impressive western gateway into the City. May be a unique opportunity to create a water based recreational hub comprising an off-line basin for moorings and other water-based uses on part of the existing golf course. Would also provide a crucial strategic role for the wider canal network. Would take advantage of existing recreational facilities in the area. Inverness Rowing Club would like to expand their existing activities and Scottish Canals are in communication with Jacobite Cruises and Caley Cruises about their existing and future needs. The proposed second canal bridge crossing at Torvean will have implications for how this section of the canal is used both operationally and commercially. Supports Council's desire for a development brief for the area and welcomes the opportunity to set out some of the canal-related, strategic context and potential opportunities at the forthcoming charrette. Keen to ensure that changes to this area facilitate opportunities for existing and new canal-related businesses and also that the role and setting of the canal is understood and respected. Keen to explore this further with stakeholders at the charrette and happy to assist with any preparatory work, introductory presentations or workshop input as required.	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/021	Inverness MU04	Seek a developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.	Developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/003	Inverness MU04	Notes that although part of Torvean Golf Course will be replaced with land on the opposite side of the road, considers that retention of the former golf course for recreational purposes would enable the whole of the Torvean area to be promoted as a leisure area as promoted in previous development plans. Considers the balance of use between any park and ride scheme and other possible use is inadequately addressed in the MIR.	Allocation of MU4 for as public open space in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/009	Inverness MU06	Respondent would like to see this area to be a green recreational area with riverside walks.	Site MU6 to be designated as open space.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/109	Inverness MU06	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that no development can be carried out within the functional floodplain as shown in the FRA. Flood Risk Assessment already done, but may need to be revisited post-FPS completion in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Cardrona Charitable Trust(00988)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00988/1/001	Inverness MU06	Requests that site allow mainstream housing as part of mix of uses supported for site because: good active travel connections could be made from the site to a school either at Ness-side or Ness Castle and to the district centre at the Dores Road roundabout (via land in its ownership and/or via a new crossing of Dores Road connecting to provision on the new Holm Burn bridge); non-residential uses at Milton of Ness-side would also attract difficult active travel movements; the HwLDP Reporter and the Council implied that the use mix could be reviewed during the IMFLDP process; it is more suitable for housing development than other preferred alternatives at Knocknagael and Welltown of Easter Leys; some limited mainstream housing would be compatible with a mix of community and healthcare uses; it could accommodate a demand not currently met for large detached houses on large City plots in an attractive riverside location, and; housing could be located with no woodland loss or flood risk.	Requests that site confirmed in Proposed Plan but with use mix that includes mainstream housing.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/052	Inverness MU07	Concerns about impact on Inner Moray Firth SAC due to increased moorings and boat traffic in SAC. Recreational sailing has a disproportionate effect on dolphins. Also need for otter survey and protection plan plus protection of existing recreational walking routes.	HRA of potential adverse effects on SAC and resulting mitigation requirement. Also requirements for otter survey and protection plan plus protection of existing recreational walking routes.
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/005	Inverness MU07	Believes that the Muirtown basin (MU7) should be dedicated to community, limited canal or related business use, with no option for housing. The portion of the site identified, currently occupied by the former B&Q store and car park should be included in housing site H18.	Assumed that the former B and Q building be allocated for housing as part of H18 and the remaining part of MU7 be allocated for community uses.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/006	Inverness MU07	Wish to see basin developed further as a place to live on the water, to increase activity around it and help meet local housing needs. As such supports preference for MU7 and suggested uses, but consider leisure, tourism and waterspace uses should be added. Masterplan for Muirtown basin prepared with Scottish Canals involvement several years ago. Masterplan now needs reviewed, should include vacant site at Carse Estate. Scottish Canals intend to take forward masterplan exercise this year, with stakeholder engagement. Keen to prepare draft brief with Council input and support. Potential for creation of stunning, sustainable water-focused community and tourism hub.	Add leisure, tourism and waterspace uses to proposed uses; assume requirement for development brief
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/026	Inverness MU07	This allocation is centred around the scheduled monument Caledonian Canal, Clachnaharry Sea Lock to Muirtown Quay (Index No. 5292). As scheduled monument consent may be required for some works associated with the delivery of development. Historic Scotland (HS) welcome the opportunity to continue working with the Council, Scottish Canals and other stakeholders as the delivery of the allocation progresses.	
Inverness	Merkinch Community Council(00307)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00307/1/001	Inverness MU08	Supports MU8 being a non-preferred site due to possible natural heritage impacts. MU8, known locally as Carnac Point, exhibits a large diversity of wildlife including swans, herons, otters, dolphins and a multiplicity of wading and diving birds and migratory birds. Due to this wide variety of wildlife the area supports development of it should never be considered.	
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/013	Inverness MU08	Support non-preferred status of MU8 and MU9 as development on the coast should be avoided into to reduce the risks arising from rising sea levels associated with climate change and to preserve as far as possible the special environment of the Moray Firth. Where these sites are already developed would seek their restoration to provide ecological services. Sensitive recreational uses of these sites may be appropriate.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/110	Inverness MU08	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or allocation removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Land claim has the potential to affect coastal processes/habitats in the wider Beauly and Moray Firth water bodies (currently good and high status respectively). Opportunities to minimise intertidal habitat loss and coastal restoration e.g. Managed realignment should be explored to ensure any proposals complied with the River Basin Management Plan and Policy 63 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/113	Inverness MU08	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or allocation removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Land claim has the potential to affect coastal processes/habitats in the wider Beauly and Moray Firth water bodies (currently good and high status respectively). Opportunities to minimise intertidal habitat loss and coastal restoration e.g. Managed realignment should be explored to ensure any proposals complied with the River Basin Management Plan and Policy 63 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inverness	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/003	Inverness MU08	Supports the Councils non preference of these sites for development and feels that their potential as nature reserves should be realised.	
Inverness	Inverness Harbour Trust(01196)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01196/1/001	Inverness MU08	Objects to the preferred allocation of I2 for industrial use and the non-preference for MU8 and MU9 to be preferred mixed use sites. Considers I2, MU8 and MU9 should be allocated for mixed use, specifically commercial, office, retail, residential, tourist and leisure uses, for the following reasons:-The harbour should no longer be seen as a conventional port;-Opportunity to restore the harbour and transform the city waterfront as a strategic priority;-Reuse of harbours for mixed use purposes have sustained regeneration in many UK cities;-Proximity of the firths is not a constraint to land reclamation or development, both have happened recently;-Development would be outwith Health and Safety Executive Buffers;-Not allocating the sites for mixed use is contrary to the HwLDP and the Moray Firth Major Ports and Sites Strategy (2006);-Opportunity to reflect the uniqueness of Inverness Harbour in the north-east of Scotland;-To sustain the harbour as a regional transport hub;-To recognise the opportunity at the harbour derives from the extent of the Trusts ownership and that the viability of development and the business streams promoted in policy require a comprehensive approach;-Architecture and Design Scotland were supportive of plans for a hotel adjacent to the marina;-Consistent with the Council's first Vision for Inverness in 1997; and-The trust will work closely with the community.	Allocation of I2, MU8 and MU9 for mixed use in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/013	Inverness MU09	Support non-preferred status of MU8 and MU9 as development on the coast should be avoided into to reduce the risks arising from rising sea levels associated with climate change and to preserve as far as possible the special environment of the Moray Firth. Where these sites are already developed would seek their restoration to provide ecological services. Sensitive recreational uses of these sites may be appropriate.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/111	Inverness MU09	SEPA object unless the following further information is gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.Land claim has the potential to affect coastal processes/habitats in the wider Beaully and Moray Firth water bodies (currently good and high status respectively). Opportunities to minimise intertidal habitat loss and coastal restoration e.G. Managed realignment should be explored to ensure any proposals complied with the River Basin Management Plan and Policy 63 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/114	Inverness MU09	SEPA object unless the following further information is gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Land claim has the potential to affect coastal processes/habitats in the wider Beaully and Moray Firth water bodies (currently good and high status respectively). Opportunities to minimise intertidal habitat loss and coastal restoration e.G. Managed realignment should be explored to ensure any proposals complied with the River Basin Management Plan and Policy 63 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inverness	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/003	Inverness MU09	Supports non-preference of sites MU9 and MU20 due to the following potential negative impacts:- flood risk.- natural heritage impacts.- visual prominence.- ground condition issues and contamination.- impact on the local and trunk roads.- possible loss of woodland.	
Inverness	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/003	Inverness MU09	Supports the Councils non preference of these sites for development and feels that their potential as nature reserves should be realised.	
Inverness	Inverness Harbour Trust(01196)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01196/1/001	Inverness MU09	Objects to the preferred allocation of I2 for industrial use and the non-preference for MU8 and MU9 to be preferred mixed use sites.Considers I2, MU8 and MU9 should be allocated for mixed use, specifically commercial, office, retail, residential, tourist and leisure uses, for the following reasons:-The harbour should no longer be seen as a conventional port;-Opportunity to restore the harbour and transform the city waterfront as a strategic priority;-Reuse of harbours for mixed use purposes have sustained regeneration in many UK cities;-Proximity of the firths is not a constraint to land reclamation or development, both have happened recently;-Development would be outwith Health and Safety Executive Buffers;-Not allocating the sites for mixed use is contrary to the HwLDP and the Moray Firth Major Ports and Sites Strategy (2006);-Opportunity to reflect the uniqueness of Inverness Harbour in the north-east of Scotland;-To sustain the harbour as a regional transport hub;-To recognise the opportunity at the harbour derives from the extent of the Trusts ownership and that the viability of development and the business streams promoted in policy require a comprehensive approach;-Architecture and Design Scotland were supportive of plans for a hotel adjacent to the marina;-Consistent with the Council's first Vision for Inverness in 1997; and-The trust will work closely with the community.	Allocation of I2, MU8 and MU9 for mixed use in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr John West(01713)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01713/2/002	Inverness MU09	Welcome potential development at MU8 and MU9, see this as being capable of becoming an innovative, exciting and vibrant place – more exciting than the site boundaries shown in the MIR. Consider a meeting on this topic alone should be held as the opportunities on the existing waterfront have been squandered.	Allocation of MU8 and MU9 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/027	Inverness MU11	Historic Scotland (HS) welcome the aspirations for these areas and have offered detailed comments in relation to the Inverness City Centre Development Brief consultation.	
Inverness	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/5/001	Inverness MU11	Supports MU11 as a mixed use proposal for business, retail, housing and community uses. Site has planning permission and the respondent feels that the site supports some of the key development issues listed in MIR. Regarding the significant cons listed, the respondent feels that the economic feasibility of the proposals were considered prior to the submission of the planning application and the case for demolition of the existing building on site and impacts on surrounding Conservation Area were assessed via the planning application.	
Inverness	Mr John West(01713)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01713/2/005	Inverness MU11	Support use of parts of the site for student accommodation, however very concerned at the quality and construction of proposed building. General concern regarding quality of design of future developments in this area.	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/027	Inverness MU12	Historic Scotland (HS) welcome the aspirations for these areas and have offered detailed comments in relation to the Inverness City Centre Development Brief consultation.	
Inverness	Mr John West(01713)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01713/2/004	Inverness MU12	Disappointed at lack of positive thinking in respect of the Bridge Street development.	
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/006	Inverness MU13	Any development of MU13 and MU14 would require substantial areas of parking. Adopting a continental model this could be underground parking.MU14 includes the Northern Meeting Park which is a prime area of open space that should be retained as an area which is fit for its current uses. Supports relation of Council HQ and the use of the current built environment for public projects.	Removal of Northern Meeting Park from MU14

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/006	Inverness MU14	Any development of MU13 and MU14 would require substantial areas of parking. Adopting a continental model this could be underground parking. MU14 includes the Northern Meeting Park which is a prime area of open space that should be retained as an area which is fit for its current uses. Supports relation of Council HQ and the use of the current built environment for public projects.	Removal of Northern Meeting Park from MU14
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/115	Inverness MU15	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that proposals for redevelopment need to be supported by FRA to demonstrate that site not at risk of flooding or flooding can be managed in line with SPP.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/007	Inverness MU15	Once UHI offices have relocated to the new campus, MU15 should be re-used. A suggested new use is a respite/rehabilitation centre for injured/incapacitated servicemen and women.	
Inverness	ASDA Stores Limited(01070)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01070/1/001	Inverness MU16	Supports identification of R3 as preferred site for retail development. However consider ASDA site and immediate surroundings (MU16) should be an identified local or commercial centre within the retail hierarchy for the following reasons: -Combination of supermarket, additional retail units, other permissions and a medical centre mean area has a role as a focus for community activity;-Large scale additional housing and two new schools is supported in the area in the MIR;-Important contribution of sites to the catchment population must be recognised; and-Reduces need for car travel to other centres.	Identification of R3 and MU16 as a Local Centre or Commercial Centre in the Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Hilton, Milton And Castle Heather Community Council(00290)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00290/1/002	Inverness MU17	Considers the football pitch, play park and skateboard park on MU17 should be retained and be designated as open space. Respondent requests that all play areas and football pitch to be no dog areas, an outside adult gym to be delivered on the site and existign parking provision to be retained.	Existing open space provision to be protected and enhanced
Inverness	The Highland Council Housing Service(01308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01308/1/001	Inverness MU17	Landowner supports the Council's preference of this site for housing for the following reasons- the current football pitch is an underused facility, it is uninviting with high fencing and is unsuitable for smaller group activities- the proposal is to redevelop the west side of the site for mixed size Council houses with the east side retained for common use with provision of high quality 7 aside kickabout pitch with the skatepark facility relocated or reinstated on the site or in close vicinity	
Inverness	Culcabock & Drakies Community Council(00279)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00279/1/001	Inverness MU18	Objects to MU18 site as it is part of Culcabock Village and would not be suitable for retail. It would be much more suitable for low density residential housing as this type of housing is urgently needed and it would provide a community hub.	Reallocate from Mixed Use to Residential
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/010	Inverness MU18	Respondent objects to site MU18 given the the historic uses on the site and road traffic issues around the site.	Remove site MU18 from the LDP
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/011	Inverness MU19	Respondent considers MU19 to have considerable history and should be listed and used as a tourist attraction.	MU19 should be a Business/Tourism allocation
Inverness	Ministry Of Defence(01177)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01177/1/001	Inverness MU19	Ministry of Defence (MOD) confirms the future of the Cameron Barracks (MU19) is currently under consideration as part of the MOD's Basing Optimisation Programme which is examining a range of options for the site from closure/rationalisation to expansion/redevelopment for intensified military use along with other sites in the area. Welcomes the flexible and pragmatic approach expressed by Council officers as MOD considers future development options for the site either military or alternative uses. Agrees with Pros and Cons listed in MIR. Notes no decision has yet been made on the future of the site and the MOD would welcome future discussions with the Council as the LDP emerges to help determine the long term future of the site.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/116	Inverness MU20	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or allocation removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. The Highland Wide Local Development Plan contains a policy (Policy 5 – Former Longman Landfill Site) which identifies the Longman site (site MU20/MU21 in the IMFLDP) as appropriate for mixed use .Development, including waste management and other renewable energy uses. A further policy relating to Waste Management Facilities (Policy 70) identifies the former Longman Landfill Site as a preferred site for waste management facility proposals. We would object to the IMFLDP unless the Longman site is identified within the IMFLDP as a mixed use site which includes waste management as an appropriate use	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Inverness	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/003	Inverness MU20	Supports non-preference of sites MU9 and MU20 due to the following potential negative impacts:- flood risk.- natural heritage impacts.- visual prominence.- ground condition issues and contamination.- impact on the local and trunk roads.- possible loss of woodland.	
Inverness	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/002	Inverness MU20	RSPB supports the non allocation of this site for development as beyond the difficulties of developing the site they also believe it is the best use for these sites and would create a world class frontage. They also consider that this is in keeping with the modern approach to brownfield sites and cite New Yorks former docklands which are now parks and reserves.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/005	Inverness MU20	Land between the A9 and the Moray Firth should be promoted as areas of public open space as per previous local plans. Considers allocating this land for commercial purposes is inappropriate for the following reasons:-Longman Industrial Estate is on the other side of the A9;-Sites could be developed as an attractive amenity space taking advantage of the water front;-Allocating even part of the area will seriously damage the sites recreational/amenity potential; and-No proposals which would provide adequate alternative provision in the area.	Allocation of I4, MU21 and MU20 as public open space in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Catesby Property Group(01256)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01256/1/001	Inverness MU20	Objects to the non preferred status of MU 20 and the preferred status of MU21 for the following reasons:- both sites have similar constraints in terms of the local and trunk road network, likely contamination, and loss of woodland but MU20 offers greater regeneration benefits than MU21 and can accomodate a greater range of uses including retail, and tourism and leisure- the benefits it would bring to the local economy/employment- it will utilise the attractive setting and connect people with the firths area of the city- it is a good location for commerical development in terms of accessibility- Inverness has limited options to develop elsewhere due to physical constraints	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/056	Inverness MU21	Requests HRA of potential adverse effects of sites on adjoining SAC and SPA. Masterplan for area should include a landscape framework which seeks to retain woodland on MU21 as a visual framework and screen.	HRA of potential adverse effects of sites on adjoining SAC and SPA and resultant mitigation as developer requirements. Woodland retention requirement for site MU21.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/012	Inverness MU21	Object to MU21, MU22, T2, and 14 because risks arising from rising sea levels associated with climate change and to preserve as far as possible the special environment of the Moray Firth. Where these sites are already developed would seek their restoration to provide ecological services. Sensitive recreational uses of these sites may be appropriate.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/117	Inverness MU21	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. The Highland Wide Local Development Plan contains a policy (Policy 5 – Former Longman Landfill Site) which identifies the Longman site (site MU20/MU21 in the IMFLDP) as appropriate for mixed use development, including waste management and other renewable energy uses. A further policy relating to Waste Management Facilities (Policy 70) identifies the former Longman Landfill Site as a preferred site for waste management facility proposals. We would object to the IMFLDP unless the Longman site is identified within the IMFLDP as a mixed use site which includes waste management as an appropriate use.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Mr Roger Reed(00965)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00965/1/001	Inverness MU21	Objects to Mixed Use allocation of MU21 and requested it to be allocated as greenspace for the following reasons- it forms a natural corridor around the perimeter of the Moray Firth- it has experienced considerable regeneration and this should be allowed to continue- the site is not suitable for industry due to its neighbouring uses including the football stadium, new marina, potential harbour expansion area, campus and the 3 main entry points to the cityRespondent also objects to the industry allocation for I4 particularly the idea of an incinerator at the site as this would likely cause pollution and increase traffic on an already congested road network. Overall the respondent would like to see the coastal sites MU21 and I4 safeguarded as a nature conservation area.	Requests change of use from mixed use to open space
Inverness	Mr Donald B Henderson(01054)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01054/1/002	Inverness MU21	Supports allocation of travellers site on T1. Considers MU21 and T1 would be suitable for a travellers site than T3 for the following reasons:- safe access to main arterial routes;- ready access to services and facilities;- closer to areas where the police can provide the appropriate visibility and reassurance to the public during their normal course of patrol;- police able to respond more quickly where disruptive elements of the travelling community cause fear intimidation to those travellers who are law abiding and want to go about their business unhindered and peaceable manner; and- large enough for expansion in the future.	Non-allocation of T3 for traveller's site; allocation of travellers site on MU21
Inverness	Mrs Katrina Coutts(01084)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01084/1/001	Inverness MU21	Considers part os site MU21 should be considered for an expansion of the exsiting Gypsy/Traveller Site.	Allocation of part of MU21 as Temporary Stop site for Gypsy Travellers.
Inverness	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/001	Inverness MU21	RSPB object to the allocation of these sites for development as beyond the difficulties of developing them they believe it is also the best use for these sites and would create a world class frontage. They also consider that this is in keeping with the modern approach to brownfield sites and cite New Yorks former docklands which are now parks and reserves.	Allocation as public open space to be used for nature reserve.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/005	Inverness MU21	Land between the A9 and the Moray Firth should be promoted as areas of public open space as per previous local plans. Considers allocating this land for commercial purposes is inappropriate for the following reasons:-Longman Industrial Estate is on the other side of the A9;-Sites could be developed as an attractive amenity space taking advantage of the water front;-Allocating even part of the area will seriously damage the sites recreational/amenity potential; and-No proposals which would provide adequate alternative provision in the area.	Allocation of I4, MU21 and MU20 as public open space in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/012	Inverness MU22	Object to MU21, MU22, T2, and 14 because risks arising from rising sea levels associated with climate change and to preserve as far as possible the special environment of the Moray Firth. Where these sites are already developed would seek their restoration to provide ecological services. Sensitive recreational uses of these sites may be appropriate.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/118	Inverness MU23	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text 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 encroaches on watercourses or the areas immediately adjacent to it, or any crossings proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/119	Inverness MU24	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required. Wetlands may be present on this site therefore a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment and a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/120	Inverness MU24	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Flood Risk Assessment required. Wetlands may be present on this site therefore a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment and a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Prison Service(00662)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00662/1/002	Inverness MU24	Potentially suitable prison sites, considers cons identified in MIR could be overcome if an exceptional case for these sites were made. Feasibility of development at this location has been examined following initial discussions with the landowner ('lukewarm' towards proposals), however option is not being progressed at the current time.	Consider allocation MU24 and MU25 for prison
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/039	Inverness MU24	This allocation would have a significant impact on the scheduled monument Bogbain Wood, hut circle and field system 400m SSW of Bogbain Farm (Index no. 4698). Historic Scotland therefore welcome that the allocation is not preferred by the Council	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/121	Inverness MU25	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 any planning application. Wetlands may be present on this site therefore a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment and a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Prison Service(00662)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00662/1/002	Inverness MU25	Potentially suitable prison sites, considers cons identified in MIR could be overcome if an exceptional case for these sites were made. Feasibility of development at this location has been examined following initial discussions with the landowner ('lukewarm' towards proposals), however option is not being progressed at the current time.	Consider allocation MU24 and MU25 for prison
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/010	Inverness MU26	Objects to M26. Does not want this agricultural land used for housing and endorses significant cons listed in MIR. There should be no development here as it may be of future use for expansion of UHI services.	Assumed removal of MU26
Inverness	Highland And Island Enterprise(01035)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01035/1/006	Inverness MU26	Supports mixed use allocation and mix of uses but requests extension to preferred area to include whole area within surrounding roads because: the land does not currently provide public open space and this will better be provided within the campus, but; recognise need for East Link safeguard.	Extension of site as mixed use allocation with mix of uses as stated but to include whole area within surrounding roads including that shown as preferred public open space.
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/004	Inverness MU27	Considers to be an inappropriate site for travellers for the following reasons:- A96 is dangerous for travellers' traffic; and - may discourage locals from using the area for amenity. Questions if a site could be found in areas already identified for development - namely MU27, MU28 or MU29	Removal of site T2 from Proposed Plan and consideration of new travellers sites at the longman.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/122	Inverness MU27	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that an FRA has already been carried out for part of the site but may need to be extended and development must be in accordance with FRA recommendations previously accepted. This site now seems to be separate from the Beechwood site and FRA required to support this site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application. FRA already complete for the Beechwood site adjacent.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Prison Service(00662)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00662/1/003	Inverness MU27	Supports Council's preference for business and commerce use on MU27 and is the Scottish Prison Services preferred site option. Assume business and commerce would include Use Classes 4,5,6,7,8,10 and 11, prison falls under use class 8. Consider prison is more compatible with business/industrial uses than residential use.MU27 is the Scottish Prison Services preferred site for the following reasons:-publicly owned site;-Best rated site in comparison to other potential sites;-Two miles from Inverness city centre;- Not contaminated;-Strong boundaries – raised railway embankment and rear of future commercial properties;-Potential to be well-planned and away from UHI campus buildings;-Proximity to major road network of A9/A96 with good access to Inverness and the Courts;-Not located adjacent to residential properties; and-Compatible with other supported land uses.	Assume prison (or Class 8 Use) listed as one of a number of acceptable uses on MU27.
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/028	Inverness MU27	These allocations have the potential to impact on the scheduled monument Ashton Farm Cottages, ring ditch 415m SW and pit circles 460m WSW of (Index no. 11535). Historic Scotland (HS) would wish to continue to be involved in discussions with the Council, Transport Scotland and others stakeholder regarding the potential impacts on this site from development here and works associated with the A96. HS would therefore ask for the developer requirements to reflect this.	Seeks developer requirement to reflect that HS wish to continue to be involved in discussions with the Council, Transport Scotland and others stakeholder regarding the potential impacts on the scheduled monument Ashton farm Cottages
Inverness	Highland And Island Enterprise(01035)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01035/1/002	Inverness MU27	Supports proposed use mix but disagree with Council's cons list for this site. Believes loss of prime farmland and watercourse flood risk not significant. Accepts East Link dependency but calls on Plan to help deliver road improvements in this area.	Retention of site within Proposed Plan with no significant farmland or flood risk area safeguards. Action programme and Plan to indicate how East Link and associated roads will be delivered (all assumed).
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/057	Inverness MU28	Development factors and developer requirements should reflect those set out in HwLDP. This should be considered further as part of the HRA of this plan in relation to the Inner Moray Firth SPA, allowing for HRA work already undertaken for the HwLDP and the Green Networks Supplementary Guidance	Development factors and developer requirements should reflect those set out in HwLDP.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/001	Inverness MU28	Objects to preference of MU29 and MU28, objects to non-preference of C13 and supports non-preference of site H57 . Respondent objects to the expansion of East Inverness in particular these 4 sites and land to the north west of H57. Concerns raised in response to the HwLDP remain unchanged. Westhill, Resaurie, Smithton and Culloden are large predominately residential areas with very little "on the doorstep" accessible open space compared to other parts of Inverness. The plan needs to provide for a large public open space including parkland, an arboretum, playgrounds, allotments etc. The Council should establish this and not wait for developers' speculative proposals and timetables.	Removal of MU28 and MU29 and requests retention of C13.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/008	Inverness MU28	Large scale extension of Inverness to the east is not desirable, again diverting resources from other areas and producing along ribbon of development that will overburden infrastructure in this part of the region. We therefore we oppose allocations H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30 in Inverness, although the smaller 'infill' allocations can be supported.	Removal of site allocations at H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30.
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/004	Inverness MU28	Considers to be an inappropriate site for travellers for the following reasons:- A96 is dangerous for travellers' traffic; and - may discourage locals from using the area for amenity.Questions if a site could be found in areas already identified for development - namely MU27, MU28 or MU29	Removal of site T2 from Proposed Plan and consideration of new travellers sites at the longman.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/123	Inverness MU28	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that development will have to be in accordance with the previous FRA recommendations. Planning consent will already have this condition but need to add it to development plan also. Flood Risk Assessment has already carried out.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/057	Inverness MU29	Development factors and developer requirements should reflect those set out in HwLDP. This should be considered further as part of the HRA of this plan in relation to the Inner Moray Firth SPA, allowing for HRA work already undertaken for the HwLDP and the Green Networks Supplementary Guidance	Development factors and developer requirements should reflect those set out in HwLDP.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/001	Inverness MU29	Objects to preference of MU29 and MU28, objects to non-preference of C13 and supports non-preference of site H57 . Respondent objects to the expansion of East Inverness in particular these 4 sites and land to the north west of H57. Concerns raised in response to the HwLDP remain unchanged. Westhill, Resaurie, Smithton and Culloden are large predominately residential areas with very little "on the doorstep" accessible open space compared to other parts of Inverness. The plan needs to provide for a large public open space including parkland, an arboretum, playgrounds, allotments etc. The Council should establish this and not wait for developers' speculative proposals and timetables.	Removal of MU28 and MU29 and requests retention of C13.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/008	Inverness MU29	Large scale extension of Inverness to the east is not desirable, again diverting resources from other areas and producing along ribbon of development that will overburden infrastructure in this part of the region. We therefore we oppose allocations H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30 in Inverness, although the smaller 'infill' allocations can be supported.	Removal of site allocations at H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/004	Inverness MU29	Considers to be an inappropriate site for travellers for the following reasons:- A96 is dangerous for travellers' traffic; and - may discourage locals from using the area for amenity. Questions if a site could be found in areas already identified for development - namely MU27, MU28 or MU29	Removal of site T2 from Proposed Plan and consideration of new travellers sites at the longman.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/124	Inverness MU29	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the northern half of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on the developable area or layout options. No development would be permitted in areas at risk of flooding.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/029	Inverness MU29	The western section of this allocation contains the scheduled monument Milton, ring-ditch 320m SSE of (Index no. 6001). Historic Scotland (HS) would ask that the developer requirements reflect this and HS would wish to be involved in early discussions on how to deliver this mixed used development with consideration to the scheduled monument.	HS would ask that the developer requirements reflect this the western section of this allocation contains the scheduled monument Milton, ring-ditch 320m SSE of (Index no. 6001).
Inverness	Mr D And E Williams(00961)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00961/1/001	Inverness MU29	Supports the MU29 allocation but would like to see the scheduled development date of 2016 brought forward.	Requests scheduled development date of 2016 brought forward.
Inverness	Macdonald Hotels(00985)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00985/1/001	Inverness MU29	Landowner supports the continued allocation of Stratton Lodge land (H59 and MU29) as preferred sites but has some concerns:- Servicing and phasing of the development relative to the HwLDP provisions. A Significant Con of the site has been noted as its dependency on "local and trunk road network" and although the HwLDP states various provisions, the respondent has concerns that these depend on actions of others. As a result the restoration of Stratton Lodge Hotel (H59) will be delayed whilst the commitments are made. - Although the landowner accepts the requirement of the link between A9 and A96, they are concerned about its route, the connectivity between their land and adjoining development sites, its deliverability and the detail of the major junctions. Respondent unsure whether the Strategic Link Road has to be completed in its entirety in advance of Phase 2. If so, respondent questions the ability to deliver it through Ashton Farm as it is allocated as Open Space (C13) and is likely to remain in agricultural use for some time. - Main concern is the need to upgrade Barn Church Road in advance of respondent's land being developed. - H59 is indicated as Phase 1 in HwLDP but respondent concerned this may not be feasible without allowing access through the open part of their land as indicated in Phase 2. A preferred means of access is outlined in the attached map.- Lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network. The consultation in early 2012 was absent of detail about the timing of the provision of local connections and improvements required to open up land at Stratton. Respondent argues that this opportunity should not be land-locked or hindered by uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. As a result respondent would prefer the open part of land to be separated out (as it is in terms of ownership) from MU29 and shown as a housing site.	Respondent would prefer the open part of land to be separated out (as it is in terms of ownership) from MU29 and shown as a housing site.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/008	Inverness MU30	Large scale extension of Inverness to the east is not desirable, again diverting resources from other areas and producing along ribbon of development that will overburden infrastructure in this part of the region. We therefore we oppose allocations H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30 in Inverness, although the smaller 'infill' allocations can be supported.	Removal of site allocations at H59, MU28, MU29 and MU30.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/125	Inverness MU30	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the northern half of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on the developable area or layout options. No development would be permitted in areas at risk of flooding.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/059	Inverness MU31	Supports non-preference of site because of landscape character and badger concerns.	Non retention of site option.
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/002	Inverness MU31	Support non-preference MU31 for the following reasons:-Loss of open space amenity-Loss of good farm land-Pressure on existing schools-Potential for coalescence of Culloden and Balloch, resulting in loss of identity	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/126	Inverness MU31	SEPA in reference to part of the site (Cfs 282 and below) will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA in reference to part of the site (Cfs 147) will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on developable area or layout options. FRA should also address drainage to ensure no impacts off-site.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/040	Inverness MU31	The northern section of this allocation contains the scheduled monument Balloch of Culloden, enclosure 1050m NNW of (Index no. 5008). Historic Scotland therefore welcome that this section of the allocation is not preferred by the Council.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Macdonald Estates(01313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/013 13/1/001	Inverness MU31	Object to non-preferred of site because it: is in single ownership and available; would be a sustainable extension to Culloden providing many of its own facilities which would also serve the wider urban district; can be accessed off the trunk or local road networks; lies close to rail, air and sewerage connections; has an attractive outlook over the firths but is not too elevated to risk exposure; lies in the heart of the A96 Growth Corridor which is promoted for development by the Government and Council in several planning documents; would assist in meeting the Government's and Council's ambitious housing targets which are justified by the housing needs and demand assessment and are needed to provide a generous land supply; is not dependent upon major infrastructure works or subject to competing uses in contrast to sites at Ness-side, Charleston, Inverness East, Tornagrain and Whiteness; is a better location for development than west or north of the city which would only add traffic flows to existing pinch points at Clachnaharry and the Kessock Bridge; provides housing choice; can take advantage of road and other transport improvements already planned / programmed for Barn Church Road and the A96; is close to existing community, commercial, cycle / walking route and public transport facilities; could provide accessible recreational and public open space; could offer additional land for use by Culloden Academy; would have very limited adverse visual and landscape character impact due to its gently rolling topography, surrounding urban uses and visual enclosure; will safeguard pipeline corridors on its northern edge; will not affect the integrity or setting of the scheduled monument which will be preserved, buffered and if appropriate better accessed and interpreted; will allow habitat retention and enhancement following from species surveys and mitigation, and; will deliver affordable housing.	Retention of mixed use allocation and its enclosure within the city boundary for 500 houses, community facilities, local shops and recreational space at Balloch Farm.
Inverness	Macdonald Estates(01313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/013 13/1/002	Inverness MU31	Propose indicative layout for site which will: allow bus route penetration along a landscaped spine access; access from the local road network; safeguarding of all land directly between Culloden and Balloch as greenspace and provide other structural public open space; follow best practice in terms of designing streets and pedestrian priority principles; offer land for relocation of the Culloden Academy pitches and better access and parking at the facility; safeguard land for a new neighbourhood centre to accommodate local shops and community facilities, and; maximise solar gain.	Retention of mixed use allocation and its enclosure within the city boundary for 500 houses, community facilities, local shops and recreational space at Balloch Farm.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/002 04/1/060	Inverness MU32	Supports non-preferred of site because of likely adverse landscape character impacts.	Non retention of site option
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/005 23/1/127	Inverness MU32	No provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a FRA and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on developable area or layout options. FRA should also address drainage to ensure no impacts off-site.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. To support any planning application.
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/009 57/1/037	Inverness MU32	These allocations all lie within or partly within the Culloden Inventory Battlefield site, Historic Scotland therefore welcome that these sites are not preferred by the Council.	
Inverness	Mr I Alexander(01016)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/010 16/1/001	Inverness MU32	Objects to non preferred of site because: the housing and commercial elements of the proposal could be integrated; it is close to community facilities at Westhill and Woodside; it is on a tourist route, at a gateway and could offer tourist facilities to complement existing; it is of a scale that is appropriate for an edge of City location; it will lengthen the stay of tourists; it does not have any significant constraints; any adverse effects can be mitigated; its use mix could not reasonably be located within the city; there is already a cluster of farm buildings and 7 houses at this location; it could provide a new public viewpoint and parking connected to the core path network; it has an exceptional outlook; it is downslope of the tourist route and backed by commercial woodland and would therefore not have any adverse visual impact; it would provide a planned rather than ad-hoc city edge; it will not have any adverse impact on Culloden Battlefield because of its distance from and lack of intervisibility with the core site and the opportunity for mitigation; it will be masterplanned and have a coherent landscaped framework; built development adjacent to the visually sensitive B9006 will be kept to a minimum and be of low profile design; the wider Blackpark landholding could offer flood water storage in the upper reaches of problem catchments; unmet demand for paddock style housing plots; proposal could offer pedestrian connections to Woodside and wider core path network; it is within the altitude (140m) and city centre proximity (4km) limits in the adopted local plan; it's within 400m of a bus route, and; its development could offer an improvement to the B9006 along the length of Blackpark ownership.	Retention of site within Proposed Plan for mixed use development of 10-12 paddock house plots, affordable housing, courtyard redevelopment (holiday accommodation option), tourist related commercial development, restaurant, specialist retailing, country house hotel, touring caravan and camping site and 12 holiday lodges.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/005 23/1/128	Inverness MU33	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Discharge from chemical toilets should have separate collection system and be disposed of to licensed waste carrier as this could damage the public sewer.The remainder to foul drainage should be directed to the public sewer.	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
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/129	Inverness MU35	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that any development proposals for the northern quarter of the field would have to be accompanied by a FRA and the outcome may adversely affect the developable area and development options. Alternatively Highland Council could change the site boundary to remove this portion of the site.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application. To support any planning application.
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/005	Inverness B01A	Note B1A and B1B are non-preferred, no further comments at this stage	
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/001	Inverness B01A	Support the preference for open space and non-preference of H1(a), H1(b), B1(a) and B1(b). Supportive of Dunain Community Woodland and concerned regarding recent lack of co-operation from Robertson Homes and their attempts to alter and extend their existing permission to develop the former NHS site. Original planning consent was the result of extensive negotiations and compromise involving many parties, to develop a sensitive and high amenity site, which was in public ownership. Inappropriate that any further concessions should be made which were not deemed appropriate in the original permission, and reflected in the original financial agreement. Any substantial amendment to the planning permission, involving any additional capacity, should be subject to a substantial additional payment to the public purse by the developer.	Seeks additional developer contributions for any further amendments to the planning application.
Inverness	Alastair Cunningham(00583)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00583/1/001	Inverness B01A	Dunain Community Woodland group (DCWG) support preference for open space however they suggest that community use would be more appropriate as it allows them scope for limited development such as pathways, signage, car parking, interpretation, storage of tools and possibly a shelter which would be used for forest school activities. Their basic remit is to create a green space which would provide a range of recreational, artistic and educational opportunities (their activities and the public use of the site are provided in detail in their submission). Their aim is 'to undertake the managements of DCW for the benefit of the community and the wildlife found there, as a quiet, safe and accessible green space.' The DCWG have future plans for this land in keeping with their basic remit and aim (which are provided in detail in their submission). They state that these plans will help deliver a range of policy priorities in relation to delivery of green space in and around settlements, protection of habitat networks, maintenance of woodlands particularly close to settlements and provision of access and recreation facilities.	Reallocate site from Openspace to Community Uses
Inverness	L.A. Maclean(00657)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00657/1/001	Inverness B01A	Supports sites B1(a) and B1(b) being retained as woodland as they are part of a community woodland, have archaeological interest, have recreational and environmental education value.	
Inverness	Community Land Scotland(00685)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00685/1/001	Inverness B01A	Supports the non-preference of site B1 (a) and B1 (b) and supports the Council's preference for the sites to be open space. It may be preferable to allocate the sites for community use as there may be need for limited development for community use such as paths, signage, shelter and storage. The sites are important as they provide amenity space to the adjacent highly populated area and wider Inverness. The sites are important habitat for some rare species and provides access to the Great Glen Way. Respondent is aware of the interest of Dunain Community Woodlands to obtain the site to protect and manage it for amenity and habitat and for limited recreational purposes and believes this will help deliver a number of Council policies with regard to green space in settlements, habitats, woodlands, recreation and environmental education.	Seeks consideration of reallocation of site from Openspace to Community Use
Inverness	Mr John Craig(00703)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00703/1/001	Inverness B01A	Respondent considers site B1a and B1b is in need of careful management due to the location of an archaeological interest, attractive woodland, an area of afforestation, wealth of water available for artistic and practical uses, presence of badgers and red squirrels and an area for dog walkers. There has been previous issues on the site which, with proper management, could deliver a proposed development with natural charms. Further details are contained in the representation about the role of the neighbouring landowners and the past management of the site.	developer requirements related to natural, built and cultural heritage and species and habitats to be included - assumed.
Inverness	Mrs C Wood(00948)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00948/1/005	Inverness B01A	Respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for development and supports their allocation as open space.	
Inverness	Ms Rebekah Morris(00952)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00952/1/003	Inverness B01A	Respondent supports the non preference of this site for development because of its value to the community for recreation and its importance as a habitat for wildlife.	
Inverness	Ms Jemimah Morris(00953)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00953/1/001	Inverness B01A	Respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites due to: - its amenity and recreational value to the community - the impact development would have on the landscape and on wildlife habitat	
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/002	Inverness B01A	Currently community woodland and should be protected for everyone to use.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/041	Inverness B01A	This allocation contains the scheduled monument Leachkin, chambered cairn (Index no. 3104) and development within this site is likely to have a significant impact on this scheduled monument. In light of this Historic Scotland welcome its non-preferred status.	
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/001	Inverness B01A	Respondent considers the site to be valuable natural area and should be preserved as a community woodland	
Inverness	Ms Paula Thomson(01029)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01029/1/001	Inverness B01A	Supports the Councils identification of this area as public open space- suggesting that Robertsons had previously committed to gifting this to Dunain Community Woodland- and is concerned about the impact development would have on the skyline	
Inverness	Mr Ron Lyon(01239)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01239/1/001	Inverness B01A	Supports the Council's non-preference for development on B1(a) and B1(b). Dunain Woods is a community managed woodland and a committee was formed to protect the area from commercial exploitation and maintain it in perpetuity as a natural resource to be enjoyed freely by the people.	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/044	Inverness B01ABC	Supports non-preference for sites a and b and alternative of community woodland. Agrees with "cons"listed in MIR as justification.	
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/003	Inverness B01ABC	Requests clarification in Plan that no significant development will be allowed on this site prior to completion of the West Link because of pressure on existing canal crossings.	Developer requirement that no significant development will be allowed on the site prior to completion of West Link.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/130	Inverness B01ABC	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the site would have to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and note that the outcome of the FRA could have an impact on developable area or layout options. FRA should also address drainage to ensure no impacts off-site.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/005	Inverness B01B	Note B1A and B1B are non-preferred, no further comments at this stage	
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/001	Inverness B01B	Support the preference for open space and non-preference of H1(a), H1(b), B1(a) and B1(b). Supportive of Dunain Community Woodland and concerned regarding recent lack of co-operation from Robertson Homes and their attempts to alter and extend their existing permission to develop the former NHS site. Original planning consent was the result of extensive negotiations and compromise involving many parties, to develop a sensitive and high amenity site, which was in public ownership. Inappropriate that any further concessions should be made which were not deemed appropriate in the original permission, and reflected in the original financial agreement. Any substantial amendment to the planning permission, involving any additional capacity, should be subject to a substantial additional payment to the public purse by the developer.	Seeks additional developer contributions for any further amendments to the planning application.
Inverness	Alastair Cunningham(00583)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00583/1/001	Inverness B01B	Dunain Community Woodland group (DCWG) support preference for open space however they suggest that community use would be more appropriate as it allows them scope for limited development such as pathways, signage, car parking, interpretation, storage of tools and possibly a shelter which would be used for forest school activities.Their basic remit is to create a green space which would provide a range of recreational, artistic and educational opportunities (their activities and the public use of the site are provided in detail in their submission). Their aim is 'to undertake the managements of DCW for the benefit of the community and the wildlife found there, as a quiet, safe and accessible green space.' The DCWG have future plans for this land in keeping with their basic remit and aim (which are provided in detail in their submission). They state that these plans will help deliver a range of policy priorities in relation to delivery of green space in and around settlements, protection of habitat networks, maintenance of woodlands particularly close to settlements and provision of access and recreation facilities.	Reallocate site from Openspace to Community Uses
Inverness	L.A. Maclean(00657)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00657/1/001	Inverness B01B	Supports sites B1(a) and B1(b) being retained as woodland as they are part of a community woodland, have archaeological interest, have recreational and environmental education value.	
Inverness	Community Land Scotland(00685)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00685/1/001	Inverness B01B	Supports the non-preference of site B1 (a) and B1 (b) and supports the Council's preference for the sites to be open space. It may be preferable to allocate the sites for community use as there may be need for limited development for community use such as paths, signage, shelter and storage. The sites are important as they provide amenity space to the adjacent highly populated area and wider Inverness. The sites are important habitat for some rare species and provides access to the Great Glen Way. Respondent is aware of the interest of Dunain Community Woodlands to obtain the site to protect and manage it for amenity and habitat and for limited recreational purposes and believes this will help deliver a number of Council policies with regard to green space in settlements, habitats, woodlands, recreation and environmental education.	Seeks consideration of reallocation of site from Openspace to Community Use

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr John Craig(00703)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00703/1/001	Inverness B01B	Respondent considers site B1a and B1b is in need of careful management due to the location of an archaeological interest, attractive woodland, an area of afforestation, wealth of water available for artistic and practical uses, presence of badgers and red squirrels and an area for dog walkers. There has been previous issues on the site which, with proper management, could deliver a proposed development with natural charms. Further details are contained in the representation about the role of the neighbouring landowners and the past management of the site.	developer requirements related to natural, built and cultural heritage and species and habitats to be included - assumed.
Inverness	Mrs C Wood(00948)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00948/1/005	Inverness B01B	Respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for development and supports their allocation as open space.	
Inverness	Ms Rebekah Morris(00952)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00952/1/003	Inverness B01B	Respondent supports the non preference of this site for development because of its value to the community for recreation and its importance as a habitat for wildlife.	
Inverness	Ms Jemimah Morris(00953)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00953/1/001	Inverness B01B	Respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites due to: - its amenity and recreational value to the community - the impact development would have on the landscape and on wildlife habitat	
Inverness	Ms Katherine Morris(00954)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00954/1/002	Inverness B01B	Currently community woodland and should be protected for everyone to use.	
Inverness	Mr Owen Morris(00975)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00975/1/001	Inverness B01B	Respondent considers the site to be valuable natural area and should be preserved as a community woodland	
Inverness	Ms Paula Thomson(01029)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01029/1/001	Inverness B01B	Supports the Council's identification of this area as public open space- suggesting that Robertsons had previously committed to gifting this to Dulnain Community Woodland- and is concerned about the impact development would have on the skyline	
Inverness	Mr Ron Lyon(01239)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01239/1/001	Inverness B01B	Supports the Council's non-preference for development on B1(a) and B1(b). Dulnain Woods is a community managed woodland and a committee was formed to protect the area from commercial exploitation and maintain it in perpetuity as a natural resource to be enjoyed freely by the people.	
Inverness	Robertson Homes(00206)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00206/1/004	Inverness B01C	B1c is non-preferred but includes a Listed Building which has been partly converted to residential use. Robertsons are keen to keep their options open for future uses of the remainder of the building to help them bring it back into beneficial use. Request the Proposed Plan allows the possibility of other uses for the Listed Building and other parts of site Back.	Re-tention of site B1c for development (use type preference not stated) in the Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/131	Inverness B02	Will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state FRA required to support any redevelopment of the site and outcome may adversely affect the viability or development options on the site. Mitigation measures may be required to ensure development protected from flooding to an adequate standard. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group - Holm Mills(01254)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01254/1/001	Inverness B02	Supports development allocation as part owner but requests mixed use not just business and that the wider site should be classed as a commerce centre and recognised in the retail hierarchy of Inverness City with scope for redevelopment and expansion. Believes this would accord with: Scottish Planning Policy; the established nature of the shopping centre at Holm Mills; the brownfield nature of the site; the opportunity to expand an existing tourist facility and local employment; the mix of existing uses surrounding the Mills, and; the nature of the Highland wide Local Development Plan allocation as mixed use. Suggests that the appropriate mix of uses would be retail, business, employment, tourism and residential. This mix would maximise flexibility and the competitive advantage of the site on as a waterfront and major tourist-route-front location. Offers further discussion and ownership details. Believes any developer requirements should meet the test of Circular 1/2010.	Reallocation of site from business to mixed use and considers the area around the Edinburgh Woollen Mill should be classed as a Commerce Centre and recognised in the retail hierarchy of Inverness City with scope for redevelopment and expansion. Also seeks developer requirements in line with circ 1/2010.
Inverness	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/002	Inverness B03	Brownfield sites and re-development within Inverness should be exhausted before using greenfield sites. Land at the Glebe could provide space for two housing developments similar to those at Falconer Court.	Assumed reallocation of B3 to housing
Inverness	Culcabock & Drakies Community Council(00279)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00279/1/002	Inverness B04	Objects to preferred status of B4 (and assumed R7) for the area south of Police HQ as it is believed that the site is not suitable for business use due to problems with access and drainage. It is suggested that a more suitable use would be safeguarding the site as part of the Drakies Park buffer.	Extension of greenspace south of Police St at Inshes.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Raigmore Community Council(00314)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00314/1/006	Inverness B04	Objects to further development at B4, particularly on existing greenspace. Development within B4 has been piecemeal over the years and there is limited scope for additional development. Some of the existing greenspace in Raigmore Estate is being lost to the pedestrian bridge which crosses the estate to the UHI campus. The Residents Association have plans to improve the childrens play park near the bridge but is currently on hold while the bridge is being constructed. Other reasons for objecting include: - lack of public transport to the Estate, particularly during the evening and on Sundays;- only one entrance to the estate for vehicles which is a major issue for emergency services- existing access problems on Millburn Road, specifically at KFC.	Removal of allocation at B4
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/132	Inverness B04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state FRA required to support any redevelopment of the site and outcome may adversely affect the viability or development options on the site. Mitigation measures may be required to ensure development protected from flooding to an adequate standard. Extensive upgrading to culverts or surface water drainage arrangements may be required. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/051	Inverness B06	Concerns about potential adverse impacts on woodland, badgers, landscape character, City setting, and other species in B7 pond (otter, common toad, great crested newt). Suggests pond area is excluded from site boundary or stringent survey and protection plan requirements added.	Pond area be excluded from B7 site boundary or stringent survey and protection plan requirements added. Landscape and green networks masterplan also required.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/133	Inverness B06	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.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application.
Inverness	Inverness Estates(00944)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00944/4/001	Inverness B06	Inverness Estates seek the interim allocation for residential development of site B7 (and parts of B6) with the development of B7 providing an access route for the future development of part of H49. Respondent states that the land at Milton of Leys is currently allocated in the Adopted Inverness Local Plan for business and commercial use and that planning permission has previously been granted for the development of film studios, a media centre, a visitor/retail and restaurant facility, and an hotel. Respondent believe there to be no prospect of the film studios ever being developed because the site to be unattractive for either business or industrial use due to the preferential policy focus applied to other business and industrial sites within the Inverness, and A96 Corridor. Respondent have been considering alternative development strategies suggesting that parts of the site are also suitable for a final phase of the Milton of Leys housing area. The transport infrastructure of the area is now considered capable of accommodating development on the site which is the subject of this submission. It is stated that the views which can be obtained by looking north from the site are not sufficient justification for Class 4 development.	Inverness Estates seek the interim allocation for residential development of site B7 (and parts of B6) with the development of B7 providing an access route for the future development of part of H49.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/051	Inverness B07	Concerns about potential adverse impacts on woodland, badgers, landscape character, City setting, and other species in B7 pond (otter, common toad, great crested newt). Suggests pond area is excluded from site boundary or stringent survey and protection plan requirements added.	Pond area be excluded from B7 site boundary or stringent survey and protection plan requirements added. Landscape and green networks masterplan also required.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/134	Inverness B07	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 required in support of planning application. Wetlands may be present on this site therefore a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment and Habitat Survey required in support of planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Inverness Estates(00944)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00944/4/001	Inverness B07	Inverness Estates seek the interim allocation for residential development of site B7 (and parts of B6) with the development of B7 providing an access route for the future development of part of H49. Respondent states that the land at Milton of Leys is currently allocated in the Adopted Inverness Local Plan for business and commercial use and that planning permission has previously been granted for the development of film studios, a media centre, a visitor/retail and restaurant facility, and an hotel. Respondent believe there to be no prospect of the film studios ever being developed because the site to be unattractive for either business or industrial use due to the preferential policy focus applied to other business and industrial sites within the Inverness, and A96 Corridor. Respondent have been considering alternative development strategies suggesting that parts of the site are also suitable for a final phase of the Milton of Leys housing area. The transport infrastructure of the area is now considered capable of accommodating development on the site which is the subject of this submission. It is stated that the views which can be obtained by looking north from the site are not sufficient justification for Class 4 development.	Inverness Estates seek the interim allocation for residential development of site B7 (and parts of B6) with the development of B7 providing an access route for the future development of part of H49.
Inverness	Inverness Estates(00944)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00944/4/002	Inverness B07	In considering alternative options for the development of the site in question, the following assumptions have been made by Inverness Estates:- the tourist/commercial/hotel development should be located close to the A9, taking advantage of views to the north;- there is unlikely to be any demand, at this location, for tourist lodges; and- the area currently allocated for the hotel/lodge development (to the west) should be reallocated for the purposes of residential development. It is suggested by Inverness Estates that this would maximise the development and employment prospects for the commercial/tourist development area and integrate the proposed new residential area with the existing Milton of Leys residential quarter and with all the infrastructure and facilities associated with that. It is further suggested by Inverness Estates that the development scenario they are promoting in relation to land at Milton of Leys should be preferred.	Removal of site H79 within the current IMF LDP
Inverness	Raigmore Community Council(00314)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00314/1/005	Inverness B08	Despite development of the UHI being underway key issues need to be resolved including addressing the lack of public transport within the immediate areas and the expected increase in congestion on surrounding roads. Although some proposals are in place they do provide a full or sustainable solution.	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/003	Inverness B08	Disappointed that no provision is made for a rail halt at Beechwood (site B8) despite the agreement at the Inshes Church plenary meeting of HIE/Highland Council/Transport Scotland/multiple Community Councils on 10 October 2011. The record of that meeting includes the agreement to discussions between the Council, Transport Scotland and community representatives around the potential and viability of a rail halt at the campus. The IMFLDP must include provision for a rail halt and associated shuttle service into town.	Inclusion of site allocated for rail halt and provision for shuttle bus service.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/014	Inverness B08	Support the development of Inverness B8 for Business use as this is a highly accessible location for such uses but we would like to see connectivity by foot and cycle to this area (and indeed to the Inverness Retail Park) improved as part of the development.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/135	Inverness B08	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that an FRA has already been carried out for part of the site but this may need to be extended and development must be in accordance with FRA recommendations previously accepted. Flood Risk Assessment will be required to be updated one in support of any planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required to be updated one in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Inverness Estates(00944)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00944/4/002	Inverness B08	In considering alternative options for the development of the site in question, the following assumptions have been made by Inverness Estates:- the tourist/commercial/hotel development should be located close to the A9, taking advantage of views to the north;- there is unlikely to be any demand, at this location, for tourist lodges; and- the area currently allocated for the hotel/lodge development (to the west) should be reallocated for the purposes of residential development. It is suggested by Inverness Estates that this would maximise the development and employment prospects for the commercial/tourist development area and integrate the proposed new residential area with the existing Milton of Leys residential quarter and with all the infrastructure and facilities associated with that. It is further suggested by Inverness Estates that the development scenario they are promoting in relation to land at Milton of Leys should be preferred.	Removal of site H79 within the current IMF LDP
Inverness	Highland And Island Enterprise(01035)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01035/1/001	Inverness B08	Asserts that Campus permission area should more accurately be given a mixed use allocation since it includes development within use classes 4, 10, 8 and 11. Disagrees with cons listed for site as these are being mitigated as part of the permitted development.	Change in use of allocation so that it's mixed use including development within use classes 4, 10, 8 and 11. No additional developer requirements beyond those in extant permission .

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/136	Inverness B09	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that an FRA may be required to ensure sufficient capacity in channel for watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required to be updated one in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Inverness Estates(00944)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00944/1/001	Inverness B09	Objects to site B9 being allocated for business use. Would like site to have a Mixed Use allocation for commercial development such as business accommodation, commercial leisure facilities, restaurants, drive through restaurants and ancillary commercial activities.Reasons for this change of allocation are:- No prospect of site being developed for Class 4 uses.- Would not undermine the general availability or supply of land for Class 4 uses in Inverness area.- Site was previously allocated for commercial leisure uses.- Would allow the delivery of land and money to resolve the constriant associated with the internal roundabout at Inverness Retail and Business Park (IRBP). Contribution already made from Tesco and JJB. This in turn could make it an "enabling policy" as it would enable the Council's aspiration for a route from the Beechwood Campus through IRBP.- Trunk Road Authority has no objections to proposed uses.- HIE has indicated support for early development of site on grounds of economic development and there is clear market interest.- Submission at Call for Sites stage and the planning application were based on a development framework.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/137	Inverness B10	B10 (combination of MU27 and H55). 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 any planning application. Cairnlaw Burn runs adjacent to the site. The water body is currently at moderate morphological status and is therefore a priority for restoration. There appears to be a small buffer strip left between the site boundary and the water course. This looks too small to be sufficient to allow for future restoration and development of natural processes. This should be considered during planning of the development. There are also small historically straightened watercourses along the site boundary and running through the site. The developer requirements should include an appropriate buffer strip to Cairnlaw Burn and smaller watercourses.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application and the developer requirements should include an appropriate buffer strip to Cairnlaw Burn and smaller watercourses.
Inverness	Highland And Island Enterprise(01035)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01035/1/004	Inverness B10	Confused as to boundary and nature of site suggestion but are content with Plan's preferred uses north of railway line.	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/006	Inverness B11	Object to B11 due to road safety concerns with unfamiliar tourists turning right with caravans on a hill with a bend.	Removal of site allocation from P lan.
Inverness	ASDA Stores Limited(01070)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01070/1/001	Inverness R03	Supports identification of R3 as preferred site for retail development. However consider ASDA site and immediate surroundings (MU16) should be an identified local or commercial centre within the retail hierarchy for the following reasons: -Combination of supermarket, additional retail units, other permissions and a medical centre mean area has a role as a focus for community activity;-Large scale additional housing and two new schools is supported in the area in the MIR;-Important contribution of sites to the catchment population must be recognised; and-Reduces need for car travel to other centres.	Identification of R3 and MU16 as a Local Centre or Commercial Centre in the Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/138	Inverness R04	SEPA will object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption.	Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/139	Inverness R05	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state site at risk of flooding. FRA would be required to demonstrate proposals comply with SPP and mitigation measures would not increase risk elsewhere. Consultation with Flood Prevention Authority on flood prevention mechanisms required. F	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/009	Inverness R06	Out of town retail should be resisted and further allocations of such should not be made. In particular we opposed allocation R6 in Inverness.	Removal of R6 allocation from plan.
Inverness	Culcabock & Drakies Community Council(00279)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00279/1/002	Inverness R07	Objects to preferred status of B4 (and assumed R7) for the area south of Police HQ as it is believed that the site is not suitable for business use due to problems with access and drainage. It is suggested that a more suitable use would be safeguarding the site as part of the Drakies Park buffer.	Extension of greenspace south of Police St at Inshes.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr Brian Grant(00769)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00769/1/001	Inverness R07	Landowner objects to preference for open space on southern part of R7. Seeks a Mixed Use allocation to cover non-preferred R8 to allow for commercial/business/town centre uses including leisure/hotel/retail. Following reasons:- these uses would be consistent with B4 and Inshes Retail Park to the east, and that it could form part of the commercial centre because the same land uses are proposed as those identified for a commercial centre. - commercial viability is at least partly due to nearby compatible uses. - accessibility by a range of modes of transport (including bus, walking and cycling). - it is unclear why the local road network is considered to have capacity for B4 but not this site and seeks clarification on this. - if a Transport Assessment is required with any application then this could consider improvements to the local road network. Landowner questions whether the Council has an up to date open space audit based on qualitative and quantitative supply of open space. It is stated that open space should serve a particular function or purpose in order to be protected, and this function or purpose should be informed by an open space audit, in accordance with SPP. The landowner suggests the site serves no amenity/recreation purpose and questions the difference between this area and the police expansion area. The landowner acknowledges the retained right of access from Dellfield of Inshes roundabout which runs parallel to Sir Walter Scott Drive inside the existing open space.	Seeks allocation of non-preferred R7 site as Mixed Use
Inverness	Mr Brian Grant(00769)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00769/1/002	Inverness R07	Landowner states there were no adverse comments made by the community about this site at the IMFLDP workshop. The landowner asks for the positive aspects of this site to be weighed against the loss of open space.	
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/140	Inverness R08	SEPA will not object - Highland Council confirm that they have done modelling and the flood map is anomalous. R8 (seems to be part of C11).	
Inverness	Simpson Highview(01058)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01058/1/001	Inverness R08	Objects to the non-preferred status of R8 and to the preferred status of C11 in so far as showing the boundary extending around the R8 site. The respondent believes that by doing this it will help to support the Development Strategy in relation to the Council's option to see through to competition of the growth areas at Inshes and Milton of Lyles and Policy 34 of HwLDP. It is also proposed that it will help support the Key Development Issues to direct retail and other commercial development to locations that maximise accessibility and to consolidate the City and protect green wedges.	Retention of the R8 site for retail/commercial uses and in turn the decrease in size of C11.
Inverness	Unknown Client(01314)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01314/1/001	Inverness R08	Landowner (part) objects to R8 not being preferred for commercial uses and seeks its allocation for retail/commercial/business/leisure uses. Landowner has a right of vehicular access from the roundabout to the immediate north east. The owners of the land between this landowners site and Inshes road are making a separate submission however discussions have taken place and any planning application would not be to the detriment of the other landowner, and both have compatible proposals for commercial uses. The landowner considers that this site is suitable for retail/commercial/business/leisure which is largely the uses set for a commerce centre, and this site is considered to represent a natural extension of Inshes Retail Park. The landowner agrees with the identified pros of this site listed in the MIR and considers that the commercial viability is at least partly due to nearby compatible uses. The landowner also considers that this site provides opportunity for commercial development in a highly accessible location. The landowner considers that the scale of the site means that it would only be able to accommodate one or two units and is therefore unclear why roads capacity is an issue. The landowner cites a previous TEC response on a planning application for a retail unit on the site (09/00454/FULIN) this suggested bus-stop laybys with shelters, developer contributions and a Travel Plan but did not suggest any wider concerns about road capacity nor did it suggest refusal on the basis road network capacity.	Retention of R8 in Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Unknown Client(01314)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01314/1/002	Inverness R08	Landowner objects to non-preferred status because:-'loss of greenspace at entrance to public park' is not a significant quantitative loss and does not have any function related to the proposed park, nor is it required for the development of the park. -does not identify any proposed land uses for the site in connection with the District Park other than a footpath along the eastern boundary. -refutes the suggested detriment to the District Park as Phase 1 is well progressed and this site is not utilised. -eastern section corresponds with the right of access and therefore any development of this site could simply incorporate a pedestrian footpath alongside the vehicular access to ensure no conflict with Inshes District Park. -some limited landscaping is also shown along the boundary of the site on the approved plans for the District Park. It is felt that any planning application that comes forward for this site can incorporate landscaping along the site boundaries and that this would limit visual impact of any physical development. The landowner therefore asserts that the allocation of this site for development would not conflict with the development, use of or access to Inshes District Park.-major benefit of the allocation is that it would allow some parking spaces to be created along the eastern boundary; which could help rectify the existing issues of parents parking on the distributor road to drop off their children at Inshes Primary School.-no concerns were raised about the potential development of this site at the Council-led consultation meeting held at Inshes Church on 29th May.	Retention of site within Plan
Inverness	Mr Dereck Mackenzie(00678)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00678/1/002	Inverness R10	Supports the 1994 Plan and the Council has admitted its error in failing to re-allocate it in the 2006 Plan.	Supports allocation of site for retail purposes because it was allocated in the 1994 Plan and the Council has admitted its error in failing to re-allocate it in the 2006 Plan.
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/009	Inverness C02	Supports preference for C2, H5 and MU4. Sites form part of the Torvean and Ness-side Charette area which Scottish Canals is keen to support. Scottish Canal's vision for the area would see the canal play a role in a major recreational and tourist hub here. Opportunity to investigate the creation of additional waterspace within the existing landscape setting to help create an impressive western gateway into the City. May be a unique opportunity to create a water based recreational hub comprising an off-line basin for moorings and other water-based uses on part of the existing golf course. Would also provide a crucial strategic role for the wider canal network. Would take advantage of existing recreational facilities in the area. Inverness Rowing Club would like to expand their existing activities and Scottish Canals are in communication with Jacobite Cruises and Caley Cruises about their existing and future needs. The proposed second canal bridge crossing at Torvean will have implications for how this section of the canal is used both operationally and commercially.Supports Council's desire for a development brief for the area and welcomes the opportunity to set out some of the canal-related, strategic context and potential opportunities at the forthcoming charrette. Keen to ensure that changes to this area facilitate opportunities for existing and new canal-related businesses and also that the role and setting of the canal is understood and respected. Keen to explore this further with stakeholders at the charrette and happy to assist with any preparatory work, introductory presentations or workshop input as required.	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/021	Inverness C02	Seek a developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.	Developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/141	Inverness C03	SEPA will not object if text modified to state FRA required to support any development proposed adjacent or within flood plain and outcome may adversely affect the developable area or development options on the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/005	Inverness C04	Respondent supports the use of C4 as allotments however notes that it is split by the Flood Diversion Channel.	
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/006	Inverness C04	Supports development at site H15 as it is recognised that the Flood Relief Channel will make the site difficult to farm - similar to C4 and it will round off development in this area of Inverness. A Green Wedge running from site H14 through this site should be maintained.	Developer Requirement on site H15 that green corridor from H14 is maintained.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/007	Inverness C04	Supports non-preferred status of H13 and supports Preferred status of C4. Respondent considers that all land south of the road would be better utilised for allotments as proposed to housing.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00942)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00942/1/001	Inverness C04	The Scottish Government (SG) supports preferred status of C4 and H15 . In support of proposals they have submitted a site boundary plan, a series of drawings, a development framework, a statement on the background of Knocknagael Farm and the modernisation programme, a transport paper, and an ecological report. SG propose around 190 house development, and lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C4. Reasons given for the development:- receipts will be reinvested in the modernisation of the National Bull Stud Farm which avoids the need for taxpayers funding. -will make a significant contribution to an effective and marketable housing land supply, complementing delivery of expansion areas and contributing towards the balance of required sites mentioned in the HwLDP as "wider Inverness HMA and windfall." -Consider site to be effective, free from infrastructure constraints of a deliverable scale, and providing choice. -crucial to identify sufficient smaller scale more easily delivered sites with larger sites to the east and west of the city -the Council needs to account for the difficulties faced by the house builders gaining project finance and the impact this will have on build rates. -transport paper demonstrates how suitable connections can be made, and that there is capacity in the local road network-housing proposed could provide a natural rounding off of the settlement by the topography-through structure planting and that the transition from urban to rural can be softened by integrating wildlife, woodland and housing-sustainable location, accessed by a choice of transport options and within easy walking distance of local facilities-considers this land to be surplus to the farms operational requirements.-potential for some form of small scale hydroelectric scheme outwith the site within the Big Burn-Over one third of the site has been reserved for open space and landscaping	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00942)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00942/1/002	Inverness C04	The Scottish Government (SG) object to non-preferred status of H16. In support of proposals they have submitted a site boundary plan, a series of drawings, a development framework, a statement on the background of Knocknagael Farm and the modernisation programme, a transport paper, and an ecological report. SG propose around 190 house development, and lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C4. Reasons given for the development:- receipts will be reinvested in the modernisation of the National Bull Stud Farm which avoids the need for taxpayers funding. -will make a significant contribution to an effective and marketable housing land supply, complementing delivery of expansion areas and contributing towards the balance of required sites mentioned in the HwLDP as "wider Inverness HMA and windfall." -Consider site to be effective, free from infrastructure constraints of a deliverable scale, and providing choice. -crucial to identify sufficient smaller scale more easily delivered sites with larger sites to the east and west of the city -the Council needs to account for the difficulties faced by the house builders gaining project finance and the impact this will have on build rates. -transport paper demonstrates how suitable connections can be made, and that there is capacity in the local road network-housing proposed could provide a natural rounding off of the settlement by the topography-through structure planting and that the transition from urban to rural can be softened by integrating wildlife, woodland and housing-sustainable location, accessed by a choice of transport options and within easy walking distance of local facilities-considers this land to be surplus to the farms operational requirements.-potential for some form of small scale hydroelectric scheme outwith the site within the Big Burn-Over one third of the site has been reserved for open space and landscaping.	SG support these C4, H15 and H16 for a circa 190 house development, with a notional 140 to the north, and a notional 50 in a lower density area to the south. SG suggest a lesser area of allotment or the creation of a Community Production Garden on a suitable part of field C or the wider C4. SG consider H16 to be suitable for housing with an area of landscaping/woodland planting to create the green edge to the development.
Inverness	Ms Freda Newton(00987)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00987/1/002	Inverness C04	Unacceptable that C4 is preferred for community/allotments without land owner consultation and as a spurious extension of larger designation on opposite side of Essich Road. Consider preference for allotments is ill-conceived and possibly a knee-jerk reaction only because of its relative proximity to the Knocknagael part of site C4.	Allocation of C4 for housing rather than community use in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/021	Inverness C05	Seek a developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.	Developer requirement to note the need to consider the setting of the Caledonian Canal.
Inverness	Emma Marr(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/1/001	Inverness C08	Object to allocation as proposed. The land should only be allocated for open space/ recreational park, as in the existing Local Plan which followed consultation on proposed uses. Construction of the Gaelic School has already reduced the area available for provision of the planned District Park; this should not be reduced further and the opportunity should not be lost to be able to provide an area for recreational games on the only level area of land available, in accordance with previously agreed conditions. Furthermore, the uses for which the Gaelic Group has applied for planning permission on the land would cause disturbance to neighbours.	Allocate the land for open space/ recreational park use only.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/002	Inverness C08	Respondent refers to a letter sent on 1st May 2012. Respondent has objected to current planning application on site C8 for office development on the site. Respondent considers that site C8 should remain as a park/public open space.	Site C8 to be zoned as open space.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/142	Inverness C08	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that development would have to be supported by an FRA, drawing on information from the Asda FRA and the SWIFRS. FRA would be required to demonstrate proposals comply with SPP and mitigation measures would not increase risk elsewhere. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Dr Maria De La Torre(01205)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01205/1/007	Inverness C08	Gaelic School - was community space	
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness C09	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape
Inverness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/024	Inverness C10	The site lies within the Leys Castle Inventory Designed Landscape boundary. While Historic Scotland (HS) are content with this HS would ask that developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape. Should HS be requested they would consider reviewing the current boundary of the designed landscape.	Developer requirements need to consider the setting of the core of the designed landscape
Inverness	Simpson Highview(01058)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01058/1/001	Inverness C11	Objects to the non-preferred status of R8 and to the preferred status of C11 in so far as showing the boundary extending around the R8 site. The respondent believes that by doing this it will help to support the Development Strategy in relation to the Council's option to see through to competition of the growth areas at Inshes and Milton of Leys and Policy 34 of HwLDP. It is also proposed that it will help support the Key Development Issues to direct retail and other commercial development to locations that maximise accessibility and to consolidate the City and protect green wedges.	Retention of the R8 site for retail/commercial uses and in turn the decrease in size of C11.
Inverness	Lochardil And Drummond Community Council(00304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00304/2/015	Inverness C13	Respondent considers that C13 should not be preserved as a green wedge as this concept is outdated. Respondent considers that this site should be part park and partly developed.	Change allocation C13 to Mixed Use
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/001	Inverness C13	Objects to preference of MU29 and MU28, objects to non-preference of C13 and supports non-preference of site H57. Respondent objects to the expansion of East Inverness in particular these 4 sites and land to the north west of H57. Concerns raised in response to the HwLDP remain unchanged. Westhill, Resaurie, Smithton and Culloden are large predominately residential areas with very little "on the doorstep" accessible open space compared to other parts of Inverness. The plan needs to provide for a large public open space including parkland, an arboretum, playgrounds, allotments etc. The Council should establish this and not wait for developers' speculative proposals and timetables.	Removal of MU28 and MU29 and requests retention of C13.
Inverness	Norah Munro(00600)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00600/1/001	Inverness C13	Objects to non-preferred status of H57. Differing view from the presentation given in the MIR of site options and preferences for Ashton Farm. The Executors remain committed to the development as outlined in the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework with the mixed housing and commercial elements. They would wish to see future plans reflect this and to be within the phasing as outlined (in the framework) and are concerned that the current plans (MIR) have no allocation of development opportunities to the Ashton Farm site. The farm being surrounded by various developments (Inverness Retail Park, Beechwood Campus and Stratton mixed use) together with the planned trunk road alignment would make it impossible to continue both practically and profitably as a non-developed farming unit. Ensuring that the unit remains accessible, and part of a coherent phased development for the A96 Corridor remain key.	Allocate land at Ashton Farm for phased development of housing and commercial uses and ensure that access is maintained for the farming unit and for development.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Macdonald Hotels(00985)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00985/1/001	Inverness C13	Landowner supports the continued allocation of Stratton Lodge land (H59 and MU29) as preferred sites but has some concerns:- Servicing and phasing of the development relative to the HwLDP provisions. A Significant Con of the site has been noted as its dependency on "local and trunk road network" and although the HwLDP states various provisions, the respondent has concerns that these depend on actions of others. As a result the restoration of Stratton Lodge Hotel (H59) will be delayed whilst the commitments are made. - Although the landowner accepts the requirement of the link between A9 and A96, they are concerned about its route, the connectivity between their land and adjoining development sites, its deliverability and the detail of the major junctions. Respondent unsure whether the Strategic Link Road has to be completed in its entirety in advance of Phase 2. If so, respondent questions the ability to deliver it through Ashton Farm as it is allocated as Open Space (C13) and is likely to remain in agricultural use for some time. - Main concern is the need to upgrade Barn Church Road in advance of respondent's land being developed. - H59 is indicated as Phase 1 in HwLDP but respondent concerned this may not be feasible without allowing access through the open part of their land as indicated in Phase 2. A preferred means of access is outlined in the attached map.- Lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network. The consultation in early 2012 was absent of detail about the timing of the provision of local connections and improvements required to open up land at Stratton. Respondent argues that this opportunity should not be land-locked or hindered by uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. As a result respondent would prefer the open part of land to be separated out (as it is in terms of ownership) from MU29 and shown as a housing site.	Respondent would prefer the open part of land to be separated out (as it is in terms of ownership) from MU29 and shown as a housing site.
Inverness	Mr Fraser Hutcheson(00986)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00986/1/001	Inverness C13	Supports preference for housing development on H56. Raises number of concerns regarding servicing and phasing of development relative to the provisions of the HwLDP and lack clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network in the area. Concerned about the route of the A9-A96 due to connectivity of H56 with adjoining development plan, its deliverability and the nature of major junctions with the A9 and A96. Not clear whether Strategic Link Road has to be completed in its entirety in advance of commencing Phase 2 of East Inverness. If this is the case, question if the section through Ashton Farm can be completed when it is identified as open space (C13) and likely to remain in agricultural use for the foreseeable future. In the consultation conducted by Transport Scotland on the east link in early 2012 there was an absence of detail about timing of provision of local road connections and improvements required to open up development land north of the railway at Cradlehall. Vital that this opportunity is not land-locked or hindered by the uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. Separate representations to Transport Scotland have been made about connectivity right across the East Inverness area. In the absence of clarity over access to the proposed trunk road link and local future local road network developers will be reluctant to show interest and commit to financial contributions to road proposals at H56. On the basis of Transport Scotland's draft options there are strong reservations about being involved in the development of the East Inverness area. Landowner seeks clarity about how H56 will be accessed for development purposes and therefore whether it is worth while making the site available for development. Transport Scotland has so far failed to do this. As such, call upon the Council to provide clear development guidance through the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.	Proposed Plan to provide clarity on A9-A96 link in terms of route, junctions, timing and level of developer contributions
Inverness	The Executory Of Hector Munro(01311)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01311/1/001	Inverness C13	The executory of Hector Munro objects to the preferred "open space - land not be to developed" identification of this land and supports its allocation for small scale development in the short term and a long term allocation for mixed uses (as reflected in the HwLDP) for the following reasons- although there are historical issues regarding the availability of this land, the situation with Ashton Farm owners is under discussion and is likely to change towards making the land available for development in the future- the landowners do not support community parkland development as a primary use for this site- it is acknowledged that the access is largely if not solely dependent upon getting access from the east (ie. Stratton Farm) and the proposed East Link is not programmed to start until 2017 at the earliest - it is also recognised that Transport Scotland are unlikely to approve a new access onto the A96 at this location, and access from the south west is not achievable due to road capacity issues- Inverness Estates are currently in the process of preparing a detailed planning application for Stratton Farm which will bring access up to and including the mutual eastern boundary with Ashton Farm	Change of use from Openspace to Mixed Use
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/003	Inverness C14	Support preference for community use and as providing playing fields for an expanded Culloden Academy. Should remain as open green space	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr Allan Hunter(01152)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01152/1/002	Inverness C15	Respondent questions whether site C15 would be for allotments	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/002	Inverness I01	Comments that proposed development likely to have a significant effect on European natural heritage site.	Developer requirement for appropriate mitigation.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/013	Inverness I01	Welcomes proposals to make more use of the Longman area for industrial purposes but concerned at the proposal for an energy-from-waste (incineration) facility. In the absence of due consultation, with details of how this facility would operate, of possible adverse effects on the neighbourhood and current recycling schemes and how costs compare to the current waste disposal scheme, respondent objects to an irreversible decision to designate any part of sites I1, I2, I3 or I4 or elsewhere in Inverness, for an energy-from-waste facility.	Requirement that waste-to-energy plant is not allowed on the site.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/143	Inverness I01	SEPA object unless the following further information is gathered prior to Proposed Plan or allocation removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Although planning permission is granted SEPA don't seem to have been consulted. We have record of data request in 2008.	Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan,
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/054	Inverness I02	Concerns regarding potential adverse effect on Moray Firth SAC, River Moriston SAC and Inner Moray Firth SPA because of detrimental impact on water quality, noise, vibrations (from piling), and increased recreational boat traffic. Cites that previous research has demonstrated that a connectivity exists between the site and the designations.	Need for HRA and resultant mitigation as developer requirements.
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/013	Inverness I02	Welcomes proposals to make more use of the Longman area for industrial purposes but concerned at the proposal for an energy-from-waste (incineration) facility. In the absence of due consultation, with details of how this facility would operate, of possible adverse effects on the neighbourhood and current recycling schemes and how costs compare to the current waste disposal scheme, respondent objects to an irreversible decision to designate any part of sites I1, I2, I3 or I4 or elsewhere in Inverness, for an energy-from-waste facility.	Requirement that waste-to-energy plant is not allowed on the site.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/144	Inverness I02	SEPA will object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. FLand claim has the potential to affect coastal processes/habitats in the wider Beaully and Moray Firth water bodies (currently good and high status respectively). Opportunities to minimise intertidal habitat loss and coastal restoration e.G. Managed realignment should be explored. Sewerage discharge points would need extended.	Lood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.
Inverness	Inverness Harbour Trust(01196)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01196/1/001	Inverness I02	Objects to the preferred allocation of I2 for industrial use and the non-preference for MU8 and MU9 to be preferred mixed use sites.Considers I2, MU8 and MU9 should be allocated for mixed use, specifically commercial, office, retail, residential, tourist and leisure uses, for the following reasons:-The harbour should no longer be seen as a conventional port;-Opportunity to restore the harbour and transform the city waterfront as a strategic priority;-Reuse of harbours for mixed use purposes have sustained regeneration in many UK cities;-Proximity of the firths is not a constraint to land reclamation or development, both have happened recently;-Development would be outwith Health and Safety Executive Buffers;-Not allocating the sites for mixed use is contrary to the HwLDP and the Moray Firth Major Ports and Sites Strategy (2006);-Opportunity to reflect the uniqueness of Inverness Harbour in the north-east of Scotland;-To sustain the harbour as a regional transport hub;-To recognise the opportunity at the harbour derives from the extent of the Trusts ownership and that the viability of development and the business streams promoted in policy require a comprehensive approach;-Architecture and Design Scotland were supportive of plans for a hotel adjacent to the marina;-Consistent with the Council's first Vision for Inverness in 1997; and-The trust will work closely with the community.	Allocation of I2, MU8 and MU9 for mixed use in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/013	Inverness I03	Welcomes proposals to make more use of the Longman area for industrial purposes but concerned at the proposal for an energy-from-waste (incineration) facility. In the absence of due consultation, with details of how this facility would operate, of possible adverse effects on the neighbourhood and current recycling schemes and how costs compare to the current waste disposal scheme, respondent objects to an irreversible decision to designate any part of sites I1, I2, I3 or I4 or elsewhere in Inverness, for an energy-from-waste facility.	Requirement that waste-to-energy plant is not allowed on the site.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/145	Inverness I03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state site at risk of flooding. FRA would be required to demonstrate proposals comply with SPP and mitigation measures would not increase risk elsewhere.	Flood Risk Assessmentwill be required in support of any planning application.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/056	Inverness I04	Requests HRA of potential adverse effects of sites on adjoining SAC and SPA. Masterplan for area should include a landscape framework which seeks to retain woodland on MU21 as a visual framework and screen.	HRA of potential adverse effects of sites on adjoining SAC and SPA and resultant mitigation as developer requirements. Woodland retention requirement for site MU21.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Muirtown Community Council(00309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00309/1/008	Inverness I04	Do not support a refuse incinerator on site I4 for the following reasons:-such a facility should not be sited within the City or it's immediate environment;-it is claimed that with modern technology these facilities can be relatively ' clean' . However, like most things, including the particle board factory at Tornagrain, they are prone to problems, and do not always at optimum efficiency. -bulk of the former landfill site should be kept as landscaped open space with potential for wildlife reserve, walking, cycling, picnic areas, equestrian events, shows/circus, highland games, sheep dog trials, informal games pitches, City seafront etc.	Allocation of the majority of the former landfill site for landscaped open space with potential for wildlife reserve, walking, cycling, picnic areas, equestrian events, shows/circus, highland games, sheep dog trials, informal games pitches, City seafront etc.
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/003	Inverness I04	Respondent supports site I4 for an Energy from Waste Plant	
Inverness	Westhill CC(00324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00324/1/013	Inverness I04	Welcomes proposals to make more use of the Longman area for industrial purposes but concerned at the proposal for an energy-from-waste (incineration) facility. In the absence of due consultation, with details of how this facility would operate, of possible adverse effects on the neighbourhood and current recycling schemes and how costs compare to the current waste disposal scheme, respondent objects to an irreversible decision to designate any part of sites I1, I2, I3 or I4 or elsewhere in Inverness, for an energy-from-waste facility.	Requirement that waste-to-enegey plant is not allowed on the site.
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/011	Inverness I04	Object to the proposed incinerator (energy from waste) proposal at Longman (14).	
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/012	Inverness I04	Object to MU21, MU22, T2, and 14 because risks arising from rising sea levels associated with climate change and to preserve as far as possible the special environment of the Moray Firth. Where these sites are already developed would seek their restoration to provide ecological services. Sensitive recreational uses of these sites may be appropriate.	
Inverness	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/018	Inverness I04	Concerns regarding the potential for a waste plant in this location given that the text in the MIR is limited in terms of any potential effects on the environment or wildlife.	
Inverness	Mr Roger Reed(00965)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00965/1/001	Inverness I04	Objects to Mixed Use allocation of MU21 and requested it to be allocated as greenspace for the following reasons- it forms a natural corridor around the perimeter of the Moray Firth- it has experienced considerable regeneration and this should be allowed to continue- the site is not suitable for industry due to its neighbouring uses including the football stadium, new marina, potential harbour expansion area, campus and the 3 main entry points to the cityRespondent also objects to the industry allocation for I4 particularly the idea of an incinerator at the site as this would likely cause pollution and increase traffic on an already congested road network. Overall the respondent would like to see the coastal sites MU21 and I4 safeguarded as a nature conservation area.	Requests change of use from mixed use to open space
Inverness	Combined Power And Heat Highland Ltd(00983)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00983/1/001	Inverness I04	Notes I4 is consistent with HwLDP allocation for mixed use development at the former Longman landfill site and HwLDP Policy 70 which supports waste management facility proposals at 4 preferred sites, including Longman. States that opportunity to bring the former Longman Landfill site back into use is subject to feasibility work to test the viability and suitability of the land for development; requests for the Proposed Plan to recognise this consistent with the HwLDP.	Proposed Plan to recognise that there is uncertainty in relation to the viability and suitability of the Longman site for development, consistent with the HwLDP.
Inverness	Inverness Civic Trust(01064)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01064/2/003	Inverness I04	Reservations regarding an incinerator on this site; consider it would be better suited further east along the Moray Firth coast.	Acceptable uses on I4 to not include incinerator
Inverness	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/001	Inverness I04	RSPB object to the allocation of these sites for development as beyond the difficulties of developing them they believe it is also the best use for these sites and would create a world class frontage. They also consider that this is in keeping with the modern approach to brownfield sites and cite New Yorks former docklands which are now parks and reserves.	Allocation as public open space to be used for nature reserve.
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/005	Inverness I04	Land between the A9 and the Moray Firth should be promoted as areas of public open space as per previous local plans. Considers allocating this land for commercial purposes is inappropriate for the following reasons:-Longman Industrial Estate is on the other side of the A9;-Sites could be developed as an attractive amenity space taking advantage of the water front;-Allocating even part of the area will seriously damage the sites recreational/amenity potential; and-No proposals which would provide adequate alternative provision in the area.	Allocation of I4, MU21 and MU20 as public open space in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/046	Inverness T01	Comments that site within Torvean landform SSSI. However, impact may be negligible if development restricted to worked out area. Physical impact to integrity would only occur if the esker ridges and other still natural landforms are affected. Other visual and recreational impacts should be mitigated by developer requirements.	Visual and recreational impacts developer requirements mitigation.
Inverness	Inverness West Community Council(00296)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00296/1/004	Inverness T01	Requests that should the site be designated as a temporary stop site for travellers that this should not displace the current trail and quad bike usage of the old quarry. Concerns that this usage if displaced would cause damage and disruption to the surrounding area.	Developer requirement to safeguard existing quad and trail bike usage of the quarry.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Scottish Canals(00655)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00655/1/010	Inverness T01	Respondent understands the requirement for Travellers sites to be allocated but urges Council to ensure that activities on the site do not spill onto the towpath through conditions on consents, particularly if Torvean is to be promoted as a western gateway to the city. Concerned allocation of site could cause increased difficulties for managing conflicts between different users of the towpath. Management of site and surrounding area crucial to the success of the Torvean area and enjoyment of the canal.	Requirement for any site allocation to specify that travellers activities do not spill onto the canal towpath.
Inverness	Mr Kenneth Sutherland(00937)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00937/1/002	Inverness T01	Considers T1 and T2 much more suited for travellers sites than T3.	
Inverness	Ms Kathleen Sutherland(00938)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00938/1/002	Inverness T01	Favour T1 and T2 in comparison to T3.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Tony Kell(01025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01025/1/002	Inverness T01	Considers T1 more suitable than T3 because of the absence of local housing and presence of better road access.	
Inverness	Mr Donald B Henderson(01054)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01054/1/002	Inverness T01	Supports allocation of travellers site on T1. Considers MU21 and T1 would be suitable for a travellers site than T3 for the following reasons:- safe access to main arterial routes;- ready access to services and facilities;- closer to areas where the police can provide the appropriate visibility and reassurance to the public during their normal course of patrol;- police able to respond more quickly where disruptive elements of the travelling community cause fear intimidation to those travellers who are law abiding and want to go about their business unhindered and peaceable manner; and- large enough for expansion in the future.	Non-allocation of T3 for traveller's site; allocation of travellers site on MU21
Inverness	Mr Edwin And Linda Simpson(01055)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01055/1/002	Inverness T01	Objects to T3 and supports alternative site at somewhere like T1 as it provides better access to all the available services and more space.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Ms Claire Wilson(01056)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01056/1/002	Inverness T01	Understand that travellers' choose not integrate with existing communities, therefore logical to allocate a site not directly adjoined to a local community, for example T1.	
Inverness	Mrs Katrina Coutts(01084)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01084/1/002	Inverness T01	Considers that Sites T01 and T03 should be used for alternative purposes to temporary stop sites for Gypsy/Travellers.	Allocate land in alternate locations such as site MU21.
Inverness	D. Fraser(01153)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01153/1/002	Inverness T01	Respondent considers T1 would more suitable as it does have the same constraints as T3 and would not affect local residents	Non-allocation of T3 in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/004	Inverness T01	Considers site should be retained as public open space to accommodate an expanding city in future years. Also contrary to Policy 39 Gypsies/Travellers of the HwLDP.	Allocate T1 as public open space in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mrs Maggie Parks(01265)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01265/1/001	Inverness T01	Objects to the preferred status of T3 for travellers and supports T1 for the following reasons- the social impact of the Daviot site close to elderly residents- the waste management issues caused on the Daviot site- its location away from services - and its safety given its proximity to the main road- Torvean quarry offers a big site which is well screened from the road	Removal of T1 and retention of T3
Inverness	Mr Ian Hunt(01270)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01270/1/002	Inverness T01	Respondent supports use of Site T1	
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/003	Inverness T02	Comments that proposed development likely to have a significant effect on European natural heritage site.	Developer requirement for appropriate mitigation.
Inverness	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/058	Inverness T02	Serious concerns about potential adverse effects on the integrity of the adjacent Inner Moray Firth SPA/RAMSAR site. Believes there will be disturbance to birdlife in particular their roost sites from people and dogs on the shore. Site is on seaward side of road and beyond tree screen that was intended to minimise disturbance. Believes there will also be a cumulative adverse effect on roost sites if this and other coastal site options are confirmed. Asserts that site should not be retained unless appropriate assessment demonstrates no adverse effect on integrity.	Site should not be retained unless appropriate assessment demonstrates no adverse effect on integrity of SPA.
Inverness	Smithton & Culloden Community Council(00317)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00317/1/002	Inverness T02	Respondent believes that site T2 may have effect on public recreation and the proposed coastal trail. Respondent suggests alternative site at Alturlie Quarry.	
Inverness	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/012	Inverness T02	Object to MU21, MU22, T2, and 14 because risks arising from rising sea levels associated with climate change and to preserve as far as possible the special environment of the Moray Firth. Where these sites are already developed would seek their restoration to provide ecological services. Sensitive recreational uses of these sites may be appropriate.	
Inverness	Balloch Community Council(00492)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00492/1/004	Inverness T02	Considers to be an inappropriate site for travellers for the following reasons:- A96 is dangerous for travellers' traffic; and - may discourage locals from using the area for amenity. Questions if a site could be found in areas already identified for development - namely MU27, MU28 or MU29	Removal of site T2 from Proposed Plan and consideration of new travellers sites at the longman.
Inverness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/146	Inverness T02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that no development would be supported below the coastal flood level. This should be achievable as SEPA Flood Map just shows flooding around the edges. Flood Risk Assessment not be required provided development above coastal flood level.	
Inverness	Mr Kenneth Sutherland(00937)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00937/1/002	Inverness T02	Considers T1 and T2 much more suited for travellers sites than T3.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Ms Kathleen Sutherland(00938)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00938/1/002	Inverness T02	Favour T1 and T2 in comparison to T3.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr F Driver(01131)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01131/1/001	Inverness T02	Concerned about T2 for the following reasons:- land is not identified in Inverness Local Plan so proposal is contrary to it.- If approved it would set a precedent for further development on the old road which would be detrimental to visual amenity.- Inner Moray Firth is a protected area and proposal would not be in the spirit of protecting the area in terms of amenity and wildlife.- No connection to sewer.- Would affect value of respondent's property.	
Inverness	J Davis Addly(01304)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01304/1/001	Inverness T02	Considers that if this site is be used as a travelling site then its access should be from close to the Tesco roundabout rather than through existing residential areas.	
Inverness	Cllr Kate Stephen(01348)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01348/1/006	Inverness T02	Objects to the Council's preference of this site as a temporary site for travellers for the following reasons- it should not be on a dump - and it should not be on a sensitive environmental site	
Inverness	Richard Crawford - Collective Response(01352)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01352/1/003	Inverness T02	Concerned that this use will have an adverse effect on the neighbouring shoreside walking route. Believe other (undefined) mixed use sites may be suitable for this purpose.	
Inverness	Strathnairn Community Council(00320)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00320/1/001	Inverness T03	The site should not be allocated for traveller site development. There is concern within the community with regard to this proposal:- Road Safety, given the function of the B9154, its junction with the A9 and the practice of using the route as a diversion in the case of serious accidents on the A9;- Criminality, given recent experience of gypsy travellers staying at the site;- Intimidation, partly given recent experience;- Public Reassurance and Safety, as distance from Inverness and limited resources would prevent the Police from being able to provide the visibility and reassurance necessary;- Environmental Issues, particularly with regard to abandonment of human and other waste;- Negative Impact to Local Economy, with respect to proximity to la range of ocal businesses and belief that the trade of thos businesses would be significantly impacted upon;- Schooling, as the schooling facilities in the area are not suitably resourced.It is appropriate that the Council identifies sites for the gypsy traveller community, but it is important that locations identified for sites are suitable both in terms of location and facilities, including access from/to main roads. More suitable locations would be Torvean Quarry or the reclaimed land adjacent to the ICT stadium. This would ensure proximity of travellers to services they require and also enabling effective policing. Before any rural location is considered, a proper and full local impact assessment should be carried out and a full consultation had with residents.	Consider Torvean Quarry or the reclaimed land adjacent to the ICT stadium as more suitable locations. Before any rural location is considered, a full local impact assessment is required.
Inverness	Strathnairn Community Council(00320)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00320/2/002	Inverness T03	Makes reference previous letter (320/1) requesting removal of site T3 from plan	Removal of T3 from Proposed Plan
Inverness	Ms Susan Cameron(00921)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00921/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects because of adverse impact on tourist route - spoiling the atmosphere and reducing the number of visitors. Believes Torvean Quarry would be a more suitable site.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Kenneth Sutherland(00937)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00937/1/002	Inverness T03	Considers T1 and T2 much more suited for travellers sites than T3.	
Inverness	Ms Kathleen Sutherland(00938)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00938/1/002	Inverness T03	Favour T1 and T2 in comparison to T3.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Donald M Fraser(00959)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00959/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to allocation of this site as a travellers site because of previous impact on the farm operation, and social concerns.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mrs Bea Wallace(00971)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00971/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to site T3 for the following reasons:- Is very close tot he existing tourist campo and caravan park at Auchnahillin which could have a negative impact on tourism in the area.- Very few local amenities in Daviot. A better site needs to be found with better amenities, a nearby school and which would have less impact on the local community.Torvean Quarry would have less of an impact on the local community and would provide local amenities.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Alan Croxford(00972)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00972/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to site T3 for following reasons:- Entrance is near two bends in the bend and not suitable for use by lots of vehicles.- Is in direct view of the respondents property.- During previous use of the site, elderly neighbours were harassed, the nearby touring campsite was asked for water, fires were lit to burn waste, neighbours were disturbed. Household and roadworks debris was left behind, a pick up truck was abandoned and a dog had to be rescued.- No facilities on site.Respondent understands that a local resident has identified the site as suitable for his Firewood business, which would be a more constructive and beneficial use of the site.A temporary site should be located adjacent to the existing site at Caledonian Stadium, moving the salt depot. Another alternative is Torvean Quarry where there are no neighbours to bother and it is screened.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Ms Carol Taylor(00989)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00989/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to site T3 for the following reasons:- Access at both junctions with the A9 are precarious when towing caravans.- The site would exacerbate traffic flow problems during the Moy Games Fair.- Any dogs on the site could cause problems for sheep and cattle in the area.Respondent suggests that site at Torvean Quarry should be used instead.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Bob And Liz Shannon(00991)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00991/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to site T3 for following reasons:- Current vehicular access to site has limited sight lines and the suggested use introduces an element of danger to this section of the road due to the relatively slow moving traffic it would generate.- Limited screening from the adjoining road which is a tourist road and part of the national cycle network and this would impair visitor enjoyment.- Close to a number of houses and could be commercially damaging to nearby Auchnahillin Holiday Park.- Site is relatively small and may not justify the investment. However the Torvean site (T1) is a size that would justify investment and would be more convenient for supervision/management by the Council. It also has good access to the A82, is well screened, distant from residential properties and close to services in Inverness.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Tony Kell(01025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01025/1/002	Inverness T03	Considers T1 more suitable than T3 because of the absence of local housing and presence of better road access.	
Inverness	Mr William And Jennifer Smart(01044)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01044/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to the allocation of land for a travellers site based on- experience of how site this was managed last time, and the disturbance it caused- the lack of police in close proximity- the impact on a small rural school- the distance from facilities and services- the road safety of this site- a more suitable site being Torvean Quarry which has better access to services and facilities, better road access, and room for future development	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr Donald B Henderson(01054)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01054/1/002	Inverness T03	Supports allocation of travellers site on T1. Considers MU21 and T1 would be suitable for a travellers site than T3 for the following reasons:- safe access to main arterial routes;- ready access to services and facilities;- closer to areas where the police can provide the appropriate visibility and reassurance to the public during their normal course of patrol;- police able to respond more quickly where disruptive elements of the travelling community cause fear intimidation to those travellers who are law abiding and want to go about their business unhindered and peaceable manner; and- large enough for expansion in the future.	Non-allocation of T3 for traveller's site; allocation of travellers site on MU21
Inverness	Mr Edwin And Linda Simpson(01055)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01055/1/002	Inverness T03	Objects to T3 and supports alternative site at somewhere like T1 as it provides better access to all the available services and more space.	Non-allocation of T3 in Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mrs Katrina Coutts(01084)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01084/1/002	Inverness T03	Considers that Sites T01 and T03 should be used for alternative purposes to temporary stop sites for Gypsy/Travellers.	Allocate land in alternate locations such as site MU21.
Inverness	D. Fraser(01153)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01153/1/002	Inverness T03	Respondent considers T1 would more suitable as it does have the same constraints as T3 and would not affect local residents	Non-allocation of T3 in the Proposed Plan
Inverness	Mr David Ross(01183)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01183/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to the allocation of this site as a travellers site for the following reasons- safety of the access junction - the lack of sanitary facilities- social concerns about it being next to housing area with a lot of elderly residents- concerns about the impact on camping business nearby -Tovean quarry is considered a better site in terms of access arrangements and remoteness from settlement	Removal of T3 and allocation of T1
Inverness	Ms Anita Gibson(01220)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01220/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to this land being preferred as a Traveller's site for the following reasons- concern about the impact on the quality of life for nearby residents including elderly occupants- it is highly visible from the B9154 road (alternative tourist route from the A9)- impact on amenity because the road is part of the National Cycle Network 7 and is popular for walkers, horse riders etc- safety concerns about poor vehicle access - effect on the local property market- issues with fly tipping and management of waste- experience of past social/police issues and lack of a positive contribution to the local community- adverse affect on tourism businesses (Auchnahillin Caravan and camping park) such as their own- the site is small and therefore is it viable to provide the necessary infrastructure/ facilities, management and maintenance that is necessary- favours Torvean quarry for this type of use as it is away from residences and screened from the main road and considers that this could be developed without compromising the new river crossing, citing Longman as an example- favours further development of stopping places for temporary occupants at Longman, there is space, infrastructure, it would not affect houses or businesses, and gives travellers easy access to the trunk roads	Removal of T3 and retention of T1 in Plan
Inverness	Mr Donald Gibson(01221)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01221/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to a Travellers site being identified here for the following reasons- negative impact on tourism in general and their business (Auchnahillin Caravan and camping park) in particular - detract from enjoyment of the adjacent B9154 road by other users, particularly walkers, cyclists, horse riders- traffic hazard from unsuitable access and limited visibility- general tendency of travellers' camps to be unsightly and environmental impact of rubbish and other waste- adverse effect on property values and the local housing market - effect on local residents, particularly the elderly and vulnerable- favours Torvean quarry for this type of use as it is away from residences - favours further development of stopping places for temporary occupants at Longman, there is space, infrastructure, it would not affect houses or businesses, and is accessible for users and managers	Removal of T3 and retention of T1

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Inverness	Mr Tom Gibson(01222)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01222/1/001	Inverness T03	The respondent objects to the establishment of a travellers' site alongside the B9154 and feels that this would- spoil the landscape and scenery - negatively effect the amenity of being in the area including the recreational use of the B9154 by cyclists, walkers, and tourists- have a negative effect on the family's Auchnahillin Caravan and Campting businessThe respondent hopes that the Council will consider the other options- particularly making more use of the space next to the Longman Roundabout off the A9 as it is considered that travellers can be accommodated here within easy access of the main roads without impacting on homes or businesses	The respondent objects to the use of this land for a Travellers site and considers that other options particularly expansion of the Longman site should be preferred.
Inverness	Ms Georgia Gibson(01225)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01225/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to this land being preferred as a Traveller's site for the following reasons- concern about the impact on the quality of life for nearby residents including elderly occupants- impact on amenity because the road is popular for walkers, horse riders etc- adverse affect on family's tourism businesses - favous further development of stopping places for temporary occupants at Longman as it would not affect houses or businesses	Removal of T3 from Plan
Inverness	Mrs Babs Kinnear(01234)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01234/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to the allocation of this site for Travellers for the following reasons- road safety concerns due to the sites proximity to the road- its location above the snow line, and its effect on the provision of facilities- concern about the appearance of the site- concern about privacy due to close vicinity to existing residents- considers Torvean to be the most suitable option as it is screened from the road and would cause minimum disruption to the community	Removal of T3 and retention of T1
Inverness	Mr Neil Pirritt(01243)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01243/1/001	Inverness T03	Respondent objects to the Councils preference of this land being allocated as a Travellers site for the following reasons- the site has not been well maintained or cleared after their use- it is close to housing and there were social issues caused by this proximity - on checking the title deeds through the UK Land Register the Council do not own this land	Respondent objects to the Councils preference of this land being allocated as a Travellers site
Inverness	Mrs Margaret N Sanderson(01263)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01263/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to the Council's preference of this site for a traveller's site for the following reasons- the previous social/criminal issues caused by use of this site - the previous problems with waste management on this site- considers Torvean quarry to be a better site for this purpose.	Removal of T3 and rentention of T1
Inverness	Mrs Maggie Parks(01265)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01265/1/001	Inverness T03	Objects to the preferred status of T3 for travellers and supports T1 for the following reasons- the social impact of the Daviot site close to elderly residents- the waste management issues caused on the Daviot site- its location away from services - and its safety given its proximity to the main road- Torvean quarry offers a big site which is well screened from the road	Removal of T1 and retention of T3
Inverness	Mr Ian Hunt(01270)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01270/1/001	Inverness T03	The respondent objects to Site T3 for the following reasons:- Impact on view from B9154 - Impact on business operation of existing Caravan Site at Auchnahillin - Distress caused to the local community - School provision is inadequate - Road safety would be detrimentally affected - Increased criminal activity.	Removal of Site T3
Inverness	Visit Scotland(01346)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01346/2/001	Inverness T03	Visit Scotland express their concern that any proposed developments must take into consideration the implications they will have on tourism both for existing businesses, such as Achnahillin Holiday Park, and for visitors of an area.	