

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Ross and Cromarty Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	Highland Planning Consultancy(00963)	Suggested sites outwith settlements	Suggested sites outwith settlements	<p>Seeks the allocation of the two sites submitted for Ardross at the Call for sites stage of the IMFLDP.</p> <p>Respondent supports site A Dalnavie Farm, Ardross for development of 3 houses and reasons that it is a suitable site because it is considered that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it occupies a poorly drained portion of the field, but that drainage can be addressed through development - it would read well with the new houses on other side of the road - there are no infrastructure issues - no trees will be affected - it poses no visual amenity issue <p>The respondent feels that this proposal sits well with SPP 2010 in terms of its principle to increase the supply of new homes through flexible delivery in sustainable locations and infill sites are highlighted as being capable of making useful contribution.</p> <p>Respondent supports site B Dalnavie Farm, Ardross for housing development maybe not for the short term but for towards the end of the 10 year plan period. The respondent considers that this site is well located to service the industrial area of the Cromarty Firth, that it will compliment Ardross, that it is deliverable, and that it could be a sustainable development capable of producing a sense of place.</p>	Seeks the allocation of the two sites submitted for Ardross at the Call for sites stage of the IMFLDP .
Ross and Cromarty Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/2/003	Suggested sites outwith settlements	Respondent wishes to promote a development opportunity at Greenleonachs, by Culbokie on land within their control. The site is circa 3 acres and is located amongst a group of houses in the immediate surrounding area including Tigh-na-Tobar, Lochside Cottage and The Swallows. Approval has previously been granted for an agricultural building on the site. Respondent feels that as the proposal is deemed in accordance with the adopted policies of the development plan (respondent's view) it should be included as an allocation or on a list of suitable opportunities.	Seeks allocation of land as development opportunity.
Ross and Cromarty Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/2/004	Suggested sites outwith settlements	Respondent owns a site at Burnside Woods, Killen, approximately 9km due east of Culbokie, which currently accomodates circa 100 acres of woodland. Would like the site allocated for holiday let/tourism for approximately 12 properties and activity centre/shop. The idea of holiday let accommodation scheme has previously been discussed with the Council.	Would like site at Burnside Woods, Killen, allocated for holiday let/tourism for approximately 12 properties and activity centre/shop.
Ross and Cromarty Area - Suggested sites outwith settlements	Muir Homes(01229)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01229/1/001	Suggested sites outwith settlements	<p>Muir Homes consider there are circumstances where sites on/adjacent to main arterial routes, which are readily accessible to nearby services and where a strong landscape framework exists, could add to deliverable development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that additional development within the hinterland around towns area would be small scale (not more than 3 to 4 units), easily accessible in all respects (access to the site/local services etc), and contained/absorbed within a landscape context in order to protect the visual amenity/integrity of the rural 	Site to be allocated for the development of 3/4 live-work residential units. Second preference is for establishment of a criteria based policy framework for this type of development to allow development of this nature on sites on/adjacent to main arterial routes, which are readily accessible to

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scottish Planning Policy places an onus on local development plans to promote economic activity and diversification in all small towns and rural areas - that home-work units are a particular opportunity to deliver a form of sustainable development suited to retaining/increasing economic activity within rural areas, meeting specific business needs in some employment sectors, while also providing for housing needs - that there is an accepted requirement at national level for live-work style residential units in rural areas and that this form of supported development cannot readily be delivered within established settlements. <p>Muir Homes support a proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - south of Muir of Ord (opposite Windhill) and directly adjacent to and accessed from the A862, to be allocated for the development of 3/4 live-work residential units. - the site is considered accessible (to the A862 and to local services in Muir of Ord), fully contained within a long established landscape framework (which would be retained and enhanced as part of any development), and to represent an attractive and deliverable development. - their second preference is for the establishment of a criteria based policy framework for this type of development to allow development of this nature on sites on/adjacent to main arterial routes, which are readily accessible to nearby services and where a strong landscape framework exists. 	nearby services and where a strong landscape framework exists.
Alness	Mr Peter Marshall(00641)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00641/1/002	Alness General	Would like a path or cycle track connecting Alness and Invergordon to use instead of the bus.	Add path between Alness and Invergordon as developer requirement for Alness and Invergordon
Alness	Chisholms Property Development(00893)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00893/1/001	Alness General	Seeks clarification that part developed and permitted housing site at Willowbank Park, Alness has been omitted from Alness Inset Map simply because it is an irrevocable commitment. If this is not the case then wishes site added to Plan as per extant permission.	None. However, if the Council doesn't accept that housing permission exists in perpetuity at Willowbank Park site then wishes site added to Proposed Plan draft as per extant permission.
Alness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/012	Alness General	An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.	It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.
Alness	Diageo(01028)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01028/1/001	Alness General	Diageo seek the identification of land east (map included) of the distillery for industrial/business so they could expand the distillery and associated industrial operations.	Allocate land east of Teaninich Distillery for industrial/business use
Alness	Diageo(01028)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01028/2/001	Alness General	Respondent requests that the site which was allocated for Housing in the RACE Local Plan which is adjacent to the Teaninich Distillery is reallocated for Business and Industrial land to allow the owners to expand if need be.	Allocate land to north of Teaninich Distillery distillery cottages for business/industrial use in the Proposed Plan.
Alness	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/6/001	Alness General	Respondent would like a site at Bridgend, Alness allocated as a housing site as per the details of planning permission 08/00333/FULRC. The development of	Allocate land at Bridgend, Alness for housing (as per planning permission

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				the site is underway. NOTE: Details of planning permission given in rep. Rep includes assessment against key development issues.	08/00333/FULRC) in Proposed Plan.
Alness	Mr Warwick Wilson(01169)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01169/1/001	Alness General	Suggests settlement boundary on the south side of Alness should be moved to include Dalmore Distillery. This would make an important industry and employer inclusive of the local plan; reflect the inclusion of Alness Point Business Park and make for a more complete boundary around the town.	Expansion of Alness settlement boundary to include Dalmore Distillery
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/165	Alness H02	SEPA do not object, however, there may be groundwater issues as a result of the quarrying. If the Council think FRA required then SEPA we would be happy to comment on it. There is the possibility that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/166	Alness H03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state burn may cause risk of flooding and FRA would be required to support development proposals. Mitigation measures may be required to address flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Alness	Mr William Gill(01072)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01072/1/001	Alness H03	Respondent owns land at sites H3, H4, H7, B1 and C1 and supports them being allocated. All can be brought forward for development in the shorter term, including H3 and H4. It is understood by the respondent that for these sites to be developed, the current junction onto the A9 to the south-east of Achnagarron may require upgrading therefore some land would have to be developable in order to make the cost of this justifiable. Therefore to make the development viable it be appropriate to include the most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction within the settlement boundary.	Extend settlement boundary to include most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction
Alness	Mr William Gill(01072)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01072/1/001	Alness H04	Respondent owns land at sites H3, H4, H7, B1 and C1 and supports them being allocated. All can be brought forward for development in the shorter term, including H3 and H4. It is understood by the respondent that for these sites to be developed, the current junction onto the A9 to the south-east of Achnagarron may require upgrading therefore some land would have to be developable in order to make the cost of this justifiable. Therefore to make the development viable it be appropriate to include the most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction within the settlement boundary.	Extend settlement boundary to include most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/167	Alness H06	SEPA do not object, however, there may be groundwater issues as a result of the quarrying. If the Council think FRA required then SEPA we would be happy to comment on it. There is the possibility that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/168	Alness H07	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that FRA or further information required to ensure development not at risk of flooding. Outcome may affect the developable area of the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Alness	Mr William Gill(01072)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01072/1/001	Alness H07	Respondent owns land at sites H3, H4, H7, B1 and C1 and supports them being allocated. All can be brought forward for development in the shorter term, including H3 and H4. It is understood by the respondent that for these sites to be developed, the current junction onto the A9 to the south-east of Achnagarron may require upgrading therefore some land would have to be developable in order to make the cost of this justifiable. Therefore to make the development viable it be appropriate to include the most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction within the settlement boundary.	Extend settlement boundary to include most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/277	Alness H08	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/169	Alness H09	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from PlanRemoval of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. Alness River runs along the east boundary of the site. It is currently at good morphological status. Development of the site must take account of future river processes e.G. Erosion and planform change. This will require significant morphological assessment.	Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.
Alness	Mr David MacKay(01303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01303/1/001	Alness H09	The landowner objects to the Council's non preference of this site for housing for the following reasons - it would compliment existing housing - it would improve the character of the area - it would improve "policing' through improved connections from the town to the river and to Hill Street, making the Hill Street area safer - it would be a high amenity place to live due to proximity to open space and walks - it has a fairly level access to town amenities making it suitable for amenity housing - adjacent land has been through the planning process and concerns about flooding were dismissed - if there is contamination this should be fully investigated rather than dismissed beforehand	Allocation of H9 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/278	Alness H10	SEPA have no objection to H10	
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/279	Alness MU1	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Alness	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/032	Alness MU1	Historic Scotland (HS) welcome the recognition of the potential setting impact on the scheduled monument Carn Liath, cairn, Obsdale (Index no. 2970) and would ask that the developer requirements reflect the need to consider this in the delivery of development.	Potential mitigation of any impact on the setting of scheduled monument Carn Liath, cairn, Obsdale (Index no. 2970) should be specified as a developer requirement.
Alness	Mr Warwick Wilson(01169)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01169/1/002	Alness MU1	Notes half the land running from Salvesen Court out to the A9 is already classed for mixed use (MU1), would like this extended as far as the Milnafua junction.	Expansion of MU1 to A9(T)
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/170	Alness B01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text should state burn may cause risk of flooding and FRA would be required to support development proposals. Mitigation measures may be required to address flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Alness	Mr William Gill(01072)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01072/1/001	Alness B01	Respondent owns land at sites H3, H4, H7, B1 and C1 and supports them being allocated. All can be brought forward for development in the shorter term, including H3 and H4. It is understood by the respondent that for these sites to be developed, the current junction onto the A9 to the south-east of Achnagarron may require upgrading therefore some land would have to be developable in order to make the cost of this justifiable. Therefore to make the development viable it be appropriate to include the most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction within the settlement boundary.	Extend settlement boundary to include most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/171	Alness B02	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 onto watercourses.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/172	Alness B03	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 will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/177	Alness C01	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Alness	Mr William Gill(01072)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01072/1/001	Alness C01	Respondent owns land at sites H3, H4, H7, B1 and C1 and supports them being allocated. All can be brought forward for development in the shorter term, including H3 and H4. It is understood by the respondent that for these sites to be developed, the current junction onto the A9 to the south-east of Achnagarron may require upgrading therefore some land would have to be developable in order to make the cost of this justifiable. Therefore to make the development viable it be appropriate to include the most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction within the settlement boundary.	Extend settlement boundary to include most south easterly field at Achnagarron junction
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/173	Alness I01	SEPA will not object to this allocation. The Strategic Environmental Assessment says FRA required but SEPA is not sure this necessary. Seems to be staying as quarry or being 'naturally regenerated'. SEPA wouldn't seek FRA for that but local authority might? Possible requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/174	Alness I03	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.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/175	Alness I05	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.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Alness	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/176	Alness I06	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 onto	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
				watercourses.	
Avoch	Mr George Glass(00003)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00003/1/001	Avoch General	Seeks inclusion of their garden ground (Ardvreck) within settlement boundary.	Extend settlement boundary to include garden ground
Avoch	Caroline Eccles(00025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00025/1/001	Avoch General	<p>The respondent objects to the scale of housing land identified, given the amount of housing land already with permission. The respondent is concerned about the character of the village being affected and pressure this will add to the road network.</p> <p>The respondent questions why the slope above and parallel Ormond Terrace has not been included within the settlement boundary and identified as open space as shown in RACE due to concern about the impact on landscape setting and amenity if this is not protected as open space. The respondent supports the tennis courts being included as preferred green space because they area could add significantly to amenity.</p>	<p>Seeks wooded slopes above Ormond Terrace to be identified as open space.</p> <p>Supports the Tennis Courts being identified as open space.</p> <p>Supports only the housing land that has already had planning permission being allocated for housing.</p>
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/002	Avoch General	Concerned about development outwith the boundary of Avoch. May occur due to lack of available sites within the boundary or landowners desire to raise capital. Often justified on basis of housing clusters, greater clarity is needed regarding what is a cluster and when does it become a small settlement. Question the status of Killen and houses appearing at Wester Templand.	Greater clarity regarding the difference between a cluster and small settlement
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/005	Avoch General	<p>Broadly in agreement with key development issues, however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern about development outwith settlement boundary, due to landscape impact and potential sacrifice of the principle of presumption against development outwith a settlement boundary. Housing group clause being used to justify building just outwith settlement boundary, for example at Knockmuir, where Local Plan text states development should be avoided; - Lack of thought given to impact of growth on neighbouring communities, for example traffic and school capacities; - Lack of discussion regarding the optimum size of the village and justification for expansion without economic development. - Concerned residential development will only add to the volume of commuter traffic into Inverness; - Concerned development will lead to increases in heavy traffic through the conservation village which was not designed to cope with such levels of traffic; and - Requests inclusion of two further areas of open space (a) grass between the sea wall and the harbour car park to the south west of B2 as it is an important recreation and picnic spot (b)bank of trees overlooking Ormand terrace running from H5 back towards the cemetery as it offers shelter to the gardens of Ormand terrace, stabilises the bank and provides drainage and defines the edge of the village. 	<p>Include two further areas of open space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -grass between the sea wall and the harbour car park to the south west of B2 - bank of trees overlooking Ormand terrace running from H5 back towards the cemetery

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Avoch	Michael Armitage(00588)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00588/1/004	Avoch General	Concern about the extent of potential housing sites in Avoch (H1-H8). Argues that this scale of development will damage the rural integrity of the village and it will become a dormitory town to Inverness. Does not believe that the housing sites will "round-off" the village nor the statement that "additional housing is required to sustain local facilities". Avoch should be given as much protection for its landscape and heritage as Cromarty or Fortrose. The landscape of the natural bay with field/woodland backdrop should be protected.	Respondent seeks a lower level of development than H1-8 and considers infrastructure, services and landscape should determine the where and how much.
Avoch	Ms Frances Armitage(01185)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01185/1/004	Avoch General	Concerned about the level of housing proposed on sites H1-8 for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is potential to damage the integrity of the village in terms of landscape and infrastructure and services; - the impact on the character and identity of the rural village; and - the impact on the agricultural/wooded village setting 	Respondent seeks a lower level of development than H1-8 and considers infrastructure, services and landscape should determine the where and how much.
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/006	Avoch H01	Note planning permission has already been granted. However object to the allocation of this site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential impact on protected species; - Impact on ancient woodland; - Limited access to public transport; - Impact on environmental habitats and recreational value of Rosehaugh Estate to the community; - Lies within flood plain and development must not lead to increase in risk of flooding, reduction in water quality or impact on habitats downstream and tidal zones at Avoch Bay; - May lead to increase in the spread of invasive ornamental species from gardens; and - Increase traffic on School Brae and junction with the High Street. 	Delete H1
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/007	Avoch H02	Support H2, must consider safe active travel routes to local services and will require pedestrian crossing at the western (bus) entrance to the Primary School	Seeks Developer requirement for pedestrian crossing at the western (bus) entrance to the Primary School
Avoch	Michael Armitage(00588)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00588/1/001	Avoch H02	Objects to H2 and H3 as it is prime agricultural land and this should preclude any housing/commercial development.	Deletion of H2 and H3 allocations.
Avoch	Ms Frances Armitage(01185)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01185/1/001	Avoch H02	Respondent objects to this site being allocated for development because the land is of prime agricultural value.	Deletion of H2
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/008	Avoch H03	Second preferred area for residential development. Must consider active travel links; explore creation of off road routes; entrance to village and retention and expansion of features like the beech hedge which screens this area from the road.	Requirement for retention and expansion of beech hedge and possibly for active travel links
Avoch	Michael Armitage(00588)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00588/1/001	Avoch H03	Objects to H2 and H3 as it is prime agricultural land and this should preclude any housing/commercial development.	Deletion of H2 and H3 allocations.
Avoch	Ms Frances Armitage(01185)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01185/1/001	Avoch H03	Respondent objects to this site being allocated for development because the land is of prime agricultural value.	Deletion of H2

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/8/002	Avoch H03	The landowner seeks to ensure high quality development and attaches a revised Development Framework plan. The landowner further commits to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - preparing a masterplan; - the master plan indicating the number of houses and phasing at a rate and scale that respects the functioning of the expansion land, its character and the viability of the development; - including a landscaping and structure planting framework to soften of development through introduction of significant areas of deciduous structure planting which would visually relate the overall site to areas to the north Avoch Burn valley; and - retaining and supplementing the existing woodland together with the introduction of new planting along the south and west boundaries to help integrate the development into the landscape. 	
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/8/006	Avoch H03	Landowner supports the allocation of these sites for the purposes shown for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoch has a good range of existing community and commercial facilities which are relatively close at hand to the development area - The provision of a remote path link from the land through the Memorial field development will encourage active and healthy travel. - A local bus service presently runs along the A832 road to the north of the site. - C1 would complement or provide the opportunity to enhance the range of facilities at a level commensurate with the increase in housing. This might include potential for the relocation of or an addition to the existing playing field provision in the longer term. - If the sites are allocated, masterplanning of the site preceded by public engagement would follow after the development of H1 and H2 is committed. 	
Avoch	Caroline Eccles(00025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00025/1/005	Avoch H04	The respondent is concerned about surface water run off from these sites causing flooding issues.	Delete this allocation.
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/009	Avoch H04	Support site, but the following must be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in water run-off – potential for flooding, negative impact upon water quality, riparian habitat and protected species in and around the burn and SAC - Increased traffic on Schoolbrae 	
Avoch	Caroline Eccles(00025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00025/1/005	Avoch H05	The respondent is concerned about surface water run off from these sites causing flooding issues.	Delete this allocation.
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/010	Avoch H05	Satisfied with limited scope of development but consider design is out of keeping with the landscape character of Ormonde Terrace. Development must be sympathetic to the conservation special character.	Seeks developer requirement/s to ensure that development is sympathetic to the landscape and conservation character of the area.
Avoch	Caroline Eccles(00025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00025/1/002	Avoch H06	Supports the Councils non preference of this site as it is considered that its development would detrimentally affect the landscape setting of Avoch and is concerned about surface water run off.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/011	Avoch H06	Support Council's non-preference of H6 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly visible overlooking conservation village; - Steep group likely to result in drainage issues; - Prime agricultural land; - Vehicular access problems – crossing required on core path and joining school brae; - Impact upon trees on railway line as new residential may interfere with them; and - New residents dumping garden waste over fences. 	
Avoch	Michael Armitage(00588)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00588/1/002	Avoch H06	Objects to H6 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is prime agricultural land - it would have significant visual impacts on the landscape, particularly as Avoch is mainly a traditional village - Impact on the existing wildlife; and - major infrastructure concerns about access and services. 	
Avoch	Ms Frances Armitage(01185)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01185/1/002	Avoch H06	Respondent supports the Council's non preference of this site for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is prime agricultural land - impact on habitat and landscape including concern about sky lining of development - infrastructure concerns regarding services and the safety of access - enhanced access to countryside is not reason to support this 	
Avoch	Caroline Eccles(00025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00025/1/003	Avoch H07	Supports the Council's non preference of this site because of its existing amenity and landscape value.	
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/012	Avoch H07	Support non-preference of H7 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outwith SDA - Comparatively distant to village centre - Loss of important trees/recreational use - Enroachment into rural parking using spurious argument of rounding off; - Unlikely to contribute socially or economically to the development of the village as a community; - Impact on environmental habitats and recreational value of Rosehaugh Estate to the community; - Lies within flood plain and development must not lead to increase in risk of flooding, reduction in water quality or impact on habitats downstream and tidal zones at Avoch Bay; - May lead to increase in the spread of invasive ornamental species from gardens; and - Increase traffic on School Brae and junction with the High Street. 	
Avoch	Michael Armitage(00588)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00588/1/003	Avoch H07	Supports Councils non preference of H7/H8 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is prime agricultural land - it would have significant visual impacts on the landscape, particularly as Avoch is mainly a traditional village - Impact on the existing wildlife; - major infrastructure concerns about access and services 	
Avoch	Ms Frances Armitage(01185)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01185/1/003	Avoch H07	Supports the Council's non preference of this site for development because this is prime agricultural land.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/7/001	Avoch H07	Landowner supports the allocation of land for low density housing for the following reasons - it would round of the development of the settlement after completion of existing sites - it is surrounded by woodland and is therefore well contained in the landscape - it would lend itself to low density development of around 8 plots - it is no further from the centre of the village than H1and can connect to walking/cycling sites from H1 - the intention is to leave woodland and hedgegrows clear of built development and avoid tree loss including for access and set buildings back the appropriate hold back from individual trees - it would meet demand for large plots - the tracks to north and south giving access to Rosehaugh Estate would largely remain unaffected and road traffic calming measures at the road access point from H1 across East or Low Drive could give priority to non vehicular traffic. - it would generate minimal traffic - it is not a SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk area - it is not prime agricultural land - there are no other heritage features indicated in HER or SNH databases - it would comply with affordable housing policies and make developer contribution towards education facilities and public transport	The landowner seeks the allocation of H7 for low density housing
Avoch	Caroline Eccles(00025)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00025/1/004	Avoch H08	Supports the Council's non preference of this site because: - the site is not considered to be one that would readily connect to the village and therefore it is considered that it would encourage car use leading to congestion; and - due to concern about surface water run off from this site	
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/013	Avoch H08	Support non-preference for the following reasons: - would greatly increase size of village - no justification other than for developer to make money - implications for service and transport provision for Avoch and neighbouring communities	
Avoch	Michael Armitage(00588)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00588/1/003	Avoch H08	Supports Councils non preference of H7/H8 for the following reasons: - it is prime agricultural land - it would have significant visual impacts on the landscape, particularly as Avoch is mainly a traditional village - Impact on the existing wildlife; - major infrastructure concerns about access and services	
Avoch	Ms Frances Armitage(01185)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01185/1/003	Avoch H08	Supports the Council's non preference of this site for development because this is prime agricultural land.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/8/003	Avoch H08	The landowner contends that northern part of this site needs to be allocated for housing as part of an overall masterplan including C1, B1 and H3 for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to provide a balanced expansion to the village centred on land for community and recreation purposes - the additional housing land now sought will make the provision of community and recreation uses at the scale indicated feasible to a developer - on the basis that the northern part of H8 is included in the Proposed Plan the landowner does not propose to pursue the inclusion of the remainder of H8 and will accept this as for much longer term development and therefore for a future Local Development Plan - submits a revised sketch development framework plan for the area 	The landowner seeks the northern part of this site to be allocated for housing
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/014	Avoch B01	Welcome provision for economic development, but have the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - questions if speculative building is effective way of stimulating economic development; - industrial estate at approach to village may negatively impact conservation area and village as a tourist destination; and - amelioration of visual impact must be carefully considered 	Seeks developer requirement/s to ensure that development would not negatively impact on the conservation area.
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/8/001	Avoch B01	The landowner supports the allocation of these sites for the purposes shown for the following reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoch has a good range of existing community and commercial facilities which are relatively close at hand to the development area - The provision of a remote path link from the land through the Memorial field development will encourage active and healthy travel. - A local bus service presently runs along the A832 road to the north of the site. - The business land will offer the opportunity to provide employment, possibly through new build originally, close to new housing and with good access to a major road with little or no traffic impact upon the centre of the village. - The remaining business development potential could be as alternative uses or redevelopment of the extensive range of farm buildings, should they become surplus to farming operations in the medium to longer term. - If the sites are allocated, masterplanning of the site preceded by public engagement would follow after the development of H1 and H2 are committed. 	The landowner supports the allocation of these sites for the purposes shown
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/8/002	Avoch B01	The landowner seeks to ensure high quality development and attaches a revised Development Framework plan. The landowner further commits to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - preparing a masterplan; - the master plan indicating the number of houses and phasing at a rate and scale that respects the functioning of the expansion land, its character and the viability of the development; - including a landscaping and structure planting framework to soften of development through introduction of significant areas of deciduous structure planting which would visually relate the overall site to areas to the north Avoch Burn valley; and - retaining and supplementing the existing woodland together with the introduction of new planting along the south and west boundaries to help 	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				integrate the development into the landscape.	
Avoch	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/074	Avoch B02	Requests HRA check on potential adverse effects on Moray Firth SAC. However, clarifies that a land-based development such as a picnic area would not raise any HRA issues.	Addition of any mitigation coming from HRA conformity check.
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/015	Avoch B02	Support potential for sensitive economic development based on the harbour area which exploits its value as a heritage site, as a centre for wildlife tourism and as a location and port of call for leisure craft.	
Avoch	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/178	Avoch B02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements are included in Proposed Plan. Text should state that only harbour development in line with the exceptions in SPP would be supported. Flood Risk Assessment will not be required provided the allocation is only for harbour development.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and state that only harbour development will be supported.
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/016	Avoch C01	Support land for community facilities, however concerned that site is not appropriate as it currently outwith the village. Concerned allocation of site is more about the developer fulfilling obligations; more thought is needed to explore more appropriate ways in which these obligations can be met.	Consider whether there are more central sites that could be used for community facilities.
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/8/004	Avoch C01	The landowner supports the allocation of these sites for the purposes shown for the following reasons - Avoch has a good range of existing community and commercial facilities which are relatively close at hand to the development area - The provision of a remote path link from the land through the Memorial field development will encourage active and healthy travel. - A local bus service presently runs along the A832 road to the north of the site. - C1 would complement or provide the opportunity to enhance the range of facilities at a level commensurate with the increase in housing. This might include potential for the relocation of or an addition to the existing playing field provision in the longer term. - If the sites are allocated, masterplanning of the site preceded by public engagement would follow after the development of H1 and H2 is committed.	
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/8/005	Avoch C01	The landowner seeks to ensure high quality development and attaches a revised Development Framework plan. The landowner further commits to: - preparing a masterplan; - the master plan indicating the number of houses and phasing at a rate and scale that respects the functioning of the expansion land, its character and the viability of the development; - including a landscaping and structure planting framework to soften of development through introduction of significant areas of deciduous structure planting which would visually relate the overall site to areas to the north Avoch Burn valley; and	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				- retaining and supplementing the existing woodland together with the introduction of new planting along the south and west boundaries to help integrate the development into the landscape.	
Avoch	Avoch & Killen Community Council(00330)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00330/1/017	Avoch I01	Support I1 as it brings economic development but concerned about traffic impacts. HGVs already cause issues due to speed and vibration. Current speed management techniques are ineffective. Alternative route although also not ideal should be made preferred route for heavy traffic.	Seeks alternative route for access.
Avoch	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/6/001	Avoch I01	The landowner confirms the availability and their support for its allocation for industrial uses but has no intention in servicing the land to provide sites for development. In servicing the land it is requested that access is provided via an extension of the existing industrial estate service road and not from the single track public road to the north west. The existing trees along the northern boundary should also be retained and supplemented as well as suitable bunding and screen planting provided around the western and southern edges.	Seeks the following developer requirements: - that access is provided via an extension of the existing industrial estate service road and not from the single track public road to the north west; and - the existing trees along the northern boundary should also be retained and supplemented as well as suitable bunding and screen planting provided around the western and southern edges.
Barbaraville	Balnagown Estate(00964)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/005	Barbaraville General	Supports - no reasons stated.	
Barbaraville	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/075	Barbaraville H01	Requests HRA (in-combination with other developments) conformity check in terms of potential adverse effects on Cromarty Firth SPA / RAMSAR site.	Addition of any HRA resultant mitigation requirements.
Barbaraville	Network Rail(00438)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00438/1/003	Barbaraville H01	Object to housing allocation at Barbaraville due to significant safety impact it would have on adjacent Delny level crossing. Developer funded mitigation in the form of full barriers or bridge is required. Network Rail are currently in discussion with the Council regarding the closure of the level crossing to cars and making it a pedestrian level crossing with miniature warning lights.	Removal of H1 unless developer funded mitigation in the form of full barriers or a bridge is included as a developer requirement.
Barbaraville	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/026	Barbaraville H01	The scale of development proposed would overwhelm this settlement, especially is developed purely for housing. The promoters should be asked to consider a properly masterplanned development for a future Local Plan.	
Barbaraville	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/179	Barbaraville H01	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 the planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Barbaraville	Balnagown Estate(00964)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/004	Barbaraville H01	Supports preferred status of site and requests that the Proposed Plan content reflects the content of the pending PIP application on the site.	Boundary of allocation H1 and uses to reflect pending PIP application

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Barbaraville	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/180	Barbaraville B01	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.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Barbaraville	Balnagown Estate(00964)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/005	Barbaraville B01	Supports - no reasons stated.	
Barbaraville	Mr Aulay Macleod(00637)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00637/1/002		Seeks cycle path extension between Barbaraville and Invergordon.	Cross-settlement developer requirement for cycle path extension between Barbaraville and Invergordon.
Conon Bridge	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/077	Conon Bridge General	All development sites in Conon Bridge containing a water body should have a great crested newt survey undertaken.	Cross-settlement developer requirement that any development site containing a water body should have a great crested newt survey undertaken.
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/003	Conon Bridge General	Support rail halt and for it to be delivered as soon as possible. However concern over level of parking provision, feel this should be increased.	
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/012	Conon Bridge General	Support development of new primary school, however concerns over capacity if all proposed sites in Conon and Maryburgh are developed.	
Conon Bridge	Mr Alasdair Cameron(00919)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00919/1/001	Conon Bridge General	Respondent promotes new housing site to the north east of H1. The respondent considers the site to be in easy walking distance of public transport, shops, the school and playingfields. Respondent considers the site to lie outwith flood risk areas, that it would not be a loss to the farm and the mix of alder trees on the site could be retained. Access would be from the existing development on H1.	Allocation of new housing site.
Conon Bridge	Mr Alasdair Cameron(00919)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00919/2/001	Conon Bridge General	Respondent promotes new site for business uses with use of the improved access from Old Leanaig Road, access through the Braes of Conon Development. Respondent considers the site is well screened from the A835 with scope for further planting, services are closeby and sits clear of flood risks.	Allocation of new business site.
Conon Bridge	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/013	Conon Bridge General	Effect of development on A835 will need to be better understood.	
Conon Bridge	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/046	Conon Bridge General	Although not stated in the Main Issues Report, design work is progressing on a Conon Bridge railway station which is currently being delivered by Network Rail and Hitrans.	
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/001	Conon Bridge H01	Concern regarding proposed increase in capacity from 62 to 75 dwellings as this would increase amount of traffic	
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/002	Conon Bridge H02	No objection, understand site has been purchased by Tullochs but may not be developed in the near future due to current climate.	
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/005	Conon Bridge MU01	Concerns over loss of existing playing fields as there is a possibility of water seeping through the railway embankment as a flood defence and arrangements to access the site from the rear may affect the well used car park. Preference for playing fields to be left as they are. Believed playing fields were donated to local community, Community Council is investigating this. Alternative uses for fields at the rear of the playing fields should be considered for example allotments, community garden etc. Other large sites preferred for housing development Conon Bridge the Community Council question this area	Removal of housing from list of acceptable mixed uses for MU1.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				being preferred for housing development.	
Conon Bridge	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/184	Conon Bridge MU01	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or allocation is removed from Plan. Remove site unless it is supported by more detailed information e.G. A FRA along with an Masterplan showing which areas are suitable for development (brownfield and protected by FPS) and what the greenfield areas are to be used for. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Conon Bridge	Gairloch And Conon Estates(01065)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01065/1/001	Conon Bridge MU01	Landowner confirms he is happy to release MU1 for development. Aware development may involve relocation of playing field southwards to allow development at northern part of site; willing to permit this provided playing field is retained somewhere within the site.	
Conon Bridge	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/079	Conon Bridge MU02	Concerns about potential adverse impacts upon Conon Islands SAC and Lower River Conon SSSI in terms of water quality, change in hydrology and invasive non-native plants.	HRA conformity check and addition of resultant mitigation as developer requirements.
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/008	Conon Bridge MU02	Any redevelopment of MU2 would be progress. Landowner should be made to tidy up the site. Mixed use would benefit progression of the project. Concerns regarding decontamination and flooding issues.	
Conon Bridge	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/183	Conon Bridge MU02	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/007	Conon Bridge MU03	Wish to see mixed use development with retail units and leisure areas. Concerns that the roundabout will now not be built until phase 3 of the development and of the wider traffic impacts of the development. Traffic calming measures must be effective.	
Conon Bridge	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/185	Conon Bridge MU03	No provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA has already been done and accepted by SEPA. Outstanding issues regarding ongoing maintenance, surface water drainage and implementation of mitigation measures. Text should state that site should be developed in accordance with recommendations of previous FRA.	Text should state that site should be developed in accordance with recommendations of previous FRA.
Conon Bridge	Conon Brae Farms(01236)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01236/1/005	Conon Bridge MU03	Supports Councils preference for mixed use development on MU3 for the following reasons: - Most logical and legible expansion of existing modern settlement pattern in the village; - will support the new school and transport infrastructure - Increased footpath for amenities associated with the existing consent; - Road widening and traffic calming are already in place; and - No flood risk or infrastructure issues.	
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/009	Conon Bridge MU04	Support proposals provided a suitable access is formed off the main road and pavement is extended along the front of the site. Speed limit should be extended and connection from site to new railway halt should be considered.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Conon Bridge	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/186	Conon Bridge MU04	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Conon Bridge	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/004	Conon Bridge R01	Support retail/community use on this site but not housing.	
Conon Bridge	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/187	Conon Bridge R01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text to state that the applicant would need to confirm with Flood Prevention Authority that the site is protected by FPS.	Insertion of text to state that the applicant would need to confirm with Flood Prevention Authority that the site is protected by Flood Protection Scheme.
Conon Bridge	Mr And Mrs G Nixon(01002)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01002/1/001	Conon Bridge R01	Objects to retail allocation and requests wider mixed use allocation because: the wider site is capable of accommodating residential development with or without the retention of the public house; the wider site is in a single ownership; the site is previously developed and underutilised; development would result in a net environmental improvement; the previous appeal was only dismissed because of the lack of a flood risk assessment; other allocated sites in the village are subject to the same flood risk, and; satisfactory access can be formed.	R1 allocation should be replaced by mixed use allocation in Proposed Plan including principle of residential development across a wider site including the Drouthy Duck, Riverbank House and land adjacent to the River Conon.
Maryburgh	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/076	Maryburgh General	Suggests cross-settlement developer requirement that any development site containing a water body should have a great crested newt survey undertaken.	Cross-settlement developer requirement that any development site containing a water body should have a great crested newt survey undertaken.
Maryburgh	Ms Elizabeth Barras(01105)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01105/1/002	Maryburgh General	Objects to key development issues for Maryburgh .	
Maryburgh	Ms Elizabeth Barras(01105)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01105/1/003	Maryburgh General	There should be no further housing or commercial development until roads and other services are improved. Access to the A9 is dangerous and going through Maryburgh is like musical chairs. Space is needed not more houses. Good agricultural land should not be used for housing.	Developer Requirements for improvements to access and open space . Removal of allocations on good agricultural land .
Maryburgh	Ms Jenny Maclennan(01237)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/007	Maryburgh General	Maryburgh is now linked to Conon Bridge by the education department as a rural conurbation, however it is important Maryburgh retains its own identity.	
Maryburgh	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/011	Maryburgh MU01	Need to resolve ownership and access issues. Support a mix of uses, not just housing. Review of Conon Primary School capacity if all site options are developed.	
Maryburgh	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/181	Maryburgh MU01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state FRA required to support any development and outcome may adversely affect the developable area or development options on the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Maryburgh	Mr Kenneth Chisholm(00905)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00905/2/002	Maryburgh MU01	Respondent supports these sites because they are of limited agricultural value, have no recreational use, and are considered a natural expansion of the village which serves to strengthens the village centre because they are in a good location for active travel to its facilities.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Maryburgh	Brahan Estate(01036)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01036/1/002	Maryburgh MU01	Note that three landowners of MU1 jointly progressed masterplan to an advanced stage, however the agreement necessary for parties to proceed in accordance with the RACE plan did not conclude Parts of the MU1 and MU2 allocation owned by Brahan Estate are able to be brought forward with access from Hood Street. Proposed Plan must ensure flexibility in the phasing and choice of land and effective delivery of development in this area. Such flexibility applies equally to the part of MU1 that is owned by Brahan Estate and its ability to be presented as one allocation with MU2 and MU3, phased from the north. Crucial for effective delivery, infrastructure and environmental planning. MU1 and MU2/(MU3) can be served either from Hood Street or from a new access from the A835 and the Local Development Plan must allow for both. Part of MU1 Brahan Estate and MU2 and MU3 must be recognised on their merits as one allocation in addition to or as an alternative to, the remnant parts of the MU1 concept contained in the RACE plan. Both options are required to respond effectively to Maryburgh's requirements and its growth prospects; but also to enable the landholdings of others to be developed by extending and safeguarding infrastructure options. These are principles are essential to the continued sustainable development of Maryburgh.	
Maryburgh	Ms Jenny Maclennan(01237)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/006	Maryburgh MU01	Pleased MU1 contains a proportion of affordable housing, this will a mixed demographic in the village rather than it being dominated by an aging population.	
Maryburgh	Mrs Jane Menzies(01332)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01332/1/001	Maryburgh MU01	Menzies family as landowner supports the Council's preference of this land for development and are working to ease out issues associated with releasing this land for development.	
Maryburgh	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/080	Maryburgh MU02	Comments that tree belt along eastern margin of site should be retained as part of landscape framework for the site.	Developer requirement to retain tree belt along eastern margin of site.
Maryburgh	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/011	Maryburgh MU02	Need to resolve ownership and access issues. Support a mix of uses, not just housing. Review of Conon Primary School capacity if all site options are developed.	
Maryburgh	Mr Kenneth Chisholm(00905)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00905/2/002	Maryburgh MU02	Respondent supports these sites because they are of limited agricultural value, have no recreational use, and are considered a natural expansion of the village which serves to strengthens the village centre because they are in a good location for active travel to its facilities.	
Maryburgh	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/033	Maryburgh MU02	While noting that these allocations lie partly within the Brahan Inventory Designed Landscape Historic Scotland (HS) are satisfied that they can be delivered without constituting significant effects on the landscapes integrity.	Developer requirement to give due consideration to the potential effect on the Brahan Designed Landscape.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Maryburgh	Brahan Estate(01036)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01036/1/001	Maryburgh MU02	<p>Supports allocation of MU3 and MU2 for mixed uses for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will enable masterplan for Brahan Estate to be developed; - Allow early creation of landscape setting; - Delivery of existing sites allocated in the RACE plan is uncertain; - To ensure Maryburgh is able to evolve as a sustainable place; - To allow Maryburgh to contribute to declared growth objectives; - Well connected – close to community facilities and established infrastructure network; - Exceptional outlook and environment; - Logical expansion of the village; - Alternative means of opening up land identified for expansion of Maryburgh; - Provides opportunity for Brahan Estate to development its tourism, business, resource development and recreational potential; - Land will provide for housing, affordable housing, open space, recreation, community facilities and economic development; - Presence of overhead lines mean development would be kept well below the skyline; - Proposal would continue the established development pattern; - Access can be taken from a new junction on the A835, would relieve congestion on Proby Street and approach to A835/A862 roundabout; - Creation of improved links to Estate heritage from Maryburgh; - Duglass Road may provide for traffic managed connection to Maryburgh; - Sufficient school capacity; and - Would avoid any requirement for assembly of land, but would facilitate development of the present allocation MU1 adjoining Maryburgh to the north-west; and subsequently those parts of MU1 which presently appear constrained. <p>Does not consider ‘significant cons’ listed in the MIR are significant, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site well outwith core heritage woodland and would have no material impact on Brahan Designed Landscape; - Limited area of site is prime agricultural land, allocation appropriate as part of the development plan process; and - SUDS strategy that is responsive to the River Conon SAC/SSSI would be developed. 	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Maryburgh	Brahan Estate(01036)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01036/1/002	Maryburgh MU02	<p>Note that three landowners of MU1 jointly progressed masterplan to an advanced stage, however the agreement necessary for parties to proceed in accordance with the RACE plan did not conclude</p> <p>Parts of the MU1 and MU2 allocation owned by Brahan Estate are able to be brought forward with access from Hood Street. Proposed Plan must ensure flexibility in the phasing and choice of land and effective delivery of development in this area. Such flexibility applies equally to the part of MU1 that is owned by Brahan Estate and its ability to be presented as one allocation with MU2 and MU3, phased from the north. Crucial for effective delivery, infrastructure and environmental planning. MU1 and MU2/(MU3) can be served either from Hood Street or from a new access from the A835 and the Local Development Plan must allow for both.</p> <p>Part of MU1 Brahan Estate and MU2 and MU3 must be recognised on their merits as one allocation in addition to or as an alternative to, the remnant parts of the MU1 concept contained in the RACE plan. Both options are required to respond effectively to Maryburgh's requirements and its growth prospects; but also to enable the landholdings of others to be developed by extending and safeguarding infrastructure options. These are principles are essential to the continued sustainable development of Maryburgh.</p>	
Maryburgh	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/078	Maryburgh MU03	Concerns about potential adverse impacts upon Conon Islands SAC and Lower River Conon SSSI in terms of water quality, change in hydrology and invasive non-native plants. Suggests HRA conformity check and addition of resultant mitigation as developer requirements.	HRA conformity check and addition of resultant mitigation as developer requirements.
Maryburgh	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/011	Maryburgh MU03	Need to resolve ownership and access issues. Support a mix of uses, not just housing. Review of Conon Primary School capacity if all site options are developed.	
Maryburgh	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/182	Maryburgh MU03	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Maryburgh	Mr Ken Chisholm(00905)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00905/1/001	Maryburgh MU03	The Council have 'preferred' a large Mixed Use site west of Stuart Hill Drive which Brahan Estate have submitted. However, I believe there are clearly a number of issues with that site and the community in Maryburgh are unaware of such a major development that could take place.	
Maryburgh	Mr Kenneth Chisholm(00905)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00905/2/001	Maryburgh MU03	<p>Respondent objects to the allocation of MU3 because of concerns about the loss of open space/prime farmland, lack of suitable access and knock on traffic implications for the village, the large scale of development when taken together with MU1 and 2, its high visibility from a large surrounding area, and because other sites are considered more suitable.</p> <p>The Respondent is also concerned about MU3 because Wrightfield Park is often a starting point for walks up to Dunglass Island and Brahan Estate. It is also mentioned that Dunglass road is a popular recreation route and the respondent is concerned that the necessary improvements would lead to removal of very mature deciduous woodland. The respondent considers this site illogical from an active travel perspective because it means allocating a large amount of housing land in Maryburgh when the school has been moved to the top of Conon Bridge. Several alternative sites are suggested to be more appropriate including the former fish factory which is a large brownfield site, in a good</p>	Respondent seeks the removal of MU3 and its reallocation as open space or as part of the green network.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				location which has been a blight on the landscape. It is suggested that the provision of so much greenfield land will give very little incentive to develop the fish factory site, and that MU1 and 2 are also better alternatives.	
Maryburgh	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/033	Maryburgh MU03	While noting that these allocations lie partly within the Brahan Inventory Designed Landscape Historic Scotland (HS) are satisfied that they can be delivered without constituting significant effects on the landscapes integrity.	Developer requirement to give due consideration to the potential effect on the Brahan Designed Landscape.
Maryburgh	Brahan Estate(01036)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01036/1/001	Maryburgh MU03	<p>Supports allocation of MU3 and MU2 for mixed uses for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will enable masterplan for Brahan Estate to be developed; - Allow early creation of landscape setting; - Delivery of existing sites allocated in the RACE plan is uncertain; - To ensure Maryburgh is able to evolve as a sustainable place; - To allow Maryburgh to contribute to declared growth objectives; - Well connected – close to community facilities and established infrastructure network; - Exceptional outlook and environment; - Logical expansion of the village; - Alternative means of opening up land identified for expansion of Maryburgh; - Provides opportunity for Brahan Estate to development its tourism, business, resource development and recreational potential; - Land will provide for housing, affordable housing, open space, recreation, community facilities and economic development; - Presence of overhead lines mean development would be kept well below the skyline; - Proposal would continue the established development pattern; - Access can be taken from a new junction on the A835, would relieve congestion on Proby Street and approach to A835/A862 roundabout; - Creation of improved links to Estate heritage from Maryburgh; - Duglass Road may provide for traffic managed connection to Maryburgh; - Sufficient school capacity; and - Would avoid any requirement for assembly of land, but would facilitate development of the present allocation MU1 adjoining Maryburgh to the north-west; and subsequently those parts of MU1 which presently appear constrained. <p>Does not consider 'significant cons' listed in the MIR are significant, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site well outwith core heritage woodland and would have no material impact 	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>on Brahan Designed Landscape;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited area of site is prime agricultural land, allocation appropriate as part of the development plan process; and - SUDS strategy that is responsive to the River Conon SAC/SSSI would be developed. 	
Maryburgh	Brahan Estate(01036)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01036/1/002	Maryburgh MU03	<p>Note that three landowners of MU1 jointly progressed masterplan to an advanced stage, however the agreement necessary for parties to proceed in accordance with the RACE plan did not conclude</p> <p>Parts of the MU1 and MU2 allocation owned by Brahan Estate are able to be brought forward with access from Hood Street. Proposed Plan must ensure flexibility in the phasing and choice of land and effective delivery of development in this area. Such flexibility applies equally to the part of MU1 that is owned by Brahan Estate and its ability to be presented as one allocation with MU2 and MU3, phased from the north. Crucial for effective delivery, infrastructure and environmental planning. MU1 and MU2/(MU3) can be served either from Hood Street or from a new access from the A835 and the Local Development Plan must allow for both.</p> <p>Part of MU1 Brahan Estate and MU2 and MU3 must be recognised on their merits as one allocation in addition to or as an alternative to, the remnant parts of the MU1 concept contained in the RACE plan. Both options are required to respond effectively to Maryburgh's requirements and its growth prospects; but also to enable the landholdings of others to be developed by extending and safeguarding infrastructure options. These are principles are essential to the continued sustainable development of Maryburgh.</p>	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Maryburgh	Ms Jenny Maclennan(01237)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/005	Maryburgh MU03	Respondent makes the following remarks about MU3: - MU1 and MU2 should be developed before MU3 begins; - Supports housing with associated small businesses but not light industrial use; - Access could be facilitated through the landowners property without affecting traffic through the village on the single track road; - Limited loss of amenity on the river side of the site as no housing would be built on the flood plain; and - Supports allocation of site for long term development to allow for sympathetic landscaped development in keeping with the nature of the village.	
Maryburgh	Mr RJ McKee(01278)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01278/1/001	Maryburgh MU03	The respondent objects to the Council's preference of this site for a mixed use/housing for the following reasons - the access to this site would be onto the local road network within Maryburgh itself with the resultant traffic impact this would have on the village - it is considered that MU1, and MU2 are better sites for traffic impact because they can be accessed off the roundabout	Removal of MU3
Maryburgh	Mr John Matheson(01306)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01306/1/001	Maryburgh MU03	The respondent objects to the Council's preference of this site for mixed use development for the following reasons - the access to this site is through the local road network of Marburgh with the resultant traffic impact on the village - whilst access to MU1 and MU2 is considered to be better as they can be accessed from the roundabout - if MU1 and MU2 are allocated and MU3 is not allocated then this minimises loss of farmland	Removal of MU3 .
Maryburgh	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/010	Maryburgh MU04	Maryburgh Community Group have shown an interest in taking over this site and Conon Bridge Community Council would support them in any proposal for that the group have to keep the site for community use.	
Maryburgh	Ms Jenny Maclennan(01237)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/009	Maryburgh MU04	Would like to see a flexible approach to C1 and MU4 to allow the community to maximise the potential for sustainable community facilities. May involve demolishing the existing amenity centre and selling land for housing on the site. This could generate income to maintain the community facilities long term and suit the needs of the community.	Extend MU4 and include include community use in the mix of uses on MU4 to cover C1 .
Maryburgh	Conon Bridge Community Council(00274)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00274/2/010	Maryburgh C01	Maryburgh Community Group have shown an interest in taking over this site and Conon Bridge Community Council would support them in any proposal for that the group have to keep the site for community use.	
Maryburgh	Ms Jenny Maclennan(01237)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01237/1/008	Maryburgh C01	Would like to see a flexible approach to C1 to allow the community to maximise the potential for sustainable community facilities. May involve demolishing the existing amenity centre and selling land for housing on the site. This could generate income to maintain the community facilities long term and suit the needs of the community.	Allocation as C1 as mixed use
Contin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/081	Contin General	Suggests cross-settlement developer requirement that any development site containing a water body should have a great crested newt survey undertaken. General requirement for reptiles (slow worm) surveys.	Cross-settlement developer requirement that any development site containing a water body should have a great crested newt survey undertaken. General requirement for reptiles (slow worm) surveys.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Contin	Mr SJ Fraser(00611)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00611/1/001	Contin General	<p>Objects to the proposed settlement boundary within the MIR and seeks modification to include all of the respondent's land surrounding his property 'Torrison' at north end of Contin. Supports the RACE settlement boundary.</p> <p>Concerns about the impact of part of the respondents property being outwith the settlement boundary on any future planning application for housing.</p> <p>Appears to disagree with the TPO that was established on his land as feels these are mainly scrub or small trees.</p> <p>*** NOTE: Respondent might be questioning the 'value' of the trees and the sensitivity of the site for development because of their limited value as extracted timber.***</p> <p>Refers to an enclosed letter which 61 residents have signed in support of his planning application before it went to committee.</p> <p>Feels that upgrading the surface of the road to an adoptable road would be a benefit of his development proposal improving its visual appearance and its use for walkers.</p> <p>Considers that the Council should not affect a resident's assets.</p>	Extension to the settlement boundary to include land at 'Torrison' at the north end of Contin.
Contin	Miss Liz Rollinson(00682)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00682/1/001	Contin General	Supports the Councils preferred and non-preferred status on the site options in Contin as it achieves a balance between housing development and protecting a conserving the nature of the settlement. Respondent would object to any development outwith the preferred sites.	
Contin	Mr And Mrs W Finlayson(00704)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00704/1/001	Contin General	Questions why the Contin Mains Farm yard housing development site has been removed from the IMF LDP plan.	
Contin	Mr And Mrs W Finlayson(00704)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00704/1/002	Contin General	Questions why the field south of H1 has been changed from allocated for development to preferred open space.	
Contin	Mr Charlie And Sonia Ramsay(00894)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00894/1/002	Contin General	Jamestown should be considered in the context of total housing capacity of Strathpeffer and Contin as it is 1.5 miles equidistant between the two villages. There is sufficient housing capacity within the two villages in relation to the services provided.	
Contin	Ms Nicola Munro(01160)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01160/1/002	Contin General	Take Contin out of the hinterland as no more houses are needed	
Contin	Mr Robbie Munro(01228)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01228/1/002	Contin General	<p>The respondent seeks a reduction to housing provision in Contin as it is considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that there is insufficient demand - and that Contin lies outwith the main employment centres 	The respondent seeks a reduction to housing provision in Contin
Contin	Ms Nicola Munro(01160)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01160/1/001	Contin H01	Objects the Council preference for allocating H1 for housing as feels the site should be protected from development, kept as greenbelt and the site is prime agricultural land.	Non-allocation of H1 in the Proposed Plan
Contin	Roderick And Livette Munro(01161)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01161/1/001	Contin H01	Objects to the Council's preference for allocation of H1 for housing. Considers H1 should not be allocated for housing as it should remain as agricultural land regarded as greenbelt and no more houses are needed.	Non-allocation of H1 for housing in the Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Contin	Mr Robbie Munro(01228)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01228/1/003	Contin H01	The respondent objects to the Council preference of this site for housing for the following reasons - it is prime agricultural land - there is not the demand for this level of housing considering the progress on H2+3 - it has access issues - there are existing drainage problems in the area - concern about the visual impact of the development - it is currently under a land dispute between neighbours - its locality to sites of historic interest and local heritage namely Preas Mairi Burial Chamber, Preas Mairi Woodland Walk, the Smiddy, Contin Mains Farmstead/Steeding	Non-allocation of H1 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Contin	Mr Gordon Munro(01267)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01267/1/001	Contin H01	The respondent objects to the preferred status of this site for housing development for the following reasons - there are other sites in Contin and there is not sufficient demand for new housing - it is prime agricultural land - it neighbours the historic site of preas mari - there is an access issue - there is a land boundary dispute - there is a lack of capacity in the sewerage system	Non-allocation of H1 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Contin	Mr Rodderick Munro(01300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01300/1/001	Contin H01	The respondent objects to the preference of this site for housing for the following reasons - there is insufficient demand for the level of housing identified - it is prime agricultural land - its impact on surrounding historic and heritage sites such as Preas Mairi Burial chamber and woodland walk, the Smiddy Forge, and Contin Mains Farmstead and Steeding	Non-allocation of H1 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Contin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/188	Contin H02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text to state that no development or landraising is allowed below 22 m AOD or a new revised FRA is required. Flood Risk Assessment will be required if development proposed below 22 m AOD.	Insertion of text to state that no development or landraising is allowed below 22 m AOD or a new revised FRA is required. Flood Risk Assessment will be required if development proposed below 22 m AOD.
Contin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/189	Contin H03	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Contin	Sheena Clark(00240)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00240/2/001	Contin H04	Propose changing the use of this site to "Mixed" commercial and residential usage, include diversifying our agricultural business into an Educational Activity Centre, bringing employment to the local area and increasing the tourist footprint for Contin. Would seek to investigate whether flood risk is actually present on the boundary of the designated site. If deemed to be unsafe, would propose changing the boundary to further into the site, above the roadside, also proposing zoning for residential use which includes affordable houses.	Allocation of H4 for mixed commercial and residential use in the Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Contin	Simon Bates(00376)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00376/1/001	Contin H04	Support the non-preferred status of this site. There are other, preferred sites which relate better to the settlement and provide adequate land supply to accommodate demand for growth. The non-preferred sites would be superfluous and would stretch infrastructure too far. The landowners are understood to be interested now in promoting an alternative, mixed use, proposal. The ideas may have value to the direct community of Contin but would likely be viewed apethetically by the separate community of Jamestown, being about 1.5 miles away.	
Contin	Mr George Baxter Smith(00654)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00654/1/003	Contin H04	The respondent supports the Council's non preference of this site for housing because of concern about its location outwith the village. However the respondent does consider that a main road diversion could allow safer integration.	
Contin	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/082	Contin H05	Supports non-preferral because of potential adverse effects on Conon Islands SAC and Lower River Conon SSSI.	
Contin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/191	Contin H05	SEPA support the Council's non-preferred status of the site and would object to it's inclusion unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or the allocation is removed from Plan. Removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. The Black Water is adjacent to site, the water body is heavily modified and and at poor potential so will require restoration measures, these are likely to be focussed on hydrology though. River adjacent to site appears to have been historically realigned and embanked. Consideration should be given to location and construction of fishing hut to allow for future changes in the river whether by restoration or natural processes.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Contin	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/190	Contin I01	SEPA will object unless the following further information is gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Seek removal of site unless its allocation is supported by a FRA prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/001	Cromarty General	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) wish to provide more land for gardening so that they can meet the needs of their members and those on their waiting list. CAGS have searched within a couple of miles of Cromarty but have been unable to gain access to the additional land they need because landowners have wanted to retain development potential. Some members are residents of Townlands Park and are likely to get some garden ground but this will not meet the need of all those interested.	CAGs seek suitable land for additional allotments to be allocated within the IMFLDP. CAGS preference is for H5, or C8 in the first instance, C4 is also considered suitable, and if there is consensus supporting H4/C6 then this would be supported.
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/001	Cromarty General	-Supports development within existing settlements rather than greenfield sites as this will help protect rural areas, the environment, the way of life in the highlands and reduce the need to travel. - Has concerns relating to development in Cromarty and questions the need for further housing development in Cromarty or any other Highland community. Ever increaing communities will diminish the benefits of living in the Highlands and will increase road usage on an already congested road network, noise pollution, crime and demand for utilities. - Prefers that housing development be focused in areas to north and east of Inverness which have rail links. - Recognises the need for affordable housing in Cromarty but considers this can	No allocation of land for housing development

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				be used as a tool to obtain planning for inappropriate housing. Believes all housing should be affordable housing.	
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/007	Cromarty General	Notes building plots at Cromarty Mains have failed due to costs of connecting to mains sewage and planning restrictions requiring houses to be built to the same specifications, deterring self-build purchasers.	
Cromarty	Congregational Board Of The Church Of Scotland Parish Cromar(01069)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01069/1/001	Cromarty General	<p>Note Cromarty is a town of historical and architectural significance. Future development needs to be inherently cognisant that the community is compact. Cromarty requires 'breathing space'; every effort must be made to preserve such existing space within the town.</p> <p>Commend that consideration has been given to development beyond settlement boundary. Consider this is a pragmatic approach to developing Cromarty with the potential for limiting any negative developmental impact upon the town.</p> <p>Cromarty should likely develop beyond the 'settlement area', keeping close to the main road at a higher elevation and in a westerly direction as it did 250 years ago. Houses to the west of the settlement boundary rather than in Cromarty inner green spaces will help to sustain tourism.</p>	
Cromarty	Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/007	Cromarty General	No new housing development should be allowed outwith the settlement boundary. Therefore supports Council's non preference of H1-4 and H7	
Cromarty	Mr Evan McBean(01204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01204/1/001	Cromarty General	Considers that as Cromarty is an established community with facilities and services and because Nigg is re-opening any further housing development would be beneficial.	
Cromarty	Mr Garve Scott-Lodge(00666)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00666/1/001	Cromarty H01	<p>Considers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that there is a need to provide housing opportunity within rural communities and that Cromarty should be no exception - it arbitrary that no further building is being allowed above the raised beach to the south - that woodland planting here could reduce the visual impact - that a new bus stop in the existing layby at the top of the Denny could provide public transport connection - traffic calming at the access entrance - that H1 would bring access improvements to this area for walkers by turning Lady's walk into a loop route - that improved pedestrian access would bring this allocation within active travel distance of most local amenities. 	Seeks allocation of H1 and seeks developer requirements for improved/new pathways, a new bus stop at the Denny, traffic calming at the access entrance, and for suitable planting to reduce visual impact.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/002	Cromarty H01	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing due to their potential visual impact on the town boundary.	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/002	Cromarty H01	Supports the non preferred status of this site as it is not linked to the village and does not support the policy of 'rounding-off the settlement'. This site (together with H4) is prime farm land which should help contribute to the regional and international food supply which is becoming unpredictable.	
Cromarty	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/043	Cromarty H01	This site would be likely to have a significant impact on the Cromarty House Inventory Designed Landscape. In light of this Historic Scotland welcome that this allocation is not preferred by the Council	
Cromarty	Vicky And Jeff Benjamin(00990)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00990/1/002	Cromarty H01	Respondent supports non-preference of this site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no need/demand for building plots. Houses and house plots on the market; - proposals for plots do not guarantee affordability or that they would be sold to locals; - capacity of the road network including narrow footpath (and need to cross) on Denny Road; - land wanted for allotments should not influence decisions when allocating land for housing; - currently major issues with water supply at Urquhart Court and other houses at top of escarpment and this would need upgraded before any additional houses are allowed; - loss of farm land; - the proposal does not respect the character of a small fishing village. 	
Cromarty	Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/005	Cromarty H01	Objects to non-preference of this site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a need for affordable housing; - H1 will not be seen from the main road; - is within easy walking distance of Cromarty; and - the main road is accessible 	Seeks allocation of this site for affordable housing .
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/002	Cromarty H01	Objects to the non-preference of this site and considers one of the sites, most likely H4, should be allocated for housing as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a need for affordable housing - the sites offer only potential expansion areas in the village due it being bounded in other directions by the coast. - Cromarty is suffering as young people are moving elsewhere where there are affordable housing opportunities. 	Allocation of either H1, H2, H3 or H4 (most likely H4)
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/003	Cromarty H01	Considers H1 should be allocated for housing for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lies within 10 minutes walk of village amenities; - Small area of site means only limited development is possible; - Village bus stop is within reasonable walking distance of the site; - Public transport connections are no worse than anywhere else in the village; and - Scottish Water confirmed connection to public sewer is possible. 	Allocation of H1
Cromarty	Mr Peter Tilbrook(01091)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01091/1/001	Cromarty H01	Agrees with the Council's views on housing. It is important to retain the character of Cromarty by restricting future housing to the south of Cromarty, to within the settlement boundary as shown in the MIR. Therefore supports Council's non preference of H1-4 and H7	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Jacque And John Ross(01167)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01167/1/002	Cromarty H01	<p>Supports the Council's non-preference of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of demand with a large number of houses/plots available for sale; - MU1 will provide affordable housing to meet demand and building plots at Cromarty Mains are currently for sale; - questions whether landowners claims that plots are to be affordable is true and if there is a mechanism in place to ensure this claim is met; - considers landowners offer to provide allotments on the site is a 'sweetener' and should not be linked to the application for housing; - concerned if one site is granted permission it will set a precedent for further applications; - infrastructure of Cromarty cannot cope - streets are already congested; limited parking; main road is not fit for pedestrians, Denny road is not suitable for pedestrian access and cannot be widened; - wider infrastructure cannot cope, for example the Fairy Glen; - existing issues with water supply; - Cromarty is a 'jewel' in the crown of the Highlands, retaining it as a compact town allows residents to integrate well; - Cromarty has remained 'quaint' due to the natural escarpment which adds to the character of the town and there is strong support historically for not breaching the escarpment; and - concerned that if new houses are built then homes for sale may remain vacant to the detriment of the town. 	
Cromarty	Ms Jenny Henderson(01201)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01201/1/001	Cromarty H01	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of this site for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in population would benefit year round trade of local services and facilities in the village; - would increase local labour pool and benefit the local economy; - would help address shortage of affordable housing and retain young people; - concern that demographic of village, and would provide opportunity to help balance demographic; - broad social demographic is required to support the school, sport and social clubs and local businesses; - risk that MU1 may not be developed for affordable housing in the near future; - lead to a more sustainable economy; and - safeguard local jobs and businesses and protect the close-knit community. 	Allocation of H1, and H3 although stronger preference for H2 or H4.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Evan McBean(01204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01204/1/002	Cromarty H01	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of H1, H2, H3, and H4. Considers one of these sites should be allocated for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand from local people; - To provide affordable housing for people who want to return to Cromarty after moving away; - Notes H4 was favoured at MIR evening workshop, agrees, however notes that infrastructure costs would be lower for H2. <p>Response provided to a number of issues raised at evening workshop, in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing plots in Cromarty have sold at reduced prices not due to demand but due to the design of each of the houses requiring to be the same; - Scottish Water have provided assurance that any future houses would not have water pressure or sewage issues; - Provided respondent is in control any development will not end up like Culbokie; and - If landowner is in control the development will be well planned and of a high quality. The landowner is not solely interested in financial gain. If he had been he would have sold the sites to a mainstream developer. 	Allocation of one of the following sites for housing H1, H2, H3 or H4.
Cromarty	Mr And Mrs Gordon Penwright(01216)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01216/1/001	Cromarty H01	<p>Supports the Council's preference for non-allocation of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would breach tree covered escarpment which provides natural backdrop and definition of the town; - Would have a devastating impact on the rolling landscape on higher levels which attractively frames the town and enhances Cromarty House and its policies; - Many tourists comment on the unique character of Cromarty and how well it has been preserved, landscape setting must be maintained to allow town to be clearly viewed in its historical context; - No evidence of excess demand for housing in Cromarty with availability of existing stock noted - Actual demand will be met for next 15 years at site MU1 which will provide affordable housing for young people to rent and buy; - Existing and infinite infrastructure can barely cope with current pressures from residents and tourists; - Demand for allotments has been met, offer for allotments should have no relevance in a planning context and should be seen as a poor attempt to sway opinion in favour of housing development; - Call for sites process resulted in consideration of such inappropriate sites, and can only result in unnecessary pressure on the planning department. 	
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/002	Cromarty H02	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing due to their potential visual impact on the town boundary.	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/002	Cromarty H02	Supports the non preferred status of this site as it is not linked to the village and does not support the policy of 'rounding-off the settlement' . This site (together with H4) is prime farm land which should help contribute to the regional and international food supply which is becoming unpredictable.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/043	Cromarty H02	This site would be likely to have a significant impact on the Cromarty House Inventory Designed Landscape. In light of this Historic Scotland welcome that this allocation is not preferred by the Council	
Cromarty	Vicky And Jeff Benjamin(00990)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00990/1/002	Cromarty H02	Respondent supports non-preference of this site for the following reasons: - no need/demand for building plots. Houses and house plots on the market; - proposals for plots do not guarantee affordability or that they would be sold to locals; - capacity of the road network including narrow footpath (and need to cross) on Denny Road; - land wanted for allotments should not influence decisions when allocating land for housing; - currently major issues with water supply at Urquhart Court and other houses at top of escarpment and this would need upgraded before any additional houses are allowed; - loss of farm land; - the proposal does not respect the character of a small fishing village.	
Cromarty	Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/006	Cromarty H02	Objects to non-preference of this site for the following reasons: - there is a need for affordable housing in the surrounding area of Cromarty; - it is close to the main road into Cromarty; and - H2 and H4 are on the main bus route and within safe walking distance of the amenities in Cromarty. H4 has a less visual impact and would be suitable for affordable housing whilst H2 has houses on the opposite side which are aesthetically pleasing and would give a positive impression entering Cromarty.	Allocation of H2.
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/002	Cromarty H02	Objects to the non-preference of this site and considers one of the sites, most likely H4, should be allocated for housing as: - there is a need for affordable housing - the sites offer only potential expansion areas in the village due it being bounded in other directions by the coast. - Cromarty is suffering as young people are moving elsewhere where there are affordable housing opportunities.	Allocation of either H1, H2, H3 or H4 (most likely H4)
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/004	Cromarty H02	Considers H2 should be allocated for housing for the following reasons: - Four modern houses have been built opposite H2; - Village bus stop is within reasonable walking distance of the site; - Public transport connections are no worse than anywhere else in the village; - Seldom used lay-by adjacent to the site could be used as a bus stop; - Lay-by could also be used to install traffic calming measures; - No listed buildings nearby; - Views to and from nearby buildings of lower protected status will not be affected; - Lowest burden on services as the sewer pipe is across the main road; - Scottish Water confirmed connection from public water supply and that this would not have an effect on water pressures in the area; and - Scottish Water confirmed connection to public sewer is possible.	Allocation of H2
Cromarty	Mr Peter Tilbrook(01091)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01091/1/001	Cromarty H02	Agrees with the Council's views on housing. It is important to retain the character of Cromarty by restricting future housing to the south of Cromarty, to within the settlement boundary as shown in the MIR. Therefore supports Council's non preference of H1-4 and H7	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Jacquie And John Ross(01167)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01167/1/002	Cromarty H02	<p>Supports the Council's non-preference of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of demand with a large number of houses/plots available for sale; - MU1 will provide affordable housing to meet demand and building plots at Cromarty Mains are currently for sale; - questions whether landowners claims that plots are to be affordable is true and if there is a mechanism in place to ensure this claim is met; - considers landowners offer to provide allotments on the site is a 'sweetener' and should not be linked to the application for housing; - concerned if one site is granted permission it will set a precedent for further applications; - infrastructure of Cromarty cannot cope - streets are already congested; limited parking; main road is not fit for pedestrians, Denny road is not suitable for pedestrian access and cannot be widened; - wider infrastructure cannot cope, for example the Fairy Glen; - existing issues with water supply; - Cromarty is a 'jewel' in the crown of the Highlands, retaining it as a compact town allows residents to integrate well; - Cromarty has remained 'quaint' due to the natural escarpment which adds to the character of the town and there is strong support historically for not breaching the escarpment; and - concerned that if new houses are built then homes for sale may remain vacant to the detriment of the town. 	
Cromarty	Ms Jenny Henderson(01201)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01201/1/002	Cromarty H02	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of this site for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in population would benefit year round trade of local services and facilities in the village; - would Increase local labour pool and benefit the local economy; - would help address shortage of affordable housing and retain young people; - concern that demographic of village, and would provide opportunity to help balance demographic; - broad social demographic is required to support the school, sport and social clubs and local businesses; - risk that MU1 may not be developed for affordable housing in the near future; - lead to a more sustainable economy; and - safeguard local jobs and businesses and protect the close-knit community; - considers that H4 and H2 are the most feasible, H2 is most accessible. H4 has less visual impact, is safer as it is further from the road but is still close enough to be accessible to the village. 	Allocation of H1, and H3 although stronger preference for H2 or H4.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Evan McBean(01204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01204/1/002	Cromarty H02	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of H1, H2, H3, and H4. Considers one of these sites should be allocated for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand from local people; - To provide affordable housing for people who want to return to Cromarty after moving away; - Notes H4 was favoured at MIR evening workshop, agrees, however notes that infrastructure costs would be lower for H2. <p>Response provided to a number of issues raised at evening workshop, in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing plots in Cromarty have sold at reduced prices not due to demand but due to the design of each of the houses requiring to be the same; - Scottish Water have provided assurance that any future houses would not have water pressure or sewage issues; - Provided respondent is in control any development will not end up like Culbokie; and - If landowner is in control the development will be well planned and of a high quality. The landowner is not solely interested in financial gain. If he had been he would have sold the sites to a mainstream developer. 	Allocation of one of the following sites for housing H1, H2, H3 or H4.
Cromarty	Mr And Mrs Gordon Penwright(01216)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01216/1/001	Cromarty H02	<p>Supports the Council's preference for non-allocation of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would breach tree covered escarpment which provides natural backdrop and definition of the town; - Would have a devastating impact on the rolling landscape on higher levels which attractively frames the town and enhances Cromarty House and its policies; - Many tourists comment on the unique character of Cromarty and how well it has been preserved, landscape setting must be maintained to allow town to be clearly viewed in its historical context; - No evidence of excess demand for housing in Cromarty with availability of existing stock noted - Actual demand will be met for next 15 years at site MU1 which will provide affordable housing for young people to rent and buy; - Existing and infinite infrastructure can barely cope with current pressures from residents and tourists; - Demand for allotments has been met, offer for allotments should have no relevance in a planning context and should be seen as a poor attempt to sway opinion in favour of housing development; - Call for sites process resulted in consideration of such inappropriate sites, and can only result in unnecessary pressure on the planning department. 	
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/002	Cromarty H03	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing due to their potential visual impact on the town boundary.	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/002	Cromarty H03	Supports the non preferred status of this site as it is not linked to the village and does not support the policy of 'rounding-off the settlement' . This site (together with H4) are prime farm land which should help contribute to the regional and international food supply which is becoming unpredictable.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/043	Cromarty H03	This site would be likely to have a significant impact on the Cromarty House Inventory Designed Landscape. In light of this Historic Scotland welcome that this allocation is not preferred by the Council	
Cromarty	Vicky And Jeff Benjamin(00990)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00990/1/002	Cromarty H03	Respondent supports non-preference of this site for the following reasons: - no need/demand for building plots. Houses and house plots on the market; - proposals for plots do not guarantee affordability or that they would be sold to locals; - capacity of the road network including narrow footpath (and need to cross) on Denny Road; - land wanted for allotments should not influence decisions when allocating land for housing; - currently major issues with water supply at Urquhart Court and other houses at top of escarpment and this would need upgraded before any additional houses are allowed; - loss of farm land; - the proposal does not respect the character of a small fishing village.	
Cromarty	Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/007	Cromarty H03	Objects to non-preference of this site for the following reasons: - there is a need for affordable housing; - is within easy walking distance of Cromarty; and - the main road is accessible; and - H3 will not be seen from the main road.	Seeks allocation of this site .
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/002	Cromarty H03	Objects to the non-preference of this site and considers one of the sites, most likely H4, should be allocated for housing as: - there is a need for affordable housing - the sites offer only potential expansion areas in the village due it being bounded in other directions by the coast. - Cromarty is suffering as young people are moving elsewhere where there are affordable housing opportunities.	Allocation of either H1, H2, H3 or H4 (most likely H4)
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/005	Cromarty H03	Considers H3 should be allocated for the following reasons: - Lies within 10 minutes walk of village amenities; - Small area of site means only limited development is possible; - Village bus stop is within reasonable walking distance of the site; - Public transport connections are no worse than anywhere else in the village; - No listed buildings nearby; - Views to and from nearby buildings of lower protected status will not be affected; - Although site is prime agricultural land, it is not suited to agriculture as it receives very little sunlight and the barely crop is regularly weaker than remainder of the farm; and - Scottish Water confirmed connection to public sewer is possible.	Allocation of H3
Cromarty	Mr Peter Tilbrook(01091)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01091/1/001	Cromarty H03	Agrees with the Council's views on housing. It is important to retain the character of Cromarty by restricting future housing to the south of Cromarty, to within the settlement boundary as shown in the MIR. Therefore supports Council's non preference of H1-4 and H7	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Jacque And John Ross(01167)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01167/1/002	Cromarty H03	<p>Supports the Council's non-preference of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of demand with a large number of houses/plots available for sale; - MU1 will provide affordable housing to meet demand and building plots at Cromarty Mains are currently for sale; - questions whether landowners claims that plots are to be affordable is true and if there is a mechanism in place to ensure this claim is met; - considers landowners offer to provide allotments on the site is a 'sweetener' and should not be linked to the application for housing; - concerned if one site is granted permission it will set a precedent for further applications; - infrastructure of Cromarty cannot cope - streets are already congested; limited parking; main road is not fit for pedestrians, Denny road is not suitable for pedestrian access and cannot be widened; - wider infrastructure cannot cope, for example the Fairy Glen; - existing issues with water supply; - Cromarty is a 'jewel' in the crown of the Highlands, retaining it as a compact town allows residents to integrate well; - Cromarty has remained 'quaint' due to the natural escarpment which adds to the character of the town and there is strong support historically for not breaching the escarpment; and - concerned that if new houses are built then homes for sale may remain vacant to the detriment of the town. 	
Cromarty	Ms Jenny Henderson(01201)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01201/1/001	Cromarty H03	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of this site for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in population would benefit year round trade of local services and facilities in the village; - would increase local labour pool and benefit the local economy; - would help address shortage of affordable housing and retain young people; - concern that demographic of village, and would provide opportunity to help balance demographic; - broad social demographic is required to support the school, sport and social clubs and local businesses; - risk that MU1 may not be developed for affordable housing in the near future; - lead to a more sustainable economy; and - safeguard local jobs and businesses and protect the close-knit community. 	Allocation of H1, and H3 although stronger preference for H2 or H4.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Evan McBean(01204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01204/1/002	Cromarty H03	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of H1, H2, H3, and H4. Considers one of these sites should be allocated for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand from local people; - To provide affordable housing for people who want to return to Cromarty after moving away; - Notes H4 was favoured at MIR evening workshop, agrees, however notes that infrastructure costs would be lower for H2. <p>Response provided to a number of issues raised at evening workshop, in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing plots in Cromarty have sold at reduced prices not due to demand but due to the design of each of the houses requiring to be the same; - Scottish Water have provided assurance that any future houses would not have water pressure or sewage issues; - Provided respondent is in control any development will not end up like Culbokie; and - If landowner is in control the development will be well planned and of a high quality. The landowner is not solely interested in financial gain. If he had been he would have sold the sites to a mainstream developer. 	Allocation of one of the following sites for housing H1, H2, H3 or H4.
Cromarty	Mr And Mrs Gordon Penwright(01216)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01216/1/001	Cromarty H03	<p>Supports the Council's preference for non-allocation of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would breach tree covered escarpment which provides natural backdrop and definition of the town; - Would have a devastating impact on the rolling landscape on higher levels which attractively frames the town and enhances Cromarty House and its policies; - Many tourists comment on the unique character of Cromarty and how well it has been preserved, landscape setting must be maintained to allow town to be clearly viewed in its historical context; - No evidence of excess demand for housing in Cromarty with availability of existing stock noted - Actual demand will be met for next 15 years at site MU1 which will provide affordable housing for young people to rent and buy; - Existing and infinite infrastructure can barely cope with current pressures from residents and tourists; - Demand for allotments has been met, offer for allotments should have no relevance in a planning context and should be seen as a poor attempt to sway opinion in favour of housing development; - Call for sites process resulted in consideration of such inappropriate sites, and can only result in unnecessary pressure on the planning department. 	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Fraser Stewart(00407)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00407/1/005	Cromarty H04	<p>Supports development at Site H4 and does not consider the following as significant cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proximity to listed building (as house is not listed), effect on designed landscape (site at otherside of the road), walking distance (enhancements can be made to existign provision. <p>Respondent considers that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - access can be acheived through use of a mini-roundabout/new junction - this would act as a traffic calming measure. - there will be limited visual impact from the main road; - the new sewer in Cromarty negates the con related to sewerage infrastructure. Scottish water have intimated that development at H4 would not adversely effect water pressure in Cromarty; - there is opportunity to deliver allotments on this site as well as housing; - that the development at Cropmarty Mains not progresing due to market demands does not mean that site H4 would not progress; and that - allocation of Site H4 would enable Cromarty to develop in a sustainable and controlled manner. 	Allocation of site H4 for housing with provision for allotments.
Cromarty	Mr Garve Scott-Lodge(00666)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00666/1/003	Cromarty H04	<p>Considers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that there is a need to provide housing opportunity within rural communities and that Cromarty should be no exception - it arbitrary that no further building is being allowed above the raised beach to the south - that woodland planting here could reduce the visual impact - that a new bus stop in the existing layby at the top of the Denny could provide public transport connection - that improved pedestrian access would bring this allocation within active travel distance of most local amenities - that the allocation should seek traffic calming at the access point 	Seeks allocation of H4 and seeks developer requirements for improved/new pathways, a new bus stop at the Denny, traffic calming at the access entrance, and for suitable planting to reduce visual impact.
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/003	Cromarty H04	Supports non preferred status of H4 as it would impact on two of the finest houses in Cromarty. Garden grounds and greenspaces within the vilages should be protected from development (a house has already been built on the garden ground of Rosenberg)	
Cromarty	Mr Kenneth W. Dupar(00701)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00701/1/003	Cromarty H04	Supports site and believes it should be extended to the west because this site is not visually intrusive, could accommodate affordable housing, is less prone to future sea level rise, keeps traffic out of the town and is better than greenspace options within the historic core.	Allocation of the land and its extension to the west.
Cromarty	Vicky And Jeff Benjamin(00990)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00990/1/002	Cromarty H04	<p>Respondent supports non-preference of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no need/demand for building plots. Houses and house plots on the market; - proposals for plots do not guarantee affordability or that they would be sold to locals; - capacity of the road network including narrow footpath (and need to cross) on Denny Road; - land wanted for allotments should not influence decisions when allocating land for housing; - currently major issues with water supply at Urquhart Court and other houses at top of escarpment and this would need upgraded before any additional houses are allowed; 	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of farm land; - the proposal does not respect the character of a small fishing village. 	
Cromarty	Mr Jonathan Kerfoot(01052)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01052/1/008	Cromarty H04	<p>Objects to non-preference of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a need for affordable housing in the surrounding area of Cromarty; - it is close to the main road into Cromarty; and - H2 and H4 are on the main bus route and within safe walking distance of the amenities in Cromarty. H4 has a less visual impact and would be suitable for affordable housing whilst H2 has houses on the opposite side which are aesthetically pleasing and would give a positive impression entering Cromarty. 	Allocation of H4.
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/002	Cromarty H04	<p>Objects to the non-preference of this site and considers one of the sites, most likely H4, should be allocated for housing as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a need for affordable housing - the sites offer only potential expansion areas in the village due it being bounded in other directions by the coast. - Cromarty is suffering as young people are moving elsewhere where there are affordable housing opportunities. 	Allocation of either H1, H2, H3 or H4 (most likely H4)
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/006	Cromarty H04	<p>Consider H4 should be allocated for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lies within 10 minutes walk of village amenities; - Small area of site means only limited development is possible; - Village bus stop is within reasonable walking distance of the site; - Public transport connections are no worse than anywhere else in the village; - No listed buildings nearby; - Views to and from nearby buildings of lower protected status will not be affected; - Although site is prime agricultural land, it is not suited to agriculture as the barely crop is regularly weaker than remainder of the farm; - Water and drainage infrastructure are nearby; - Well suited to provision of affordable, self-build plots; and - Scottish Water confirmed connection to public sewer is possible. 	Allocation of H4
Cromarty	Mr Peter Tilbrook(01091)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01091/1/001	Cromarty H04	<p>Agrees with the Council's views on housing. It is important to retain the character of Cromarty by restricting future housing to the south of Cromarty, to within the settlement boundary as shown in the MIR. Therefore supports Council's non preference of H1-4 and H7</p>	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Jacque And John Ross(01167)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01167/1/002	Cromarty H04	<p>Supports the Council's non-preference of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of demand with a large number of houses/plots available for sale; - MU1 will provide affordable housing to meet demand and building plots at Cromarty Mains are currently for sale; - questions whether landowners claims that plots are to be affordable is true and if there is a mechanism in place to ensure this claim is met; - considers landowners offer to provide allotments on the site is a 'sweetener' and should not be linked to the application for housing; - concerned if one site is granted permission it will set a precedent for further applications; - infrastructure of Cromarty cannot cope - streets are already congested; limited parking; main road is not fit for pedestrians, Denny road is not suitable for pedestrian access and cannot be widened; - wider infrastructure cannot cope, for example the Fairy Glen; - existing issues with water supply; - Cromarty is a 'jewel' in the crown of the Highlands, retaining it as a compact town allows residents to integrate well; - Cromarty has remained 'quaint' due to the natural escarpment which adds to the character of the town and there is strong support historically for not breaching the escarpment; and - concerned that if new houses are built then homes for sale may remain vacant to the detriment of the town. 	
Cromarty	Ms Jenny Henderson(01201)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01201/1/003	Cromarty H04	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of this site for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in population would benefit year round trade of local services and facilities in the village; - would Increase local labour pool and benefit the local economy; - would help address shortage of affordable housing and retain young people; - concern that demographic of village, and would provide opportunity to help balance demographic; - broad social demographic is required to support the school, sport and social clubs and local businesses; - risk that MU1 may not be developed for affordable housing in the near future; - lead to a more sustainable economy; and - safeguard local jobs and businesses and protect the close-knit community; - considers that H4 and H2 are the most feasible, H2 is most accessible. H4 has less visual impact, is safer as it is further from the road but is still close enough to be accessible to the village. 	Allocation of H1, and H3 although stronger preference for H2 or H4.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Evan McBean(01204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01204/1/002	Cromarty H04	<p>Objects to the Council's non-preference of H1, H2, H3, and H4. Considers one of these sites should be allocated for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand from local people; - To provide affordable housing for people who want to return to Cromarty after moving away; - Notes H4 was favoured at MIR evening workshop, agrees, however notes that infrastructure costs would be lower for H2. <p>Response provided to a number of issues raised at evening workshop, in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing plots in Cromarty have sold at reduced prices not due to demand but due to the design of each of the houses requiring to be the same; - Scottish Water have provided assurance that any future houses would not have water pressure or sewage issues; - Provided respondent is in control any development will not end up like Culbokie; and - If landowner is in control the development will be well planned and of a high quality. The landowner is not solely interested in financial gain. If he had been he would have sold the sites to a mainstream developer. 	Allocation of one of the following sites for housing H1, H2, H3 or H4.
Cromarty	Mr And Mrs Gordon Penwright(01216)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01216/1/001	Cromarty H04	<p>Supports the Council's preference for non-allocation of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would breach tree covered escarpment which provides natural backdrop and definition of the town; - Would have a devastating impact on the rolling landscape on higher levels which attractively frames the town and enhances Cromarty House and its policies; - Many tourists comment on the unique character of Cromarty and how well it has been preserved, landscape setting must be maintained to allow town to be clearly viewed in its historical context; - No evidence of excess demand for housing in Cromarty with availability of existing stock noted - Actual demand will be met for next 15 years at site MU1 which will provide affordable housing for young people to rent and buy; - Existing and infinite infrastructure can barely cope with current pressures from residents and tourists; - Demand for allotments has been met, offer for allotments should have no relevance in a planning context and should be seen as a poor attempt to sway opinion in favour of housing development; - Call for sites process resulted in consideration of such inappropriate sites, and can only result in unnecessary pressure on the planning department. 	
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/005	Cromarty H05	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) consider C8 and H5 to be the most suitable alternative allotment area (if C2 is not available) and questions their effectiveness for housing.	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) seek allocation of C8 for allotments if C2 is not allocated for allotments.
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/006	Cromarty H05	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) consider C8 and H5 to be the most suitable alternative allotment area (if C2 is not available) and questions their effectiveness for housing.	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) seeks allocation of C8 and H5 for allotments (if C2 is not available).

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/004	Cromarty H05	Objects to non-preferred status of H5/H6 but questions whether they are needed. If developed, design should be high quality and low density.	Seeks allocation of H5/H6 for high quality, low density development .
Cromarty	Mr Kenneth W. Dupar(00701)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00701/1/001	Cromarty H05	Supports non-preference because of traffic impact on pedestrian safety on Miller Road.	
Cromarty	Jacque And John Ross(01167)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01167/1/002	Cromarty H05	Supports the Council's non-preference of this site for the following reasons: - lack of demand with a large number of houses/plots available for sale; - MU1 will provide affordable housing to meet demand and building plots at Cromarty Mains are currently for sale; - questions whether landowners claims that plots are to be affordable is true and if there is a mechanism in place to ensure this claim is met; - considers landowners offer to provide allotments on the site is a 'sweetener' and should not be linked to the application for housing; - concerned if one site is granted permission it will set a precedent for further applications; - infrastructure of Cromarty cannot cope - streets are already congested; limited parking; main road is not fit for pedestrians, Denny road is not suitable for pedestrian access and cannot be widened; - wider infrastructure cannot cope, for example the Fairy Glen; - existing issues with water supply; - Cromarty is a 'jewel' in the crown of the Highlands, retaining it as a compact town allows residents to integrate well; - Cromarty has remained 'quaint' due to the natural escarpment which adds to the character of the town and there is strong support historically for not breaching the escarpment; and - concerned that if new houses are built then homes for sale may remain vacant to the detriment of the town.	
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/007	Cromarty H06	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) are not against H6 being allocated for housing especially if this allows for the allocation of C8 for allotments.	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) support allocation of H6 if C8 is allocated for allotments .
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/009	Cromarty H06	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) considers that single-storey housing sited to the west of this field would be mostly hidden by slope and would only have a minor impact on the visual appearance of the town boundary. CAGS consider that this may benefit others through the upgrade of services which are currently considered to be below standard. If the consensus supports H4/C6 as the only way to enable the expansion of necessary housing and allotment gardening then this is supported.	If the consensus supports H4/C6 as the only way to enable the expansion of necessary housing and allotment gardening then Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) support this.
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/004	Cromarty H06	Objects to non-preferred status of H5/H6 but questions whether they are needed. If developed, design should be high quality and low density.	Seeks allocation of H5/H6 for high quality, low density development .
Cromarty	Mr Kenneth W. Dupar(00701)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00701/1/002	Cromarty H06	Supports non preferral of site because of historical significance of site as orchard.	
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/002	Cromarty H07	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing due to their potential visual impact on the town boundary.	CAGS do not support these areas being allocated for housing
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/006	Cromarty H07	Supports non-preferred status of H7 as it extends the village into the countryside.	
Cromarty	Mr Evan Macbean(01059)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01059/1/001	Cromarty H07	Landowner's agent confirms landowner accepts site is not suitable for housing and thus is no longer seeking the allocation of this site in the LDP.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Peter Tilbrook(01091)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01091/1/001	Cromarty H07	Agrees with the Council's views on housing. It is important to retain the character of Cromarty by restricting future housing to the south of Cromarty, to within the settlement boundary as shown in the MIR. Therefore supports Council's non preference of H1-4 and H7	
Cromarty	Mr And Mrs Gordon Penwright(01216)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01216/1/001	Cromarty H07	Supports the Council's preference for non-allocation of this site for the following reasons: - Would breach tree covered escarpment which provides natural backdrop and definition of the town; - Would have a devastating impact on the rolling landscape on higher levels which attractively frames the town and enhances Cromarty House and its policies; - Many tourists comment on the unique character of Cromarty and how well it has been preserved, landscape setting must be maintained to allow town to be clearly viewed in its historical context; - No evidence of excess demand for housing in Cromarty with availability of existing stock noted - Actual demand will be met for next 15 years at site MU1 which will provide affordable housing for young people to rent and buy; - Existing and infinite infrastructure can barely cope with current pressures from residents and tourists; - Demand for allotments has been met, offer for allotments should have no relevance in a planning context and should be seen as a poor attempt to sway opinion in favour of housing development; - Call for sites process resulted in consideration of such inappropriate sites, and can only result in unnecessary pressure on the planning department.	
Cromarty	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/011	Cromarty MU01	Landowner objects to the Mixed Use allocation of the site and would prefer it to be allocated for housing as it is expected a planning application will be submitted in the near future which includes mixed tenure housing and if viable a community based use. Respondent supports the non-preferred Community site C2 and states that the preference was agreed at the Evening Meeting for an alternative allotment site. The respondent wishes to remove the Community use from the MU1 allocation as it is the main opportunity for new housing within the centre of the village.	Change allocation from Mixed Use to Housing for MU1.
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/004	Cromarty MU01	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) are concerned that although there seemed to be an earlier commitment to providing some allotment land on MU1/C2, it now seems as if Albyn Housing want flexibility to secure private investment. CAGS consider that if this land is not available then the Council should reallocate other unused land for allotments.	
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/005	Cromarty MU01	Supports preferred status of MU1 but questions whether they are needed. If developed, design should be appropriate to village, i.E. High quality and large gardens rather than high density.	
Cromarty	Vicky And Jeff Benjamin(00990)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00990/1/001	Cromarty MU01	There is a need for affordable and rented housing in Cromarty and site MU1 is an appropriate site; the proposal by Albyn Housing would meet needs of the community.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/005	Cromarty MU01	Supports proposal for housing on MU1.	
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/007	Cromarty C01	Supports C1 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increasing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	
Cromarty	Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/006	Cromarty C01	Supports proposal for allotments on C1.	
Cromarty	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/011	Cromarty C02	Landowner objects to the Mixed Use allocation of the site and would prefer it to be allocated for housing as it is expected a planning application will be submitted in the near future which includes mixed tenure housing and if viable a community based use. Respondent supports the non-preferred Community site C2 and states that the preference was agreed at the Evening Meeting for an alternative allotment site. The respondent wishes to remove the Community use from the MU1 allocation as it is the main opportunity for new housing within the centre of the village.	Change allocation from Mixed Use to Housing for MU1.
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/004	Cromarty C02	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) are concerned that although there seemed to be an earlier commitment to providing some allotment land on MU1/C2, it now seems as if Albyn Housing want flexibility to secure private investment. CAGS consider that if this land is not available then the Council should reallocate other unused land for allotments.	
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/008	Cromarty C02	Objects to non-preferred status of C2-C8 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increasing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	Seeks allocation of C2-8 (or at least one of these) for use as allotments.
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/008	Cromarty C03	Objects to non-preferred status of C2-C8 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increasing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	Seeks allocation of C2-8 (or at least one of these) for use as allotments.
Cromarty	Mr Garve Scott-Lodge(00666)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00666/1/002	Cromarty C04	Considers C4 suitable for community use, part of it for allotments suggesting hawthorn hedging to reduce the visual impact, and part of it for a graveyard extension, with improvement of the Lady's walk so that this is accessible to prams etc.	Seeks allocation of C4 part of it for allotments and part of it for a graveyard extension, and seeks developer requirements for improvement of the Lady's walk so that this is accessible to prams etc, and for hawthorn hedging to reduce the visual impact.
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/008	Cromarty C04	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) support this for graveyard extension in the longer term and in the meantime the land is considered highly suitable for allotments being good land within reasonable distance of the town centre, and having existing access to water, and safe parking. Outwith the current town boundary this is CAGS preferred potential allotments site.	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) seek allocation for community uses, graveyard extension long term, allotments shorter term.
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/009	Cromarty C04	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) considers that single-storey housing sited to the west of this field would be mostly hidden by slope and would only have a minor impact on the visual appearance of the town boundary. CAGS consider that this may benefit others through the upgrade of services which are currently considered to be below standard. If the consensus supports H4/C6 as the only way to enable the expansion of necessary housing and allotment gardening then this is supported.	If the consensus supports H4/C6 as the only way to enable the expansion of necessary housing and allotment gardening then Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) support this.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/008	Cromarty C04	Objects to non-preferred status of C2-C8 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increasing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	Seeks allocation of C2-8 (or at least one of these) for use as allotments.
Cromarty	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/043	Cromarty C04	This site would be likely to have a significant impact on the Cromarty House Inventory Designed Landscape. In light of this Historic Scotland welcome that this allocation is not preferred by the Council	
Cromarty	Mr Peter Tilbrook(01091)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01091/1/002	Cromarty C04	Objects to non-preference of C4 . Offers the most appropriate location for allotment space as it is the most easily accessible by foot from the town and would have a negligible effect on the environment.	Seeks allocation for community use for allotments.
Cromarty	Mrs Francis Tilbrook(01092)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01092/1/008	Cromarty C04	Objects to non-preference of C4 , thinks it would be suitable for additional allotments and would not have a detrimental visual impact.	Seeks allocation for community use for allotments.
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/008	Cromarty C05	Objects to non-preferred status of C2-C8 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increasing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	Seeks allocation of C2-8 (or at least one of these) for use as allotments.
Cromarty	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/043	Cromarty C05	This site would be likely to have a significant impact on the Cromarty House Inventory Designed Landscape. In light of this Historic Scotland welcome that this allocation is not preferred by the Council	
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/008	Cromarty C06	Objects to non-preferred status of C2-C8 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increasing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	Seeks allocation of C2-8 (or at least one of these) for use as allotments.
Cromarty	Congregational Board Of The Church Of Scotland Parish Cromar(01069)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01069/1/002	Cromarty C06	Pros and cons of C7 are quite ambiguous and unclear. Do not agree that there is poor access; limited active travel opportunities or any significant visual impact. An established access exists which is on a public transport route. Consider C6 should be extended to C7 and be allocated for housing and possibly allotments. This would take pressure of the need for new housing for example at C2/MU1. Would also allow for the provision of further affordable housing, by extending planned housing at C6 along the north to northwest boundary. Do not consider this would have any visual impact.	Amalgamation of C6 and C7 and allocation for housing and possibly allotments .
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/008	Cromarty C07	Objects to non-preferred status of C2-C8 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increasing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	Seeks allocation of C2-8 (or at least one of these) for use as allotments.
Cromarty	Congregational Board Of The Church Of Scotland Parish Cromar(01069)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01069/1/002	Cromarty C07	Pros and cons of C7 are quite ambiguous and unclear. Do not agree that there is poor access; limited active travel opportunities or any significant visual impact. An established access exists which is on a public transport route. Consider C6 should be extended to C7 and be allocated for housing and possibly allotments. This would take pressure of the need for new housing for example at C2/MU1. Would also allow for the provision of further affordable housing, by extending planned housing at C6 along the north to northwest boundary. Do not consider this would have any visual impact.	Amalgamation of C6 and C7 and allocation for housing and possibly allotments .
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/005	Cromarty C08	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) consider C8 and H5 to be the most suitable alternative allotment area (if C2 is not available) and questions their effectiveness for housing.	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) seek allocation of C8 for allotments if C2 is not allocated for allotments.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/006	Cromarty C08	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) consider C8 and H5 to be the most suitable alternative allotment area (if C2 is not available) and questions their effectiveness for housing.	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) seeks allocation of C8 and H5 for allotments (if C2 is not available).
Cromarty	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/007	Cromarty C08	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) are not against H6 being allocated for housing especially if this allows for the allocation of C8 for allotments.	Cromarty Allotments and Gardens Society (CAGS) support allocation of H6 if C8 is allocated for allotments .
Cromarty	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/008	Cromarty C08	Objects to non-preferred status of C2-C8 as allotments could offer community activities as well as increaing food production and keeping people active and healthy.	Seeks allocation of C2-8 (or at least one of these) for use as allotments.
Cromarty	Mr Kenneth W. Dupar(00701)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00701/1/001	Cromarty C08	Supports non-preference because of traffic impact on pedestrian safety on Miller Road.	
Cromarty	Jacque And John Ross(01167)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01167/1/001		Acknowledges there is demand for affordable rented housing in Cromarty. Considers MU1 is appropriate for this use, and supports Albyn Housing's proposal for 30 affordable homes provided the development is phased over several years.	
Culbokie	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/083	Culbokie General	Requests settlement-wide species survey requirement for reptiles (common lizard).	Settlement-wide species survey requirement for reptiles (common lizard).
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/001	Culbokie General	<p>There has been both a shop and post office in recent history. One key priority is to establish a 'village heart' in a central location with a cluster of facilities where the community can meet informally. This is an important requirement due to the recent and future housing completions. Respondent considers that the site options in the MIR do not achieve this and several specific options are needed.</p> <p>The respondent carried out a resident survey in 2011/2012 to identify priorities for the village. It found that residents believe that the village has outgrown many of its facilities and now requires a health centre, larger shop/other retail units, a café, business space for local employment and given the linear nature of the village the need for new and improved active travel paths.</p> <p>A path and cycle network would provide opportunities for recreation and allow bicycles to avoid the main road. Path network could include the new link from Schoolcroft to Findon Hall, the link from Findon to site B1 and the link from Woodholm to Culbokie wood.</p>	Greater allocation of land for a village centre and seeks improvements to the path network.
Culbokie	Mr Peter Batten And Denise Lloyd(00878)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00878/1/002	Culbokie General	<p>Respondent objects to substantial new housing in Culbokie which services the new growth corridor between Dingwall and Tain without further substantial improvement to the public transport between them, or a major upgarde to the minor road between the Culbokie Inn and the Cromarty bridge. Also considers it may be better to identify more housing in the growth corridor itself and less in Culbokie.</p> <p>Respondent is sympathetic to integrating small business units into new housing as long as the architecture is in keeping.</p> <p>Respondent agrees with the village boundary as shown apart from inclusion of MU1.</p>	Respondent objects to substantial housing development in Culbokie unless this is accompanied by significant public transport or road network improvements.The respondent agrees with the village boundary as shown apart from inclusion of MU1.
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/018	Culbokie General	Supports stated need to preserve landscape setting of village including views over Cromarty Firth.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/005	Culbokie General	Respondent is interested in seeing the successful and sustainable expansion of Culbokie.	
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/2/002	Culbokie General	<p>Objects to preferred open space at rear of Schoolcroft, Culbokie. Respondent has control of this site and would like it to be shown as a housing allocation for a single house plot. The site has historically afforded vehicular access along the west side of No. 16 Schoolcroft and has historically accommodated stable buildings. The proposal would include a landscape buffer, would provide a more robust settlement edge and assist in enhancing the viability of existing and proposed local facilities. Allocation of this site for housing would help the Council address the key development issues for Culbokie.</p> <p>The site is located to the rear of residential properties with no natural surveillance, so respondent feels it is not suitable for recreational open space. MIR shows other more suitable open space within Culbokie.</p>	Seeks allocation of preferred open space to rear of schoolcroft as a housing allocation for 1 house.
Culbokie	Ms G Stevenson-Vallant(01273)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01273/1/001	Culbokie General	<p>The landowner objects to the Council not identifying their land for housing for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site is currently allocated for housing in RACE - there was no community objection to this site when raised at the IMFLDP MIR meeting in Culbokie - it is within the boundary of the village and is bordered by H5 and commercial and private building sites. 	The landowner objects to the Council not identifying their land (around Solus Or) for housing.
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/009	Culbokie H01	Supports H1 dependent on the provision of significant screening.	Seeks developer requirement to secure significant screening.
Culbokie	Nicam Developments Ltd(00882)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00882/1/005	Culbokie H01	Landowner supports allocation of H1	
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/017	Culbokie H01	Supports but wants developer requirements and planning permission conditions to soften this approach to the village.	Developer requirements added to require planting on southern edge of site.
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/006	Culbokie H01	Respondent supports the preference of site as it will help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/006	Culbokie H02	Despite being close to the shop and pub the site C1 is on the other side of the village from other community facilities. If it was available in the short term it may be a suitable site for a village centre but C1 is too small to provide the range of facilities required.	Seeks that the north east section of H2 should be reallocated as Mixed Use to allow it to be used for a small scale business.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Culbokie	Miss Anthea Whitehead(00679)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00679/1/002	Culbokie H02	<p>Supports the preference of site H2 and respondent confirms that owner of site is still willing to sell the site for development. There is extant planning permission for the site. There is now adequate water and sewerage capacity which will help facilitate development.</p> <p>In MIR a con is listed as "marketability of site". Respondent does not consider this constraint to have any bearing on this site in particular and consider it is just a reflection of the suppressed level of building in the last few years.</p> <p>Respondent also notes that the boundary for H2 extends further south than the land in their ownership (which accords with boundary in planning permission 11/00972/FUL) . Part of the southern section of H2 represents an extension to the settlement boundary beyond that identified in the Ross and Cromarty East LP. Respondent does not object to this extension but seeks reassurance that the development potential of land in their ownership will not be affected by this new addition e.G. A requirement for development of any one part of H2 to be dependent upon any other part to allow for access.</p>	
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/009	Culbokie H02	Should be mixed use so as to give flexibility when proposals come forward. Should also be merged with C1 as mixed use site. Believes this part of village most likely to come forward as a development site.	Merge C1 and H2 and re-classify as mixed use. Mix of uses retail, community, business and housing .
Culbokie	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/034	Culbokie H02	Historic Scotland (HS) do not have significant concerns with this allocation however developer requirements should reflect the need to consider the setting of the scheduled monument Carn Mor, Dun (Index no. 4579).	Developer requirements should reflect the need to consider the setting of the scheduled monument Carn Mor, Dun (Index no. 4579).
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/008	Culbokie H02	Supports preference of sites H2 and C1 as they will provide for the consolidation of the settlement whilst also making provision for additional local facilities. They will also help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Ms Joyce Hendry(00235)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00235/1/001	Culbokie H03	<p>The landowner of the remaining undeveloped land at site option H3 welcomes and supports the inclusion of this site in the IMFLDP and confirms its availability.</p> <p>The landowner outlines their consideration of the main development issues and attributes of the site as follows: -</p> <p>Constraints and how consider they can they be resolved or reduced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No part of the site is in a SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk area. - No part of the site is part of an agricultural unit or is Prime quality agricultural land. - A commercial woodland adjacent to the south east boundary helps to contain the site in the wider landscape setting of Culbokie. - Development will have to be set back the appropriate distance from the woodland. - There are no other natural or cultural heritage features within the site. <p>Potential benefits to the wider community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential development will require compliance with the Council's affordable housing policies and make contributions towards improved education and public transport facilities. 	<p>The landowner of the remaining undeveloped land at site option H3 welcomes and supports the inclusion of this site .</p> <p>The landowner suggests that the committed land in H3 is deleted from the allocation that appears in the Proposed Plan. For consistency it is considered that the developed parts of sites H2 and H4 should also be deleted from the final allocations.</p>

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>Impact on travel patterns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Located within 500 metres of the village shop and post office. - Approximately 1.2 km from the primary school. - Approximately 400 metres from land allocated for community use at site C1. - Paths will be provided to connect to the existing village centre and the forest. - A local bus service presently runs along the B9169 road just over 400 metres from the site. 	
Culbokie	Ms Joyce Hendry(00235)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00235/1/002	Culbokie H03	<p>The landowner states that a planning application is pending for land to the south west of the landowners house and that this forms part of the existing Ross And Cromarty East Local Plan allocation. It is also stated that this application has been the subject of negotiations with Roads officials over access and a safe connecting footpath towards the main part of the village and that agreement has now been reached over these provisions and will result in the application being withdrawn and resubmitted.</p> <p>In addition it is stated that land which forms part of that allocation, has planning permission or is already developed, and that this together with the landowners own house is said to account for almost half of site H3. The landowner suggests that this committed land is deleted from the allocation that appears in the Proposed Plan. For consistency it is considered that the developed parts of sites H2 and H4 should also be deleted from the final allocations.</p>	<p>The landowner of the remaining undeveloped land at ste option H3 welcomes and supports the inclusion of this site in the IMFLDP.</p> <p>The landowner suggests that the committed land in H3 is deleted from the allocation that appears in the Proposed Plan. For consistency it is considered that the developed parts of sites H2 and H4 should also be deleted from the final allocations.</p>
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/007	Culbokie H03	Supports H3.	
Culbokie	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/193	Culbokie H03	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.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/014	Culbokie H03	Supports site for housing.	None.
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/006	Culbokie H03	Respondent supports the preference of site as it will help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/002	Culbokie H04	Suggests that the residual part of H4 and B1 be reallocated as Mixed Use as it may present an opportunity for a village centre as the site is located near the 'heavier' end of the village, opposite the school, near the village hall, church centre, recreation ground, parking and recycling.	Reallocate 'residual' part of H4 and B1 for community and business uses to allow for a village centre to form.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/016	Culbokie H04	Should be mixed use so as to give flexibility when proposals come forward.	Re-classify as mixed use. Mix of uses retail, community, business and housing .
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/006	Culbokie H04	Respondent supports the preference of site as it will help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Mr Angus Bethune(01187)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01187/1/001	Culbokie H04	The joint landowner of the majority of this site supports its allocation for housing development which could be retained and advanced when appropriate. However a member of the Culbokie Community Group has suggested having some of this land identified for community and/or mixed use and although not against in principle there is concern about committing fully to what is a speculative use at this stage and therefore discussions are sought on this.	The joint landowner of the majority of this site seeks its allocation for development and wants to open the opportunity for considering mixed and/or community use on this site without tying to any speculative uses.
Culbokie	Ms Amanda MacRitchie(00388)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00388/1/001	Culbokie H05	Supports preference of site for the following reasons: - It is a prime development site and the logical rounding off point to the village settlement pattern. - It has good access to services and village amenities. Access is constrained but this can be resolved. - A well designed masterplan layout with good balance of open space and use of existing landscape features would provide development which would enhance the villagescape.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/008	Culbokie H05	Supports H5 subject to significant screening	Seeks developer requirement to secure significant screening.
Culbokie	Mr And Mrs Mowat(00613)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00613/1/003	Culbokie H05	Supports the preference for housing allocation of H5. Access to be taken from the B9169 either from 'internal' via H5 or new direct access. Water supply mains provided, foul drainage to the mains and surface water dealt with on site. Reasons site should continue to be allocated:- Allocated in RACE LP; - Sits well within structure of the village, within defined edges, close to services and the main village thoroughfare;- Could be accessed through H8 or land to the south (10 in RACE LP); - Potential for land assembly with site 10 in RACE LP which would allow shared servicing;- Allows scope for development without site 10 in RACE LP provided H8 is allocated, southern part of H5 site is currently constrained by ownership (landowner thought to be in receivership).	Allocate H8 to facilitate access to northern part of H5
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/015	Culbokie H05	Supports site for housing.	
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/006	Culbokie H05	Respondent supports the preference of site as it will help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/084	Culbokie H06	Serious concerns about suitability of site because of inventory woodland, green network connectivity, amenity value of trees, other alternative development sites available, footpath networks closeby. Suggests non retention or mitigation in terms of maximum retention, high standard of compensatory planting and pre-determination species survey.	Suggests non retention or mitigation in terms of maximum retention, high standard of compensatory planting and pre-determination species survey.
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/004	Culbokie H06	Objects to preferred status of H6 as it is a small site which would require removal of mature woodland.	Seeks removal of H6
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/013	Culbokie H06	Delete site because of loss of woodland.	Rejection of site option.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/006	Culbokie H06	Respondent supports the preference of site as it will help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/003	Culbokie H07	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H7, H8 and H9 housing sites.	
Culbokie	Nicam Developments Ltd(00882)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00882/1/006	Culbokie H07	Believes both H1 and H7 should be allocated for housing for the following reasons - there are no physical features which provide a logical split between H1 and H7 and the split would leave a less viable agricultural field; - as this will safeguard future expansion and provide a strong and legible boundary to the south east of Culbokie; - H7 also benefits from existing infrastructure; - and provides more opportunity for affordable housing.	Seeks allocation of H7
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/010	Culbokie H07	Supports non-preferred status of site.	Rejection of site option.
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/007	Culbokie H07	Supports non-preference of sites H7, H8 and H9.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/003	Culbokie H08	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H7, H8 and H9 housing sites.	
Culbokie	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/194	Culbokie H08	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Could be dealt with by buffer or development set-back from watercourse. Not likely to affect significant area of site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application if development encroaches onto watercourses.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Culbokie	Roger Piercy(00597)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00597/1/001	Culbokie H08	Supports the Councils non preference of this site and the reasons given for non preference - potential flood risk issues - potential impact to SAM and locally important archaeological sites identified in HER - impact upon attractive undulating landscape and panoramic views over Cromarty Firth. Also feels that the watercourse provides an important habitat link, is concerned about additional surface water run off as there are already localised flooding issues, and is concerned about potential for people to feel entitled to use his garden as a route to join up with a pathway through Findons wood. Also considers that the H5 site is sufficient for the eastern end of the village and more central sites should be preferred before H8.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Culbokie	Mr And Mrs Mowat(00613)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00613/1/001	Culbokie H08	<p>Seeks the allocation in the Proposed Plan of H8 for housing, affordable housing, business and open space subject to a masterplan.</p> <p>Access to be taken from the B9169 either from 'internal' via H5 or new direct access.</p> <p>Water supply mains provided, foul drainage to the mains and surface water dealt with on site.</p> <p>Considers H8 should be allocated for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural and logical conclusion to the village, contained within alignment of B9169 and adjoining landform; - Proximity to local facilities; - Provide choice in housing, affordable housing, local amenities and business development opportunities; - By providing low-medium density, low profile and rural character set within larger policies, structure tree planting and creation of attractive village gateway would offer a market opportunity not presently catered for; - Offers an alternative means of opening-up northern part of H5 for development (site ref 11 in RACE plan) as southern part is unlikely to be brought forward in the near future (10 in RACE plan); - Well connected to village network of routes and services, will encourage active travel; - Help support services and social facilities; - Convenient to public transport; - Supports local aspiration to centralise services in the village, in particular a larger store, compared with competing development sites; - Compatible with housing/residential uses to the west and separated from neighbouring agricultural land by the B9169; - Reconfiguration of site edges may be required for visibility, where necessary habitats will be reinstated; - Lesser impact on landscape setting in comparison to other sites; - Site is available for development; and - Cons in MIR are overstated - it provides opportunity for interpretation of Scheduled Monument, flood risk can be contained landform, unlikely to affect views of the Cromarty Firth. 	Allocation of site H8 for housing, affordable housing, business and openspace
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/011	Culbokie H08	Supports non-preferred status of site.	Rejection of site option.
Culbokie	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/044	Culbokie H08	The northern section of the allocation is in close proximity to the scheduled monument Findon Cottage, dun 180m ENE of (Index no. 2966). Historic Scotland therefore welcome that the Main Issues Report notes the potential impact on the setting of this site and that the allocation is not preferred.	
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/007	Culbokie H08	Supports non-preference of sites H7, H8 and H9.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/003	Culbokie H09	Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H7, H8 and H9 housing sites.	
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/012	Culbokie H09	Supports non-preferred status of site.	Rejection of site option.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/007	Culbokie H09	Supports non-preference of sites H7, H8 and H9.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/005	Culbokie MU01	The respondent makes the following suggestions for opportunities for creating a village centre: MU1- very well located within the village but respondent aware that the landowner may not release the land in the foreseeable future. As a result, this site is suitable for long term development but alternative sites need to be identified to allow a village centre to develop within a reasonable timescale.	
Culbokie	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/195	Culbokie MU01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA required to consider possibility that watercourse could come out of bank and affect the development site, due to topography. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application if development encroaches onto watercourses.	SEPA seeks developer requirement, Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application if development encroaches onto watercourses.
Culbokie	D&R Farrar(00614)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00614/1/001	Culbokie MU01	Objects to mixed use development at MU01 site and suggests C1 as a more suitable site along with the proposed Health Centre.	Objects to mixed use development at MU01 site and suggests C1 as a more suitable site along with the proposed Health Centre.
Culbokie	Mr Peter Batten And Denise Lloyd(00878)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00878/1/003	Culbokie MU01	Respondent objects to agricultural area of MU1, they feel that any service buildings should be located in the shop area.	Respondent objects to MU1 being allocated.
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/006	Culbokie MU01	Respondent supports the preference of site as it will help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/002	Culbokie B01	Suggests that the residual part of H4 and B1 be reallocated as Mixed Use as it may present an opportunity for a village centre as the site is located near the 'heavier' end of the village, opposite the school, near the village hall, church centre, recreation ground, parking and recycling.	Reallocate 'residual' part of H4 and B1 for community and business uses to allow for a village centre to form.
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/008	Culbokie B01	Should be mixed use so as to give flexibility when proposals come forward.	Re-classify as mixed use. Mix of uses retail, community, business and housing .
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/006	Culbokie B01	Respondent supports the preference of site as it will help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Penny Edwards(00446)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00446/1/006	Culbokie C01	Despite being close to the shop and pub the site C1 is on the other side of the village from other community facilities. If it was available in the short term it may be a suitable site for a village centre but C1 is too small to provide the range of facilities required.	Seeks that the north east section of H2 should be reallocated as Mixed Use to allow it to be used for a small scale business.
Culbokie	D&R Farrar(00614)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00614/1/001	Culbokie C01	Objects to mixed use development at MU01 site and suggests C1 as a more suitable site along with the proposed Health Centre.	Objects to mixed use development at MU01 site and suggests C1 as a more suitable site along with the proposed Health Centre.
Culbokie	Miss Anthea Whitehead(00679)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00679/1/001	Culbokie C01	Supports the preference of site C1 and respondent confirms that owner of site is still willing to sell the site for development. There is extant planning permission for the site. There is now adequate water and sewerage capacity which will help facilitate development.	
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/006	Culbokie C01	Should be mixed use so as to give flexibility when proposals come forward. Should also be merged with H2 as mixed use site. Believes this part of village most likely to come forward as a development site.	Merge C1 and H2 and re-classify as mixed use. Mix of uses retail, community, business and housing .

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Culbokie	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/008	Culbokie C01	Supports preference of sites H2 and C1 as they will provide for the consolidation of the settlement whilst also making provision for additional local facilities. They will also help address the key development issues facing Culbokie.	
Culbokie	Ferintosh Community Council(00910)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00910/1/007	Culbokie C02	Should be mixed use so as to give flexibility when proposals come forward.	Re-classify as mixed use. Mix of uses retail, community, business and housing .
Dingwall	Network Rail(00438)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00438/1/005	Dingwall General	Network Rail currently in discussions with the Council regarding Kinnairdie link road and its impact upon the three automatic open level crossings at Dingwall. Network Rail propose to close Dingwall 1 and 2 and upgrade Dingwall middle to a full barrier solution with obstacle detection.	
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/003	Dingwall General	Seek allocation of new site to south east of Craig Road for mixed uses. Consider site should be allocated as it is has an easily accessed south facing aspect; is in an unobtrusive location and is close to the town centre. Note the site is low lying and therefore potentially susceptible to flooding, however for the correct use, appropriate under building/infilling could render the site viable and appropriate for mixed use purposes. Also aware the site is currently outwith the settlement development area, however allocation of this land could result in allowing for further appropriate expansion of Dingwall which based on the conclusions of the report will be required during the lifetime of the plan.	Allocation of site to south east of Craig Road for mixed use
Dingwall	William Gray Construction Ltd(01071)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01071/1/004	Dingwall General	Respondent supports safeguarding the extent of Dingwall town centre boundary as indicated in RACE and in the IMF MIR, as an area which can continue to create and attract investment to the area, whilst reinforcing the role of the town centre in the context of the settlement.	
Dingwall	M N H McCallum(01078)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01078/1/001	Dingwall General	Suggests new site as housing allocation and to be within SDA boundary, immediately to the east of MU5 because: part of site is flatish, well drained and development would sit within natural landform; other part of site more suited for amenity / open space, and; it is within a more natural village edge defined by Mountrich Farm and a wooded ditch.	Suggests new site for housing development and open space to east of MU5.
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/196	Dingwall H01	SEPA do not object. Careful consideration of flood risk and drainage in consultation with Council who have detailed information on culvert issues. Flood Risk Assessment required	Flood Risk Assessment required.
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/197	Dingwall H02	No Flood Risk Assessment required	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/198	Dingwall H03	SEPA support the Council's non-preferred status of the site SEPA would object to it's inclusion unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or the allocation is removed from Plan. Remove the site from the allocations, or restrict site boundary to very small area outwith floodplain. Require FRA to support any modification otherwise not acceptable. Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. The River Peffery runs along the north boundary of the site. The water body is at moderate status for morphology with the main pressures being realignment and embankment. The section of burn along the boundary has both realignment and embankment so would be a potential restoration site. Space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. This is likely to require quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also an historically straightened minor watercourse on the southern boundary of the site. Again space for restoration and development of future natural processes should be allowed for.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan. Removal of the site from the allocations, or restrict site boundary to very small area outwith floodplain. Require FRA to support any modification otherwise not acceptable.
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/004	Dingwall H03	Respondent considers that non-preferred sites B2 and H3 should be allocated for business use within the plan. B2 and H3 are: - more readily accessible to pedestrians and vehicles; - closer to Kinnairdie Link Road; - likely to cost less to develop in terms of infrastructure, as such sites are more deliverable; - in a central position adjacent to existing business and industrial parks; - unlikely to effect amenity; and - H3 is not suitable for housing.	Allocation of B2/H3 for Business use in the proposed plan
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/005	Dingwall H03	H3 is not suitable for housing.	
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/199	Dingwall MU01	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Remove site or modify site boundary to include only land outwith the floodplain. Previous comments are still applicable, even though the site has been extended. Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. WB 20147 River Peffery runs along the south boundary of the site. The water body is at moderate status for morphology with the main pressures being realignment and embankment. The section of burn along the boundary has both realignment and embankment so would be a potential restoration site. Space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. This is likely to require quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also an historically straightened non-baseline watercourse (Dochcarty Burn) on the west boundary of the site. Again space for restoration and development of future natural processes should be allowed for.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan. Removal of site or modify site boundary to include only land outwith the floodplain.
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/001	Dingwall MU01	Supportive of site allocations proposed for MU1.	
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/276	Dingwall MU02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Should be ok provided development carried out in line with the previous FRA recommendations and that should be made clear in the plan. Flood Risk Assessment required	Inclusion of text to state development to be carried out in line with the previous FRA recommendations. Flood Risk Assessment required to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Dingwall	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/085	Dingwall MU03	Concerns re possible adverse impact upon long established plantation origin woodland that is present within site. Requests demonstration of over-riding public benefits, lack of suitable alternatives, pre-determination species surveys and high standard of compensatory planting. Strongly advise retention of all woodland within site because it is an important link in the local green network. Design framework required or woodland excluded from site boundary.	If site retained unchanged then requirements for pre-determination species surveys, high standard of compensatory planting and design framework. Preference for woodland to be excluded from site boundary.
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/200	Dingwall MU03	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Dingwall	Deveron Homes Ltd(01247)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01247/1/002	Dingwall MU03	Deveron Homes support the Council's preference of this site for mixed use development and considers it an effective site but states that - the conditions on planning permissions in Dingwall North have stifled development - there is significant concern about the second phase of the Kinnairdie Link Road and the County junction being delayed till 2016/17 and it is considered that this should be brought forward - developer contributions for transport infrastructure needs to be sought in line with Circular 1/2010 tests - there is a need to address the issue of the Kinnairdie Link Road (KLR) possibly by the Council considering modelling of alternative access improvements and by allowing careful and well designed phased development - developers need to be informed at an early stage on the necessary developer contributions that will be sought for schools, water and sewerage capacity upgrades - there is concern that the housing release planned for Dingwall will not be achievable if these issues are not addressed	
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/201	Dingwall MU05	No Flood Risk Assessment required. Development would have to be set back from the watercourses, but that should be adequate. Also a need to consider drainage.	Developer requirement that development would have to be set back from the watercourses. Need to consider drainage.
Dingwall	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/086	Dingwall MU06	Comments that site should be HRA checked due to proximity to Cromarty Firth SPA.	Any developer requirement mitigation resulting from HRA.
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/202	Dingwall MU06	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. FRA required prior to adoption in the plan as too much uncertainty due to railway embankments, structures, fluvial/tidal interaction. Some of site brownfield and may be suitable for development provided no increase in vulnerability but mitigation measures may be difficult to achieve. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Dingwall	Mr John Leitch(00610)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00610/1/001	Dingwall MU06	The Craig Road Residents Group object to their road being used for anything other than residential purposes and believe there to be more suitable sites in Dingwall such as the Highland Council Depot for industrial uses. They state that the HGVs are causing serious damage to their homes.	Do not allocate for any uses other than housing or open space .
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/006	Dingwall MU06	Supportive of site allocation proposed for MU6	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/203	Dingwall MU07	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 will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. The River Peffery runs along the north boundary of the site. The water body is at moderate status for morphology with the main pressures being realignment and embankment. Both banks of river along this section are heavily urbanised and it is likely that there are modifications to the bed and banks. Opportunities for improvements to channel morphology and allowance for future natural processes should be investigated as part of any development.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Dingwall	Redco Milne Ltd(01251)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01251/1/002	Dingwall MU07	Happy to work with Council and others to assemble feasible and appropriate development site. Records that their ownership has an extant retail planning permission and development brief. Believes suitable mitigation measures can be introduced to address constraints of its site and wider allocation.	
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/204	Dingwall MU08	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Removal unless FRA or other information (topo levels) provided in support of the site being included, prior to adoption.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan. other information (topo levels) provided in support of the site being included, prior to adoption.
Dingwall	Mr Kevin Sinclair(00684)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00684/1/012	Dingwall MU08	Objects to MU8 as it removes the ability for increasing the amount of goods to be transported by rail.	Removal of allocation at MU8
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/007	Dingwall MU08	Supportive of site allocation proposed for MU8	
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/205	Dingwall B01	SEPA object unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Modify the boundary to limit the site to that within the existing business park which has adequate flood defences already in place, or remove the whole site. Flood Risk Assessment required, it is unlikely that an FRA could demonstrate that the western half of the site is developable. The River Peffery runs along the north boundary of the site. The water body is at moderate status for morphology with the main pressures being realignment and embankment. The section of burn along the boundary has both realignment and embankment so would be a potential restoration site. Space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. This is likely to require quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also an historically straightened minor watercourse on the southern boundary of the site. Again space for restoration and development of future natural processes should be allowed for.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan. Modify the boundary to limit the site to that within the existing business park which has adequate flood defences already in place, or remove the whole site.
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/002	Dingwall B01	Respondent does not support expansion of Dingwall Business Park westwards shown in B1 but supports the identification of additional business land.	Remove allocation B1 covering the expansion of Dingwall Business Park.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Dingwall	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/206	Dingwall B02	SEPA support the Council's non-preferred status of this site SEPA will object to the inclusion of this site unless the following further information gathered prior to Proposed Plan or removed from Plan. Remove the site from the allocations, or restrict site boundary to very small area outwith floodplain. Require FRA to support any modification otherwise not acceptable. Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. The River Peffery runs along the north boundary of the site. The water body is at moderate status for morphology with the main pressures being realignment and embankment. The section of burn along the boundary has both realignment and embankment so would be a potential restoration site. Space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. This is likely to require quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also an historically straightened minor watercourse on the southern boundary of the site. Again space for restoration and development of future natural processes should be allowed for.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan. Remove the site from the allocations, or restrict site boundary to very small area outwith floodplain. Require FRA to support any modification otherwise not acceptable.
Dingwall	Dingwall Auction Mart Limited(01068)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01068/1/004	Dingwall B02	Respondent considers that non-preferred sites B2 and H3 should be allocated for business use within the plan. B2 and H3 are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more readily accessible to pedestrians and vehicles; - closer to Kinnairdie Link Road; - likely to cost less to develop in terms of infrastructure, as such sites are more deliverable; - in a central position adjacent to existing business and industrial parks; - unlikely to effect amenity; and - H3 is not suitable for housing. 	Allocation of B2/H3 for Business use in the proposed plan
Dingwall	Mr Robin Gardner(01214)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01214/1/002	Dingwall B02	Considers site should be allocated for business, light and general industrial uses for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site has been allocated for light and general industrial purposes in previous Local Plans for over 20 years; - Accepted high voltage power line traverses the site which precludes built development on certain parts of the site, however such land could be used for open storage yards, access roads, parking, landscaping, SUDS etc. - Trunk water mains safeguarding area is negligible and - Accepted part of the site is shown to be at risk from fluvial flooding on the SEPA flood map, however not aware of any past flooding events; planning permission has been granted in the past on this parts of the site; planning permission has been granted for industrial developments in other parts of Dingwall when flood risk mitigation measures have been incorporated and Kinnairdie Link Road drawings indicate flood risk areas on site will be reduced following completion of the road. <p>Suggests consideration should be given to the potential for further flood prevention measures adjacent to the River Peffery. Notes in light of the current poor market conditions for industrial premises it is not cost-effective to commission a detailed flood risk assessment.</p>	Allocation of B2 for business, light and general industrial uses in the Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/090	Evanton General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys including reptiles.	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys including reptiles.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/007	Evanton General	<p>Kiltearn Community Council consider it essential for the future development of the village that a bridge and road link is provided into Teandallon at an early stage.</p> <p>It is also considered that the areas identified as amenity areas in RACE should be allocated as open space, and that the area northeast of the River Glass should be further protected with footpath access via the riverbank to the Black Rock Gorge and to the core path network. It is considered that the amenity area north of the River Skiach, adjacent to the former Balconie Castle Drive should be extended to include all of the wooded area and the recently open green space on the site of the former smiddy.</p> <p>It is noted that hotel provision is under threat with the Novar Arms Hotel closed.</p> <p>They seek Council pressure on Scottish Water to extend the drainage system to include the rest of the industrial estate.</p> <p>They also seek protection of land around Kiltearn burial ground as any extension requires the consent of residents within 100 yards of the proposed extension.</p>	<p>Provide bridge and link road to Teandallon at early stage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replicate areas of open space shown in RACE in Proposed Plan - Protect area north east of River Glass and provide footpath access - Extend amenity area north of River Skiach to include wooded area and open space - Allocation of cemetery extension at Kiltearn burial ground
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/008	Evanton General	Questions why the Wester Teanininch area south of the railway is not allocated for industry.	Assume allocation of land north east of I2 for industry
Evanton	Miss Sheila Fletcher(00881)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00881/1/001	Evanton General	Teandallon Farm has been zoned for housing for 40 years and is still undeveloped so questions the need for adding additional areas for development until Teandallon has been fully used.	
Evanton	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/022	Evanton General	An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.	Developer requirement in Proposed Plan requiring existing junctions to be used to access the proposed sites.
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/001	Evanton General	Respondent feels that opportunities exist to consolidate growth in the south/south western part of Evanton which would accord with Scot Gov policy in Designing Streets as the main village facilities are within walking distance.	
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/006	Evanton Generalral	Respondent identifies a new piece of land which they would like to be allocated for housing in Evanton, to the east of MU2. It would provide a significant area of land that could be accessed safely, has no infrastructure constraints and is free from flood risk. The settlement boundary should be amended to include this proposed site. It would comply with Scot Gov policy and advice, would consolidate growth in this part of Evanton and enhance the viability of existing facilities.	Allocation of land east of MU2 for housing in Proposed Plan.
Evanton	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/009	Evanton General	Some industrial and mixed use sites lie adjacent to Inner Moray Firth SPA may adversely affect it. Any proposals on these sites must be assessed against SPP1 and SOEnD Circular 6/1995 (Amended June 2000).	
Evanton	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/004	Evanton H01	Believes that Evanton has not had adequate levels of affordable housing investment due to constrained local plan allocations particularly sites H1 and H2 which may have been developed had it not been for significant access constraints. This site (assuming both H1 and H2) have featured in the Local Plan for many years and it should now be reviewed to determine a realistic allocation. In reference to the evening workshop held in Evanton, the	Allowance for development of up to 20 units on H1 utilising existing road network before link bridge is required.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				respondent notes a general consensus of support for the proposal of the development of up to 20 units utilising the existing road network.	
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/207	Evanton H01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Recommend that development is set well back from the watercourse. If development is proposed close to the watercourse, it will require a FRA to support the application, the outcome of which may affect the developable area and layout options. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of application if development encroaches on the watercourse or include crossings.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Evanton	Mr Rob Jack(00999)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00999/1/001	Evanton H01	Objects to sites MU2 and MU3 being zoned for mixed use as there is already sufficient land zoned for development at sites H1 and H2. H1 and H2 have been zoned for 40 years but they are difficult to develop as a new bridge is required for access. Respondent feels that by having MU2 and MU3 it is allowing a developer an easy option to provide housing there rather than having additional costs at H1 and H2. Reducing the areas of development should stimulate improvements to infrastructure that the Council cannot currently afford to undertake. As the Council owns H1 and H2 it could generate income by selling the land to a developer.	Non allocation of MU2 and MU3 in Proposed Plan
Evanton	Mr Hector Munro(01041)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01041/1/001	Evanton H01	Queries preferred status of site because: prohibitively expensive to develop due to access road and bridging costs; need to compensate agricultural tenant; need for compulsory purchase on south side of river to engineer suitable road connection; alternative access as Swordale Road has no spare capacity; alternative access through Teandallon housing is problematic and creates worse congestion at Chapel Road Balconie Street junction, and; without bridge results in a long walk to school.	Assume non allocation of H1 in the Proposed Plan
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/002	Evanton H01	Objects to H1 and H2. Respondent's client is an agricultural tenant on sites H1 and H2. Sites are constrained by access issues with current access limited to Swordale Road which does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the scale of development. A new bridge is required to give access from the south and this is unlikely during the plan period. Having these sites as preferred over other options could potentially threaten the delivery of much needed growth to enhance the viability of local facilities.	Assume non allocation of H1 and H2 in Proposed Plan
Evanton	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/004	Evanton H02	Believes that Evanton has not had adequate levels of affordable housing investment due to constrained local plan allocations particularly sites H1 and H2 which may have been developed had it not been for significant access constraints. This site (assuming both H1 and H2) have featured in the Local Plan for many years and it should now be reviewed to determine a realistic allocation. In reference to the evening workshop held in Evanton, the respondent notes a general consensus of support for the proposal of the development of up to 20 units utilising the existing road network.	Allowance for development of up to 20 units on H1 utilising existing road network before link bridge is required.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/208	Evanton H02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Recommend that development is set well back from the watercourse. If development is proposed close to the watercourse, it will require a FRA to support the application, the outcome of which may affect the developable area and layout options. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of application if development encroaches on the watercourse or include crossings.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Evanton	Mr Rob Jack(00999)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00999/1/001	Evanton H02	Objects to sites MU2 and MU3 being zoned for mixed use as there is already sufficient land zoned for development at sites H1 and H2. H1 and H2 have been zoned for 40 years but they are difficult to develop as a new bridge is required for access. Respondent feels that by having MU2 and MU3 it is allowing a developer an easy option to provide housing there rather than having additional costs at H1 and H2. Reducing the areas of development should stimulate improvements to infrastructure that the Council cannot currently afford to undertake. As the Council owns H1 and H2 it could generate income by selling the land to a developer.	Non allocation of MU2 and MU3 in Proposed Plan
Evanton	Mr Hector Munro(01041)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01041/1/001	Evanton H02	Queries preferred status of site because: prohibitively expensive to develop due to access road and bridging costs; need to compensate agricultural tenant; need for compulsory purchase on south side of river to engineer suitable road connection; alternative access as Swordale Road has no spare capacity; alternative access through Teandallon housing is problematic and creates worse congestion at Chapel Road Balconie Street junction, and; without bridge results in a long walk to school.	Assume non allocation of H1 in the Proposed Plan
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/002	Evanton H02	Objects to H1 and H2 . Respondent's client is an agricultural tenant on sites H1 and H2. Sites are constrained by access issues with current access limited to Swordale Road which does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the scale of development. A new bridge is required to give access from the south and this is unlikely during the plan period. Having these sites as preferred over other options could potentially threaten the delivery of much needed growth to enhance the viability of local facilities.	Assume non allocation of H1 and H2 in Proposed Plan
Evanton	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/089	Evanton H03	Supports non-preferred of site because of potential adverse effect upon Glen Glass Red Squirrel Stronghold adjacent. For consistency wants SDA to exclude all non-preferred sites.	Exclusion of H3 from SDA
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/209	Evanton H03	Consideration to be given for drain/small watercourse in layout and design of site. Flood Risk Assessment required	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Evanton	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/005	Evanton H04	Objects to the non-preferred status of H4.	Allocate H4 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/210	Evanton H04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text included to state that FRA required and outcome may limit the scale and layout of development on the site. No development will be permitted within the functional floodplain. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Evanton	Mr Hector Munro(01041)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01041/1/002	Evanton H04	Requests as agent for part owner of site that the site be confirmed within the Proposed Plan and extended southwards as far as the Kiltearn Burial Ground access road because: the landowners will release it for development; it has had a partial, previous (albeit lapsed) outline permission for housing; it has only not been developed because of the current market downturn; it has ready and inexpensive road access; it is in close proximity to the school and village centre; its extension would allow more feasible and attractive road/site layouts; it's not prime farmland; topography issues can be mitigated by innovative design and landscaping including flood plain and railway public open space set-backs, and; it could contribute to an effective land supply for the village.	Allocation of H4 for housing in Proposed Plan and an extension of it southwards as far as the Kiltearn Burial Ground access road.
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/005	Evanton H04	Objects to non-preference of site H4 . Respondent is part owner of this site. It is non preferred due to flood risk issues. According to SEPA indicative flood map it is the northern and western edges of the site that are affected by flooding.	Assume allocation of H4 for housing in Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Novar Estates(00158)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00158/1/003	Evanton H05	Objects to non-preference of site H5. Agrees with significant pro noted in Main Issues Report (MIR) and suggests a further one is that H5 together with H6 provides a strategic long term expansion option of site MU1 . The masterplan for MU1 shows indicatively how the three sites could be linked in an effective way. Two significant cons are listed in the MIR: - Includes prime agricultural land - Is grade 2 agricultural land. Potential contribution of land to national agricultural output has to be weighed against its potential to address local and regional housing needs and opportunity to create business and employment opportunities. Respondent feels that housing and business opportunities outweigh the site's contribution as agricultural land. - Comparatively distant from centre of settlement - The distance from H5 to village centre is about 500 - 750m which is closer than some of the other proposed mixed use and housing sites identified in the MIR.	Allocation of H5 for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Novar Estates(00158)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00158/1/005	Evanton H05	Objects to non-preference of sites H5 and H6. They should be preferred due to their strategic relationship to MU1. Treating H5, H6 and MU1 in the same way creates a coherent long term development approach for the north side of Evanton. This long term approach is relevant due to site organisation and infrastructure planning decisions being taken in relation to MU1.	Allocation of H5 and H6 in Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/118	Evanton H05	Supports non-preference of site because of potential adverse effect upon Glen Glass Red Squirrel Stronghold adjacent.	
Evanton	Novar Estates(00158)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00158/1/004	Evanton H06	Objects to non preference of site H6. Agrees with significant pro noted in Main Issues Report (MIR) that it provides longer term development opportunity as this is the indicative approach laid out in the masterplan for site MU1. Makes comments on the significant cons listed in the MIR: - Comparatively distant from centre of settlement - The distance from H6 to village centre is about 500 - 750m which is closer than some of the other proposed mixed use and housing sites identified in the MIR. - Loss of trees - half of the area of H6 has poor, self seeded partly scrub woodland cover. Any development on this site under the landscape approach set out in the masterplan for MU1 would balance the loss of any of the existing scrub woodland, with high quality structural landscaping with a mixture of tree	Allocation of H6 for housnig in the Proposed Plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				species which would provide a richer ecology than the current woodland.	
Evanton	Novar Estates(00158)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00158/1/005	Evanton H06	Objects to non-preference of sites H5 and H6. They should be preferred due to their strategic relationship to MU1. Treating H5, H6 and MU1 in the same way creates a coherent long term development approach for the north side of Evanton. This long term approach is relevant due to site organisation and infrastructure planning decisions being taken in relation to MU1.	Allocation of H5 and H6 in Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/119	Evanton H06	Supports non-preference of site because of potential adverse effect upon Glen Glass Red Squirrel Stronghold adjacent.	
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/002	Evanton H06	Kiltearn Community Council consider that this land can be easily and inexpensively developed and serviced.	Allocation of H6 in the Proposed Plan
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/221	Evanton H06	SEPA support the non-preferred status of the site but will not object to its inclusion provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. A FRA may be required if development is proposed close to the watercourse this could be adequately dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in vicinity of the watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment required if development encroaches on 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.
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/003	Evanton H07	Kiltearn Community Council supports the Council's non preference of this land for housing due to the noise and industrial activity in this area, with a scrap yard, lorry park, railway and road nearby.	
Evanton	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/006	Evanton H07	In reference to the Evening Workshop, the respondent suggests that there was general agreement for a Mixed Use allocation for sites H7/B1 rather than simply for Business.	Allocate H7/B1 for mixed use in the Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/004	Evanton H08	Kiltearn Community Council support the Councils non preference of this site for housing as it is unserved, has a high water table, is on clay, and is served by a hump back bridge.	
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/211	Evanton H08	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Could be dealt with by buffer or development set-back from watercourse. Not likely to affect significant area of site. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application if close to the watercourse	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Evanton	Novar Estates(00158)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00158/1/002	Evanton MU01	<p>Supports preference of site MU1. The masterplan has been discussed with the Council and has been through Major Development pre-application procedure.</p> <p>The significant pros listed in the Main Issues Report (MIR) reflect the respondents views on the site.</p> <p>Two significant cons are notes in the MIR and the respondent makes the following comments: - Includes prime agricultural land - Is grade 2 agricultural land. Potential contribution of land to national agricultural output has to be weighed against its potential to address local and regional housing needs and opportunity to create business and employment opportunities. Respondent feels that housing and business opportunities outweigh the site's contribution as agricultural land. - Further from local facilities than other sites - Current local facilities are relatively limited but the increase in population from MU1 will increase the economic viability of existing facilities and provide potential for new additional facilities. The Masterplan indicatively outlines scope for allotments, bowling green and tennis courts which would be available for everyone in Evanton. None of these currently exist in Evanton. The distance from MU1 to village centre is about 500 - 750m which is closer than some of the other proposed mixed use and housing sites identified in the MIR. MU1 is also closer to the village centre than some existing residential parts of the village.</p>	
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/005	Evanton MU01	Kiltearn Community Council considers this site to be long term and unmarketable at the moment.	Assume allocation of MU1 for longer term development
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/003	Evanton MU01	Objects to MU1 . Concerned about housing development on this site as it is more remote from village facilities and would encourage unsustainable travel patterns with reliance on cars. This does onto accord with SPP and Designing Streets.	
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/006	Evanton MU02	Kiltearn Community Council consider that there should no housing here until the access into Teandallon is decided, Teandallon farm land is freed from the agricultural tenancy, and the traffic issue at the school is resolved.	Non allocation of MU2 unless issues are resolved.
Evanton	Miss Sheila Fletcher(00881)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00881/1/002	Evanton MU02	Developing MU2 would be an unnatural extension of the village. Currently housing is contained on the north west side of the road so representor could understand a small area at the north west corner between the road junction and the school being zoned for mixed use. Zoning the whole site seems unnecessary and would lead to loss of farmland.	
Evanton	Mr Rob Jack(00999)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00999/1/001	Evanton MU02	Objects to sites MU2 and MU3 being zoned for mixed use as there is already sufficient land zoned for development at sites H1 and H2. H1 and H2 have been zoned for 40 years but they are difficult to develop as a new bridge is required for access. Respondent feels that by having MU2 and MU3 it is allowing a developer an easy option to provide housing there rather than having additional costs at H1 and H2. Reducing the areas of development should stimulate improvements to infrastructure that the Council cannot currently afford to undertake. As the Council owns H1 and H2 it could generate income by selling the land to a developer.	Non allocation of MU2 and MU3 in Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/004	Evanton MU02	Respondent welcomes the preference of sites MU2 and MU3 which they own. They are free from significant constraints and are deliverable within the plan period. They are identified as mixed use including possible school expansion and small scale housing development. Respondent content with the principle of some development on MU2 but there should be a green buffer along the western edge beside Drummond Farm which is visible on the approach to the village. There may be an opportunity for the Council to purchase part of MU2 for a school drop off/pick up area should there be insufficient land within the school site. MU3 is suitable for residential development and was previously allocated for 12 units. Respondent wishes site to be allocated for housing, with a minimum of 12 units, rather than mixed use.	Allocation of MU3 for housing only - a minimum of 12 units Developer requirements for MU2: green buffer along western edge, school drop off/pick up point
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/006	Evanton MU03	Kiltearn Community Council consider that there should no housing here until the access into Teandallon is decided, Teandallon farm land is freed from the agricultural tenancy, and the traffic issue at the school is resolved.	Non allocation of MU2 unless issues are resolved.
Evanton	Miss Sheila Fletcher(00881)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00881/1/003	Evanton MU03	MU3 is a mostly undeveloped wooded area with mature trees. It is home to a lot of wildlife including woodpecker and pine martin. When development was previously proposed here the representor believes that a preservation order was discussed due to it having a rare plant species.	Non allocation of MU3 in Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Mr Rob Jack(00999)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00999/1/001	Evanton MU03	Objects to sites MU2 and MU3 being zoned for mixed use as there is already sufficient land zoned for development at sites H1 and H2. H1 and H2 have been zoned for 40 years but they are difficult to develop as a new bridge is required for access. Respondent feels that by having MU2 and MU3 it is allowing a developer an easy option to provide housing there rather than having additional costs at H1 and H2. Reducing the areas of development should stimulate improvements to infrastructure that the Council cannot currently afford to undertake. As the Council owns H1 and H2 it could generate income by selling the land to a developer.	Non allocation of MU2 and MU3 in Proposed Plan
Evanton	Mr And Mrs McArthur(01060)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01060/1/004	Evanton MU03	Respondent welcomes the preference of sites MU2 and MU3 which they own. They are free from significant constraints and are deliverable within the plan period. They are identified as mixed use including possible school expansion and small scale housing development. Respondent content with the principle of some development on MU2 but there should be a green buffer along the western edge beside Drummond Farm which is visible on the approach to the village. There may be an opportunity for the Council to purchase part of MU2 for a school drop off/pick up area should there be insufficient land within the school site. MU3 is suitable for residential development and was previously allocated for 12 units. Respondent wishes site to be allocated for housing, with a minimum of 12 units, rather than mixed use.	Allocation of MU3 for housing only - a minimum of 12 units Developer requirements for MU2: green buffer along western edge, school drop off/pick up point
Evanton	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/006	Evanton B01	In reference to the Evening Workshop, the respondent suggests that there was general agreement for a Mixed Use allocation for sites H7/B1 rather than simply for Business.	Allocate H7/B1 for mixed use in the Proposed Plan.
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/217	Evanton I06	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Site seems to be greenfield so text should state that FRA would be required and development would be restricted to areas outwith the floodplain which may have an impact on the developable area. FRA should also consider any small watercourses and culverts. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Evanton	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/087	Evanton I01	Concerns about potential adverse effects on adjacent Cromarty Firth SPA and connected Moray Firth SAC. Requests these be HRA checked. Potential impacts include disturbance from piling and boat movements, and loss of Inventory semi-natural woodland particularly adjacent to the Allt Graad. Justification for protecting woodland in terms of national status, Council policy, suitability of alternative development sites, adopted plan safeguard and lack of other open space safeguards within Evanton.	Mitigation resulting from HRA. Removal of Allt Graad woodland from site boundary or specific safeguard of it if within boundary.
Evanton	Kiltearn Community Council(00300)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00300/1/001	Evanton I01	Kiltearn Community Council object to the allocation of this land for industry considering this incompatible with the adjacent SPA. Deepwater access is available from the existing dock facility and the greater part of the airfield site is undeveloped. Considers that the wooded areas adjacent to the River Glass should be allocated as open space.	Non allocation of I1 in Proposed Plan Allocation of wooded area next to River Glass as open space in Proposed Plan
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/212	Evanton I01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed PlanText should state site at risk of flooding. FRA would be required to demonstrate proposals comply with SPP and mitigation measures if appropriate would not increase risk elsewhere. Flood Risk Assessment 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.
Evanton	Highland Deephaven(00755)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00755/1/001	Evanton I01	The site excludes an extension to the existing jetty that has planning permission, map should be amended to include this area to illustrate the full extent of the marine opportunity in the same way that it shows the opportunity for a rail link.	Amend map to include permitted jetty extension
Evanton	Adrian And Barbara Clark(01146)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01146/1/001	Evanton I01	Respondent objects to the allocation of I1 for industrial use for the following reasons: - River is used for fishing and bathing; - Presence of swans and geese; - Impact upon paths popular with dog walkers; - Presence of historic fishing bothy; and - Impact upon wooded youth camping area.	Assume non-allocation of I1 in the Proposed Plan
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/213	Evanton I02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Site seems to be greenfield so text should state that FRA would be required and development would be restricted to areas outwith the floodplain which may have a significant effect on the developable area and site layout. Flood Risk Assessment required in support of planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/214	Evanton I03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA required to ensure that the development is on land outwith the floodplain. Flood Risk Assessment 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.
Evanton	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/019	Evanton I03	Site I3 is described as being safeguarded for a rail loop and a siding to Highland Deephaven. Transport Scotland would be pleased to receive further information on this proposal.	
Evanton	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/088	Evanton I04	Supports non-preferred of site because it is within the Cromarty Firth SPA.	
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/215	Evanton I04	SEPA support the non-preferred status of the site and would object to it's inclusion 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.	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Evanton	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/216	Evanton I05	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Site seems to be greenfield so text should state that FRA would be required and development would be restricted to areas outwith the floodplain which may have a significant effect on the developable area. Flood Risk Assessment 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.
Fortrose and Rosemarkie – consolidated comments	Mr Donald Fraser(00002) , Scottish Natural Heritage(00204) , Fortrose And Rosemarkie Community Council(00286) , Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491) , Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523) , Jill J Anderson(00587) , Mr Ewan Henderson(00645) , Mr Stuart Edmond(00647) , Mr Mike Marshall(00680) , Mr Allan Pearks(00687) , Mr & Mrs Robbie & Gillian Kerr(00689) , Mr John Carruthers(00690) , Miss Pat Kemsley(00702) , Mr John Keast(00705) , Mrs Janis Keast(00707) , Mr David Pocock(00708) , Mrs Jane Barker(00709) , Mrs Helen Forrester(00710) , Mr Neil Forrester(00711) , Mrs A Jack(00712) , Miss Clare Philips(00713) , Mr Allister Ellison(00714) , Mrs Isabel Ellison(00715) , Miss Sari Paavola(00716) , Mr Ronald Gatt(00717) , Mrs Mary Pocock(00718) , Mr William Paterson(00719) , Mr Clive Simpson(00720) , Mr John Chisholm(00721) , Mrs Judith Chisholm(00722) , Mr Donald Macfarlane(00723) , Mrs J.M. Manson(00724) , Mr Adam Manson(00725) , Miss Carol Diethe(00726) , Mr Ross Macfarlane(00727) , Mr And Mrs M. Brown(00728) , Miss A Rayner(00756) , Mrs Rachel Philip(00759) , Mr Martin Philip(00760) , Mrs Sarah Cowley(00761) , Mr Craig Meredith(00762) , S.A. Comfort(00763) , Mrs Dorothy MacDonald(00764) , Mr W.Douglas Miller(00765) , Mrs Benita Miller(00766) , Mrs Anne MacEachern(00770) , Mr Tom Lloyd(00771) , Miss Victoria Murray(00778) , Miss Mary Mackenzie(00779) , Mr Peter J McLoughlin(00783) , Miss Elizabeth Marshall(00784) , Mr Robert And Christine Downing(00787) , H. Murray(00788) , N.H. Wilson(00790) , Dr P. Zentler-Munro(00791) , C. Zentler-Munro(00792) , Mrs Proudfoot(00793) , C.D. Heath(00794) , Miss Katherine Drought(00795) , Mr Alistair Brown(00796) , Miss Margaret Boyd(00797) , M.C. Hughes(00798) , M. Morrison(00799) , K. Whitton(00800) , N Lawson(00801) , Shona Haile(00802) , Miss Jane Bennett(00803) , Mr Eric Jones(00804) , Mr Thomas Anderson(00805) , M.G. Phillips(00806) , Mr Stephen Smith(00807) , Miss Jennifer Middleton(00808) , Mrs E Young(00809) , Miss Margaret Middleton(00810) , M.S. McLaren(00811) , Alexander G. Doull(00812) , Mrs Doreen Doull(00813) , Mr Gilbert Duncan(00814) , Mr David Bryee(00815) , Miss Isobel Harrison(00816) , A Hossack(00817) , Miss Jean MacArthur(00818) , Mr John MacArthur(00819) , Miss Michelle Duncan(00820) , Miss Julie Scott(00821) , Mrs Maureen Stewart(00822) , Mr Alan Duncan(00823) , Mrs A Lewis(00824) , Mr Gavin Fraser(00825) , Miss Patricia Alexander(00826) , Mr John Lewis(00827) , Miss Joan Reid(00828) , Mr Thomas Clement(00829) , Mr Ron Thom(00830) , Mrs Alison Thom(00831) ,		Fortrose, Rosemarkie General	<p>There is an almost unanimous support of the Council non preference of sites MU2, MU3, H4 & H5, there is a also a significant amount of support for the Council non preference of H6, there is more limited objection to the Council preferred MU1, and H3 sites, and a small number object to the Council preferred cemetery extension on C1.</p> <p>There is a small amount of support expressed: for a larger supermarket on the Council non preferred MU2, on the Council preferred H1 or an undefined site; for affordable housing for local people on on the Council non preferred H6 and H5 or an undefined site, for cemetery extension on, or above C1 because of the loss of good farm land associated with C1 itself; for a larger medical centre and allotments on undefined sites; for business units on Council non preferred MU2; for mixed use development on Council non preferred H6 and on the brownfield part of Council preferred MU1; for housing on Council preferred H1,H2 and H3; and for additional housing to be alternatively delivered at either Tore, Cullicudden, Fortrose Station, Killen, or in rural areas.</p> <p>Other suggestions made were that the right of way along Academy street to Chanonry Point should be improved, and that amenity areas should identified and protected as preferred open space.</p> <p>The reasons given as a general opposition to any development in Fortrose and Rosemarkie and to support the Council’s non preference of MU2, MU3, H4, H5 and H6 are given in descending order according to the number of people who have mentioned these issues: inadequate road transport and general infrastructure; loss of separate village identity; loss of good farm land; adverse landscape impact and loss of green space/belt; adequate, allocated alternative sites and inadequate local demand/need; adverse impact on local businesses/a preference to consolidate existing shopping functions on the High St; loss of village character and change to dormitory town; inadequate healthcare provision; loss of tourism; inadequate water and sewerage capacity and cordon sanitaire of existing plant; inadequate school capacity; adverse nature conservation impact; adverse flooding and drainage impacts; social impact of rapid expansion; and due to concern about the vernacular/architectural quality of new development/impact on the conservation area.</p> <p>The reasons given to object to the Council’s preference of H3 and MU1 are given in descending order according to the number of people who have mentioned these issues: adverse landscape impact and loss of green space/belt;</p>	<p>A limited amount of repsondents have requested that the MU1 Greenside Farm should be removed.</p> <p>A few have requested the cemetery extension site C1 should be removed.</p> <p>A small number of respondents support a larger supermarket on the Council non preferred MU2, on the Council preferred H1, or an undefined site, affordable housing for local people, a larger medical centre and allotments on undefined sites; business units on Council non preferred MU2; mixed use development on Council non preferred H6; additional housing to be alternatively delivered at either Tore, Cullicudden, Fortrose Station, Killen, or in rural areas, and the cemetery extension to be above (north of) C1.</p> <p>Development interest has supported the Council’s preference of H3 but requests that access is taken from East Watergate and requests that the capacity should be reduced from 16 houses to 6-8 houses.</p> <p>Development interest objects to the non preference of a reduced H6 (as allocated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan) for housing but objects to Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan developer requirement for courtyard style housing development.</p> <p>Development interest objects to the Council’s non preference of MU3 and seeks its allocation a mixed-use proposal incorporating commercial, community and visitor facilities.</p> <p>Development interest objects to the Council</p>

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
	<p>Mr John Eastwood(00832) , Miss Gail Paterson(00833) , Miss Helen Duncan(00834) , Miss Julie Gamble(00835) , Mr Franco Plagliabi(00836) , Okain J McLennan(00837) , Mr Alec Main(00838) , Mr Keith W.J. Young(00839) , Mr Robert Cameron(00840) , Mrs K.L. Cameron(00841) , Mr Robert Davidson(00842) , Miss Freda Bassindale(00843) , Miss Denise Mudge(00844) , Jay Miller(00845) , Miss Megan Stubbs(00846) , Miss Jennifer Macleod(00847) , Miss Barbara Bremner(00848) , Miss Bridget Gerstner(00849) , Miss Maureen Fraser(00850) , Miss Eleanor Smith(00851) , Mr Murdo And Amanda Mackay(00852) , P. Mckeggie(00853) , Mrs E Smith(00854) , Mr DJ Smith(00855) , Mrs M.E. Davidson(00856) , Mr William Martin(00857) , Mrs Brenda Martin(00858) , Mrs Stephanie Chatburn(00861) , Mr Graeme Harrison(00862) , A And F Reid(00863) , D.G. Hart(00864) , Mrs Edna Gordon(00865) , Mr William Gordon(00866) , Mr James Sinclair(00868) , Mrs Ena Dutton(00869) , JC And DE Ferguson(00870) , Miss Elizabeth Moran(00871) , Dr T.V. Heath(00873) , Mr William Lindsay(00874) , Mrs Caroline Fair(00875) , Mr John Fair(00876) , Mrs Verity Walker(00880) , Miss Mary Maciver(00883) , Miss Janet Syer(00884) , Lois MacDonell(00886) , Bill Taylor Associates(00889) , Miss Sheena Munro(00891) , Mrs Liz Downing(00892) , Mr Calum Anton(00906) , Mr Richard Robinson(00914) , Mr James Grant(00920) , Mr Richard Wilson(00923) , Ms Jennifer Morrison(00925) , Mr Donald John Morrison(00926) , Mr Robert Morrison(00927) , Mr Mark Watson(00929) , Ms Lorraine Coxley(00930) , Ms Nicole Watson(00931) , Mr Scott Coxley(00932) , Mrs S.L. Badger(00933) , Mrs Helen Cherry(00940) , Dr Richard Cherry(00941) , Ms Lucy MacLennan(00946) , Rev. William Mather(00947) , Mrs M Smith(00949) , Ms Nancy Cameron(00950) , Mr G. Munro(00951) , Mrs Elizabeth Brown(00956) , Cpt Arthur And Brenda Kerr(00958) , Ms Bridget Houston(00960) , Mr Brian Elias(00970) , Ms Emma Jones(00976) , Mr Gordon Grant(00981) , Mr Fraser Hutcheson(00986) , Mr Andrew Hince(00995) , Dr Jurgen Diethel(00997) , Dr Chris And Jane Jones(00998) , Ms Janice Grant(01018) , Ms Norma Sinclair(01021) , Mr Alan Smith(01037) , Mrs Margaret Smith(01038) , Ms Leslie Grant(01042) , Mr Graeme Grant(01048) , Gib Weir(01049) , Mrs Gillian M Dobson(01053) , Mr And Mrs Wylie(01067) , Mrs M MacLeman(01082) , Ms Deborah Guthrie(01085) , A.L. Warbrick(01087) , Mrs Louise Jeffery(01088) , Mr Graham Maciver(01089) , Neil And Monica Campbell(01093) , W.B. Bremner(01094) , Ms J Dunlop(01095) , Mrs Barbara Manson(01098) , F. H. Jeffery(01099) , Ms Janet MacIver(01103) , Mrs B MacDonald(01104) , Ms Mary MacDonell(01106) , P. R. James(01108) , Mr John McNicol(01111) , H D Robson(01112) , Ms Emma Sinclair(01113) , J And J Johnston(01114) , Mr Douglas Willis(01116) , Mr Brian Jones(01117) , Ms Catherine Willis(01120) , Mrs Meldrum(01123) , Mrs Ruth MacGregor(01125) , Ms Anne</p>			<p>inadequate road transport and general infrastructure; loss of good farm land; loss of tourism; inadequate school capacity; loss of village character and change to dormitory town; loss of separate village identity; inadequate water and sewerage capacity and cordon sanitaire of existing plant; and adverse flooding and drainage impacts. There is some support however for redevelopment of the steading on MU1 and there are a couple of comments in support of H3 suggesting that it is poor quality farmland and/or that its development will be acceptable with quality landscaping/planting.</p> <p>Development interest supports the Council's preference of H3 with access taken from East Watergate to the west but indicates that its capacity is for 6-8 houses rather than 16.</p> <p>Development interest objects to the Council's non preference of H6 but does not request all of H6 to be allocated, just the area previously allocated in Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, and considers that the reason for the Council's non preference relates to the extended site and its significant visual impact. The landowner objects to part of the Council non preferred H6 that was in Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan being non preferred but objects to the requirement for this site to be set out as courtyard development.</p> <p>Development interest objects to the Council non preference of MU3 and suggests that the MU3 proposal responds to deficiencies and offers opportunities to enhance the role of Fortrose as a local service and tourist centre and create additional local jobs. It is considered that the package will improve local prosperity and employment, manage the heritage, enhance services, and promote tourism and holding visitors.</p> <p>Development interest seeks allocation of the Council non preferred MU3 for mixed-uses incorporating commercial, community and visitor facilities stating that this could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - offer potential for further small shops, business/office units; - provide for local offices, businesses, health care or social facilities; - offer potential for a visitor centre which would enhance the Black Isle as a prestigious heritage resource and possibly incorporate a local park-n'-ride initiative to manage seasonal congestion (existing interpretive facilities are considered rudimentary with conflicts for visitors passing through the golf course); and - offers potential for a new village scale supermarket (6,000 square foot proposal) which would offer scope to relocate and double the size of the existing store, increase the capacity for local shopping, improve parking and servicing and help decongest the High Street enabling public safety improvements. The proposed store could carry a larger range of products and offer a service better related to the size of the catchment. It is considered that it would not have an adverse impact on existing shops as the new store size could not support specialist butcher and bakery functions. 	<p>non preference of H4 and H5 and considers that the northern boundary of H4 would make a logical edge to the settlement of Fortrose and that the creation of a tourist building on H5 would improve waterfront facilities.</p>

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
	Jack(01126) , Mr Tom Forbes(01127) , Mrs Ann Forbes(01129) , Erlend Tait(01139) , Ms Janet Dalgety(01156) , Mrs E Hiddleston(01158) , Mr William Brown(01162) , Ms Lorraine Brown(01163) , Ms Janice Joyce(01164) , Mr John Brankin(01165) , Tulloch(01166) , Ms Amanda Jack(01174) , Mr Mike Strickland(01175) , Ms Helen Dornan(01176) , Ms Roda McKenzie(01178) , Mr John Mackenzie(01184) , Mr Steve Artis(01191) , Mr David Guthrie(01199) , Mr Mike Eriksen(01226) , Ms Pamela Tait(01274) , Mr David Robinson(01279) , Ms Kate Bevan-Baker(01283) , Mrs Angela White(01284) , Mrs M Collier(01285) , Mr Gavin Heath(01286) , Ms Catriona Willis(01287) , Mrs Mary Galloway(01288) , Mr Alistair Tait(01289) , Dr And Mrs RL Nelson(01290) , Dr June Bevan-Baker(01291) , Mr Kevin Keith(01292) , J.D Hearmon(01293) , Ms Sheena Basham(01295) , Dr Ian R Basham(01296) , Ms Rosemary Harrison(01297) , Ms Brenda Steele(01299) , Ms Helen McGarry(01305) , Mrs Margaret Mackenzie(01325) , Ms Naomi Lloyd(01331) , Sandy Holm(01344) , Ms Donna Henderson(01347) , Mr Douglas Barker(01359)			<p>Development interest considers that a mixed-use proposal for the Council non preferred MU3 is appropriate on this particular site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -it is within a comfortable walking distance (400m) of most of Fortrose and to Rosemarkie; and - it is sufficiently close to the High Street that it can complement and strengthen the local business base by offering potential for interaction with local shops/businesses on the Main Street and with leisure/recreation and heritage attractions located towards the waterfront . <p>Development interest objects to the Council non preference of H4 and H5 and considers that the northern boundary of H4 would make a logical edge to the settlement of Fortrose and that the creation of a tourist building on H5 would improve waterfront facilities, and be good for the local economy. It is considered that the loss of farmland in relation to the Council non preferred H4 and H5 would be insignificant.</p>	
Invergordon	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/094	Invergordon General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/005	Invergordon General	Suggests a compromise for the SDA - it should go west of Rosskeen Bridge taking in C2 and Ross-keen Farm then north to the A9 and then as before in 'Call for sites' suggestion. They feel this would encourage inward investment and housing including some select plots at the western edge of the golf course including sites H4, H5 and H6. They would not wish to encroach on the House of Ross-keen. They wish C2 to be within the boundary as they want the option to restore/develop this as heritage site (not housing).	Inclusion of additional land within the SDA, including C2 and Rosskeen Farm, north to the A9 and then as before in 'call for sites' submission.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/011	Invergordon General	Considers the former Garden Centre, High Street should be allocated for bungalows or similar appropriate housing.	Allocation of former Garden Centre on the High Street for housing
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/012	Invergordon General	Allocation former Bone Mill on High Street for retail/housing	Allocation of former Bone Mill on High Street for retail/housing in Proposed Plan
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/013	Invergordon General	Considers former coal yard should allocation for housing - possibly 'sheltered'	Allocation of former Coal Yard for housing - possibly 'sheltered'
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/014	Invergordon General	Would like the Linear Park, the Shore Line, Natal Garden and Playing Fields allocated as protected open space	Allocation of Linear Park, the Shore Line, Natal Garden and Playing Fields allocated as protected open space in the Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Invergordon	Mr Carl Beck(00391)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00391/1/001	Invergordon General	<p>Concerned there is insufficient separation between residential property and heavy industry in Invergordon, resulting in constant noise and air pollution. Considers it should become Council policy to encourage heavy industry to relocate to Nigg and that the port at Invergordon should be further developed for tourism with emphasis placed on liners. Considers the oil service base in Invergordon should be allocated for industry to better reflect the activities taking place there, and thus would not benefit from permitted development rights.</p> <p>Considers the Inner Moray Firth Ports and Sites Strategy: 2050 should be adopted as policy and quotes sections 14, 15 and 35 of the Strategy. These sections generally relate to the incompatibility of centres of population with heavy industry/ port operations and the opportunity in Invergordon for the development of a mix of uses including tourism and leisure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - promotion of tourism and leisure development in Invergordon rather than heavy industry; - policy to relocate heavy industry to Nigg; - allocation of oil service base for industrial use; and - Moray Firth Ports and Sites Strategy translated to Policy in the Proposed Plan.
Invergordon	Cromarty Firth Port Authority(00619)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00619/1/004	Invergordon General	Request the following is added to key development issues for Invergordon: Requirement for increased Port facilities to meet future growing demands within the energy sectors.	Add requirement for increased Port facilities to meet future growing demands within the energy sectors to development factors for Invergordon.
Invergordon	Mr Peter Marshall(00641)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00641/1/001	Invergordon General	Would like a path or cycle track connecting Alness and Invergordon to use instead of the bus.	Add path between Alness and Invergordon as developer requirement for Alness and Invergordon
Invergordon	Mr Colin Graham(00656)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00656/1/002	Invergordon General	The respondent cites specific health and safety and amenity concerns about operators within the Port Authority area. The respondent is also concerned about the future of the local raft race which was held here and its fundraising for the RNLI. The respondent considers that land could have been reclaimed for storage and no berths lost if the Port Authority had filled in the wet dock instead of using linear park.	
Invergordon	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/007	Invergordon General	RSPB consider that all mixed use and industrial sites within Invergordon 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
Invergordon	Mr Roderick Mackenzie(01210)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01210/1/003	Invergordon General	<p>Considers the Invergordon settlement development area should be extended to include the entire curtilage of The House of Rosskeen, specifically the woodland and open ground, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing development opportunities in Invergordon are limited, many of the identified housing and mixed use sites in the MIR are constrained; - Site will contribute to the effective housing land supply; - Development potential of the area needs to be realised to secure the future of The House of Rosskeen, associated buildings and woodland and supported care of the family; - Area is deteriorating due to vandalism, theft and fly tipping; - Site is well contained by woodland and landscape setting; - Access road is in same ownership therefore no constraints to upgrading this road if required; - Provision will be made for wider access; - Woodland will be safeguarded and managed; and - Site is within access travel distance of local facilities in Invergordon. 	Expansion of Invergordon settlement development area to include the entire curtilage of The House of Rosskeen including woodland and open ground.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>Specific housing development areas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - H6 to be preferred for housing to allow for future subdivision and extension to create additional dwellings; - Open ground utilised for low density development with appropriate tree hold-back, open space provision and path connections; and - Conversion, redevelopment and infill development at Castle Cottages and the former laundry for c. 5 dwellings. 	
Invergordon	Munro Construction (Highland) Ltd(01235)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01235/1/004	Invergordon General	Respondents considers that there should be specific provision made for the expansion and subsequent reinstatement of the Invergordon Sand and Gravel Quarry to the north of Rhicullen/Newmore.	Provision made for the expansion and subsequent reinstatement of the Invergordon Sand and Gravel Quarry to the north of Rhicullen/Newmore.
Invergordon	Munro Construction (Highland) Ltd(01235)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01235/1/005	Invergordon General	Glossary definitions of commerce and commercial centre should be clarified and directly reflected in town centre policy. This should actively support town centre health and recognise the need for flexibility in assessing proposals for new uses, particularly at Invergordon, where the extent of this zoning is supported.	Ammend glossary definition of commerce and commercial centre.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/015	Invergordon H03	Would like site allocated for housing in the Proposed Plan.	Allocation of H3 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Invergordon	Network Rail(00438)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00438/1/004	Invergordon H03	Concerned about impact of H3 upon Ord Mains private level crossing and I7 upon Balintraid private level crossing. Private crossings, no legal right of access across other than specific users granted by Network Rail. Allocations pose risk of increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic across the level crossings. As required by the HwLDP developers must assess proposals for any implications of on the level crossings and incorporate mitigation provided through developer contributions if necessary.	Requirement in Proposed Plan for each of these sites to assess proposals for any implications upon level crossings and provide developer funded mitigation where required.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/005	Invergordon H04	Suggests a compromise for the SDA - it should go west of Rosskeen Bridge taking in C2 and Ross-keen Farm then north to the A9 and then as before in 'Call for sites' suggestion. They feel this would encourage inward investement and housing including some select plots at the western edge of the golf course including sites H4, H5 and H6. They would not wish to encroach on the House of Ross-keen. They wish C2 to be within the boundary as they want the option to restore/develop this as heritage site (not housing).	Inclusion of additional land within the SDA, including C2 and Rosskeen Farm, north to the A9 and then as before in 'call for sites' submission.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/016	Invergordon H04	Selected housing on small plots.	Allocation of sites for selected housing on small plots

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/219	Invergordon H04	SEPA support the non-inclusion of the site but will not object to it's inclusion provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the affected part of the site would have to be supported by a FRA. Flood Risk Assessment required Yes in support of the planning application if close to the watercourse. Rosskeen Burn runs near the boundary of 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.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/005	Invergordon H05	Suggests a compromise for the SDA - it should go west of Rosskeen Bridge taking in C2 and Ross-keen Farm then north to the A9 and then as before in 'Call for sites' suggestion. They feel this would encourage inward investment and housing including some select plots at the western edge of the golf course including sites H4, H5 and H6. They would not wish to encroach on the House of Ross-keen. They wish C2 to be within the boundary as they want the option to restore/develop this as heritage site (not housing).	Inclusion of additional land within the SDA, including C2 and Rosskeen Farm, north to the A9 and then as before in 'call for sites' submission.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/016	Invergordon H05	Selected housing on small plots.	Allocation of sites for selected housing on small plots
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/220	Invergordon H05	SEPA support the non-preferred status of the site but will not object to it's inclusion provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Text modified to state development of the affected part of the site would have to be supported by a FRA. Flood Risk Assessment will 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.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/005	Invergordon H06	Suggests a compromise for the SDA - it should go west of Rosskeen Bridge taking in C2 and Ross-keen Farm then north to the A9 and then as before in 'Call for sites' suggestion. They feel this would encourage inward investment and housing including some select plots at the western edge of the golf course including sites H4, H5 and H6. They would not wish to encroach on the House of Ross-keen. They wish C2 to be within the boundary as they want the option to restore/develop this as heritage site (not housing).	Inclusion of additional land within the SDA, including C2 and Rosskeen Farm, north to the A9 and then as before in 'call for sites' submission.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/016	Invergordon H06	Selected housing on small plots.	Allocation of sites for selected housing on small plots

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Invergordon	Mr Roderick Mackenzie(01210)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01210/1/003	Invergordon H06	<p>Considers the Invergordon settlement development area should be extended to include the entire curtilage of The House of Rosskeen, specifically the woodland and open ground, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing development opportunities in Invergordon are limited, many of the identified housing and mixed use sites in the MIR are constrained; - Site will contribute to the effective housing land supply; - Development potential of the area needs to be realised to secure the future of The House of Rosskeen, associated buildings and woodland and supported care of the family; - Area is deteriorating due to vandalism, theft and fly tipping; - Site is well contained by woodland and landscape setting; - Access road is in same ownership therefore no constraints to upgrading this road if required; - Provision will be made for wider access; - Woodland will be safeguarded and managed; and - Site is within access travel distance of local facilities in Invergordon. <p>Specific housing development areas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - H6 to be preferred for housing to allow for future subdivision and extension to create additional dwellings; - Open ground utilised for low density development with appropriate tree hold-back, open space provision and path connections; and - Conversion, redevelopment and infill development at Castle Cottages and the former laundry for c. 5 dwellings. 	Expansion of Invergordon settlement development area to include the entire curtilage of The House of Rosskeen including woodland and open ground.
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/222	Invergordon MU02	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed PlanA FRA may be required if development is proposed close to the watercourse this could be adequately dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in vicinity of the watercourse Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of the planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Invergordon	Mr Arnold Francis Bova(00974)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00974/1/001	Invergordon MU03	<p>Objects to MU3 being a preferred mixed use site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sub soils are heavily contaminated with hydro carbons deposits and Aromatic Benzene rings likely to be heavy fractions; - ingressing and egressing from the site and through the town above and below ground remains. Extensive infrastructure comprising storage tanks, pipework, pumping stations sumps and redundant heaters, all of which retain significant quantities of oil, will require extensive and intrusive degassing and decontamination; - risk of extensive cross contamination as tanks were emptied of oil and filled with water on the site; - likely to be extensive asbestos based concrete; - disturbing and deep cleansing hydrocarbon deposits and vapours will impact upon the amenity, health and safety of the entire town; - presently any contamination is being filtered by natural process within the clay soil and contained within the infrastructure; - introduction of impermeable surfaces will significantly increase pluvial flood risk to existing properties; - absence of suitable water courses for drainage outfall; - impact upon residential amenity; and - currently the site benefits from being disused and unoccupied and is screened from residential properties. <p>Name 'Seabank Tank Farm' is misleading, the proper description of the site is a former 'Ministry of Defence Storage and Distribution Facility for Aviation Fuel and Low Viscosity Fuel Oil'.</p> <p>Main Issues Report does not contain information on the extent or likely contamination on site or cost of carrying out the works. Due to the issues outlined above the Council preference for the site is highly speculative and not based on reality.</p>	Non-allocation of MU3 in Proposed Plan
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/009	Invergordon MU04	Supports this site for a possible education facility.	Add education facility to possible uses for this site
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/223	Invergordon MU04	<p>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 Yes prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. Rosskeen Burn runs through the site. All of the burn near the site has been straightened and embanked in the past. The water body is currently failing to meet good status for morphology with the main pressure being realignment. Restoration is therefore a priority for SEPA. 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 and embanked minor watercourse on or near the south east and south west boundaries of the site. Restoration could be tied into restoration of the Rosskeen Burn as part of the development but at the very least space should be allowed for restoration and development of natural processes in future.</p>	SEPA require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/224	Invergordon MU05	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 or further information (topographical levels) prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. Rosskeen Burn runs through the site, all of the burn near the site has been straightened and embanked in the past. The water body is currently failing to meet good status for morphology with the main pressure being realignment. Restoration is therefore a priority for SEPA. 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 and embanked minor watercourse on the south east boundary of the site. Restoration could be tied into restoration of the Rosskeen 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 require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/008	Invergordon C02	Wishes to see this included within the SDA to allow for a future restoration project.	Expand SDA to include C2
Invergordon	Cromarty Firth Port Authority(00619)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00619/1/001	Invergordon I01	Site owned and operated by Cromarty Firth Port Authority. Request significant con 'site constrained by other uses' is deleted as it is unclear what these uses are as the site no longer has rail track connection and planning permission has been granted for the site to be used for Port related storage.	
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/225	Invergordon I03	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. The site is a brownfield site adjacent to the Flood Map of Jonstones Ditch. FRA may be required for redevelopment in the vicinity of the watercourse or if further information indicates flood risk to the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Invergordon	Mr Colin Graham(00656)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00656/1/001	Invergordon I03	Respondent objects to an EFW plant because of health and safety concerns. The respondent considers there to be 'better solutions'.	Respondent does not specify however restriction of EFW uses from this industrial allocation is assumed.
Invergordon	Combined Power And Heat Highland Ltd(00983)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00983/1/003	Invergordon I03	I3 is existing allocated industrial land. Proposed Plan should recognise that the Industrial Park contains waste management facilities and that the Industrial Park is an appropriate location for the development of further waste management facilities, including an energy from waste plant.	Proposed Plan should recognise that the Industrial Park contains waste management facilities and that the Industrial Park is an appropriate location for the development of further waste management facilities, including an energy from waste plant.
Invergordon	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/093	Invergordon I05	Supports non-preferred of site because of potential adverse effects on Cromarty Firth SPA.	
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/226	Invergordon I05	SEPA support the non-preferred status of the site but will not object to it's inclusion provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Plan does indicate site would be for port uses. Should be made clear in Plan that it would only be suitable for development where the location is essential for operational reasons and FRA required to ensure will remain operational during flood conditions. Flood Risk Assessment will be required if non port related development was proposed.	Inclusion of text to make clear in Plan that it would only be suitable for development where the location is essential for operational reasons and FRA required to ensure will remain operational during flood conditions. Flood Risk Assessment will be required if non port related development proposed.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Invergordon	Cromarty Firth Port Authority(00619)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00619/1/002	Invergordon I05	Site is within tidal zone and is below High Water being owned by the Crown Estates. Request significant con 'loss of green space' is removed as there is no green space associated with this land. In respect of the ex-amenity land, the Council has agreed that this is Port Operational land and forms part of the land encompassed under site I6. Amend plan to take account of this.	Integrate I5 with I6, allocate entire site for port related uses
Invergordon	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/092	Invergordon I06	Requests check (individual and in-combination) of site for HRA conformity given proximity to/overlap with Cromarty Firth SPA and connectivity to Moray Firth SAC.	Any mitigation prompted by HRA as developer requirements.
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/227	Invergordon I06	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Plan does indicate site would be for port uses. Should be made clear in Plan that it would only be suitable for development where the location is essential for operational reasons and FRA required to ensure will remain operational during flood conditions. Flood Risk Assessment will be required if non port related development was proposed.	Inclusion of text to make clear in Plan that it would only be suitable for development where the location is essential for operational reasons and FRA required to ensure will remain operational during flood conditions. Flood Risk Assessment will be required if non port related development proposed.
Invergordon	Cromarty Firth Port Authority(00619)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00619/1/002	Invergordon I06	Site is within tidal zone and is below High Water being owned by the Crown Estates. Request significant con 'loss of green space' is removed as there is no green space associated with this land. In respect of the ex-amenity land, the Council has agreed that this is Port Operational land and forms part of the land encompassed under site I6. Amend plan to take account of this.	Integrate I5 with I6, allocate entire site for port related uses
Invergordon	Cromarty Firth Port Authority(00619)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00619/1/003	Invergordon I06	I6 comprises Invergordon Service Base owned and operated by the Cromarty Firth Port Authority. Request significant con is removed as the site is developed and as such is above the High Water Mark and thus does not form the designated environmental protected areas under the Habitats Directive.	
Invergordon	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/092	Invergordon I07	Requests check (individual and in-combination) of site for HRA conformity given proximity to/overlap with Cromarty Firth SPA and connectivity to Moray Firth SAC.	Any mitigation prompted by HRA as developer requirements.
Invergordon	Invergordon Community Council(00293)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00293/1/010	Invergordon I07	Protect site from industry - rezone for agriculture	Non allocation of I7 in the Proposed Plan.
Invergordon	Network Rail(00438)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00438/1/004	Invergordon I07	Concerned about impact of H3 upon Ord Mains private level crossing and I7 upon Balintraid private level crossing. Private crossings, no legal right of access across other than specific users granted by Network Rail. Allocations pose risk of increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic across the level crossings. As required by the HwLDP developers must assess proposals for any implications of on the level crossings and incorporate mitigation provided through developer contributions if necessary.	Requirement in Proposed Plan for each of these sites to assess proposals for any implications upon level crossings and provide developer funded mitigation where required.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Invergordon	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/228	Invergordon I07	SEPA will 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 or further information (topographic levels) prior to adoption. Flood Risk Assessment will be required prior to inclusion in the Proposed Plan. Rosskeen Burn runs through the site, part if not all of the burn through the site has been straightened or realigned in the past. The water body is currently failing to meet good status for morphology with the main pressure being realignment, restoration is therefore a priority for SEPA. Development of the site should therefore require restoration of the watercourse including space for future development of natural processes. This will require quite a bit of morphological assessment. There are also a number of historically straightened minor watercourses passing through and on the boundary of the site. Restoration could be tied into restoration of the Rosskeen 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 require Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out prior to inclusion in the Plan.
Invergordon	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/016	Invergordon I07	Site I7 is a proposed large scale single user site and from the information available will require significant infrastructure investment. In order for Transport Scotland to provide an informed response, further information on this site, and the cumulative impact on the A9(T) of the development opportunities needs to be provided.	
Milton of Kildary	Hazel Bailey(00638)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00638/1/002	Milton of Kildary General	Cyle/Pathway to link the communities of Milton, Kildary Polnicol, barbaraville, Pollo, Balintrad, Saltburn and Invergordon to the already developed cycle/pathway linking Invergordon to Alness and Evanton.	Cyle/Pathway to link the communities of Milton, Kildary Polnicol, barbaraville, Pollo, Balintrad, Saltburn and Invergordon
Milton of Kildary	Mrs Ann Macleod(00639)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00639/1/002	Milton of Kildary General	Dangerous road so seeks cycle path from Milton to Invergordon.	Seeks cycle path from Milton to Invergordon.
Milton of Kildary	Mr D Houghton(01245)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01245/1/001	Milton of Kildary General	Respondent supports a 2.1 hectare site within their landownership should be allocated for housing development for the following reasons - the Community Council are in favour of this site over other sites in the corridor of the A9 north of the village such as H2 (as mentioned at the MIR Milton evening meeting) - the land is arable but comprises a very small part which is not ideally suited for modern machinery due to the small size and tight field boundaries - it is a very attractive and marketable site and by contrast the market has not supported the H2 site - it would be a sympathetic development, a logical extension of existing hamlets at Wester Tarbat - the proposal represents a rounding off of an existing housing group as per the Housing in the Countryside SG - the landowner owns the land required to upgrade the existing road to the required standards - servicing of the land is straightforward due to proximity with the electricity and water supply network and the capacity remaining within the sewage works - the site represents effective and deliverable housing land	Respondent supports a 2.1 hectare site within their landownership should be allocated for housing development.
Milton of Kildary	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/035	Milton of Kildary H01	Historic Scotland (HS) note that these allocations lie partly within the Tarbat House Inventory Designed Landscape HS are satisfied that they can be delivered without constituting significant effects on the landscapes integrity.	Developer requirement to consider impact on Tarbat House Designed Landscape.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Milton of Kildary	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/035	Milton of Kildary MU01	Historic Scotland (HS) note that these allocations lie partly within the Tarbat House Inventory Designed Landscape HS are satisfied that they can be delivered without constituting significant effects on the landscapes integrity.	Developer requirement to consider impact on Tarbat House Designed Landscape.
Kildary	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/014	Kildary General	An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.	It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.
Kildary	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/117	Kildary H01	Believes H1 would be preferable to H2 especially with screen planting to A9.	Developer requirement for screening on A9 boundary of H1.
Kildary	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/229	Kildary H01	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Drainage and the small watercourse/drain should be considered carefully in the site design and layout. 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 inclusion of text and a Phase 1 Habitat Survey should be undertaken and any necessary mitigation included within the planning application.
Kildary	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/096	Kildary H02	Concerns re possible adverse effect on area of long established semi natural origin Inventory woodland within site. Cites national and Highland policy protection for such woodland. Wants evidence of over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, loss minimisation, pre-determination species survey and high standard of compensatory planting.	Non-retention of site or developer requirements to offset woodland impact/loss.
Kildary	Balnagown Estate(00964)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/007	Kildary H02	Suggests enlargement of site on either side into the adjacent B4 site because the H2 site is recognised by the Council as one of the few potential expansion areas for the village.	Enlargement of site on either side into the adjacent B4 site.
Kildary	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/010	Kildary B04	Comment that there may be significant natural heritage issues in terms of the potential impact on ancient woodland category 2a.	Developer requirement mitigation text in Proposed Plan.
Kildary	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/095	Kildary B04	Concerns re possible adverse effect on large areas of long established semi natural origin Inventory woodland within site. Cites national and Highland policy protection for such woodland. Wants evidence of over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, loss minimisation, pre-determination species survey and high standard of compensatory planting. Believes site should be reduced to brownfield element only and should exclude woodland and water bodies in particular. Species surveys required for reptiles and red squirrels in particular. HRA conformity check required re impact upon Pitmaduthy Moss SAC (in terms of hydrology) and Morangie Forest SPA (recreation pressure).	Reduction of site to brownfield element only to exclude woodland and water bodies. Species surveys required for reptiles and red squirrels in particular. HRA conformity check required re impact upon Pitmaduthy Moss SAC (in terms of hydrology) and Morangie Forest SPA (recreation pressure) with any mitigation as developer requirements.
Kildary	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/230	Kildary B04	SEPA will not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Depending on layout or type of development proposed drainage will need to be careful consideration at the very least. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application if close to the watercourse or lochans. There are numerous surface water features on this site and the quarry works have almost certainly significantly modified some or all of these. Opportunities for restoration should be investigated as part of any development. This may require significant morphological assessment.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Kildary	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/015	Kildary B04	The potential impact of site B4 to the A9(T) needs to be understood.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Kildary	Balnagown Estate(00964)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/006	Kildary B04	Supports site because the site is large enough to accommodate a tourism development without significant loss of mature trees. Comments that existing mature boundary woodlands are intended to be transferred in to the Estate's long term woodland management plan. Site can be serviced adequately.	None.
Muir of Ord	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/097	Muir of Ord General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for great crested newt survey and protection plan and for reptiles.	Settlement-wide developer requirement for great crested newt survey and protection plan and for reptiles.
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/001	Muir of Ord General	"The settlement boundary of Muir of Ord should be amended (as outlined in red in the attached map) for the reasons stated below;- areas of recreational land, the Lily Loch and the adjacent woodland are all of significant local amenity;- these areas should be included in the Settlement Boundary and protected as green space;- housing development would not be suitable due to the contaminated land area - the current Ross and Cromarty East (RACE) Local Plan includes these areas.The outflowing stream from the Loch Gunn Toin area flows into the Lily Loch. This stream is included within the settlement boundary in the current Local Plan and should continue to be included.The railway line to the northern extent of the settlement boundary should be excluded from the settlement boundary , in the area adjacent site H7 to indicate that no potential exists for vehicular access can be taken by crossing the railway line, and is only achievable from Balvaird Road.In addition to the key development issues outlined in the MIR, the following are community aspirations which should be explicitly supported in the Plan: - Fulfilling the community aspirations expressed through the Muir of Ord Big Picture Consultation - Supporting the redevelopment and re-use of derelict properties within the village - Improving road safety through village, both before and after delivery of the replacement bridge over the railway line - Supporting young people to live in the village by ensuring that a sufficient supply of affordable housing is available to local people - Enhancement of social and leisure facilities, e.G. Sports facility, café, meeting hub, to address the needs of the growing population of the village - Safeguarding of existing and development of new short distance safe active travel routes to and from the centre of the village and developing long distance active travel routes to and from Dingwall (via Conon Bridge), Beaully and Inverness (via the North Shore of the Beaully Firth)"	"Settlement boundary to be modified to include open space at Lily Loch.New Open Space Designation at Lily Loch.Modify SDA to include stream from Loch Gunn Toin.Additional settlement wide developer requirements to be stated as follows:- Fulfilling the community aspirations expressed through the Muir of Ord Big Picture Consultation - Supporting the redevelopment and re-use of derelict properties within the village - Improving road safety through village, both before and after delivery of the replacement bridge over the railway line - Supporting young people to live in the village by ensuring that a sufficient supply of affordable housing is available to local people - Enhancement of social and leisure facilities, e.G. Sports facility, café, meeting hub, to address the needs of the growing population of the village - Safeguarding of existing and development of new short distance safe active travel routes to and from the centre of the village and developing long distance active travel routes to and from Dingwall (via Conon Bridge), Beaully and Inverness (via the North Shore of the Beaully Firth)"
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/002	Muir of Ord General	Area is drawn in error on map: includes several private houses between West Road and the Filling Station. Area across from Filling Station is Industrial Estate, not Retail, and should also be excluded the commercial boundary. The Community Council is supportive of keeping retail development to the village centre to protect fragile economy of village shops.	boundary should be modified to exclude the industrial units and private houses.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Iah Dempster(00629)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00629/1/001	Muir of Ord General	Muir of Ord needs a community facility in village centre i.e.. A community hub. The Council should support the proposal for a cafe and heritage centre at the Old Tarradale School.	New Site allocation at Old Tarradale School for Community Use.
Muir of Ord	Fraser Maclean(00630)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00630/1/001	Muir of Ord General	Respondent wishes to see a sports barn, play park and expansion of the skate park in Muir of Ord. Also would like to see the pot holes filled in.	Cross- Settlement developer requirements for sports barn, play park and expansion of the skate park in Muir of Ord .
Muir of Ord	The Iain Elliot Partnership(00781)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00781/1/004	Muir of Ord General	Respondent supports the key development issues identified for Muir of Ord.	
Muir of Ord	Mr William Sutherland(00782)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00782/1/001	Muir of Ord General	Considers existing housing sites within settlement development area are adequate without developing additional areas given the remaining school capacity and limited facilities in the village.	"Removal of all new sites."
Muir of Ord	Mr Jim And Maureen Thomson(00872)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00872/1/003	Muir of Ord General	Consider Muir of Ord does need any further development in addition to existing allocated sites. Concerned about the condition and number of derelict buildings on the High Street; road bridge over the railway; loss of old folks home; unfinished housing developments, traffic congestion, parking and road safety. Community Council and Community Association are working hard to improve the village.	Removal of all new sites.
Muir of Ord	Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00962/1/005	Muir of Ord General	Comment that Plan should give a housing land requirement for each major settlement including Muir of Ord over 2, 5 year periods. Believe that the major settlements should accommodate all of the Mid Ross housing market area requirement and that Muir of Ord should accommodate 20% of this equating to land for 221 houses in the 2011-2015 period and 194 houses in the 2015-2020 period. Believe that the available and preferred housing sites only have a capacity for 293 units and therefore there is a shortfall of land for 122 units.	A breakdown of the housing land requirement for each major settlement including Muir of Ord over 2, 5 year periods. Support for a higher density housing allocation on site MU2 and a confirmed housing allocation on site MU3.
Muir of Ord	Gilmar Green(01135)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01135/1/003	Muir of Ord General	A key development issue should be to encourage development and re-development to be focussed on the centre of Muir of Ord in line with "enhancement of the town centre".	New cross settlemnt developer requirement to focus development on town centre.
Muir of Ord	Mr David Martin(01207)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01207/1/001	Muir of Ord General	"The respondent seeks the inclusion of his land which is allocated as No 16 in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, as a housing allocation in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.The respondent states that an access has been acquired from Corry Road and considers it unclear as to why this land is not suggested as a housing allocation."	The respondent seeks the inclusion of his land which is allocated as No 16 in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan as housing

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Anonymous 2(01334)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01334/1/001	Muir of Ord General	The respondent is concerned that the natural environment should receive sufficient protection, that roads should be properly maintained, and that there should be an enhanced skate park and a separate facility for people using bikes.	Cross-settlement developer requirement for an enhanced skate park and a separate facility for people using bikes.
Muir of Ord	Anonymous 3(01335)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01335/1/001	Muir of Ord General	Respondent seeks expansion of older kids playpark, an enhanced skatepark, and more playpark provision in the school.	Cross-settlement developer requirement for expansion of older kids playpark, an enhanced skatepark, and more playpark provision in the school.
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/003	Muir of Ord H02	Local importance, heritage and character of Market Stance and surrounding cluster of houses e.G. Bank House, Auctioneer's House. Used greatly and advertised as additional training/practice course by Golf Club; specifically allocated for use by children who are not yet allowed on the main course; and used for ClubGolf Programme The Community Council are not supportive of housing development, but would support the site being designated as green space for continued use by the Golf Club.	Removal of site H2 and allocation of site as open space.
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/001	Muir of Ord H02	Site is currently allocated for Special Uses relating to Urray House, this should be maintained in the IMFLDP to reflect this.	Change of allocation to reflect site usage as being related to Urray House.
Muir of Ord	Mr William Sutherland(00782)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00782/1/002	Muir of Ord H02	Does not support any development on H2 as it regularly used by children and adults to practice golf without causing annoyance to users of the main course and is an historical (Market Stance) area of the village.	Non-allocation of H2 in Proposed Plan
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/004	Muir of Ord H03	Not supportive of generic housing development on this site. The potential for sheltered housing in association with the new Urray House development could be supported. The loss of green space on this site is important to the residents of the care home and the community as a whole.	
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/006	Muir of Ord H04	This area is a locally important geological feature, and is a visually pleasing open space due to it's location at the gateway to the village. It has amenity value with generations of kids traditionally using it for sledging. The site is comparatively distant from the centre from the village. There is no pavement to the centre of the village.	
Muir of Ord	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/231	Muir of Ord H04	"No Flood Risk Assessment required "	
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/002	Muir of Ord H04	H4 - Object to any development, this site is a landmark geological feature within the community.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Mr William Sutherland(00782)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00782/1/003	Muir of Ord H04	"Does not support development on H4 for the following reasons:-	Contains a recognised geological feature which helps identify the character of the village;-
Muir of Ord	Mr M And R Grant(00860)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00860/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	"Do not support any development on H4. Respondents have provided copy of objection to planning application in 2002, assume this is the same site as H4. Object to housing development on H4 for the following reasons:-	Respondents house overlooks the site;-
Muir of Ord	Mr Jim And Maureen Thomson(00872)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00872/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	"Respondent lives close to H4 and does not support development on these sites for the following reasons:-	Proximity to respondents house;-
Muir of Ord	Mr Jim And Maureen Thomson(00872)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00872/1/002	Muir of Ord H04	"Respondent lives close to H4 and does not support development for the following reasons:-	Not compatible with existing stables, hotel and 'The Meadows'-
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/006	Muir of Ord H04	The amenity value of the site is appreciated but seek clarification on the importance of this feature and is this strong enough to warrant safeguarding from development. At the last Local Plan PLI there was no mention of the no mention of the hillock as a feature with teh principle reason for non-inclusion being teh existing availability of an effective housing supply. Council stated that " a designation may be possible at some future stage under a subsequent local plan review". Would also ask if limiting the extent of development would be more acceptable. The decision of whether or not to seek inclusion of this site may be influenced by the position the Council takes of site H9. (in same ownership)	Inclusion of site within Proposed Plan
Muir of Ord	Mr And Mrs James Milne(00939)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00939/1/002	Muir of Ord H04	"The respondent supports the Councils non preference of this site. The respondent considers the site to be unsuitable because of the following - The impact this would have on the entrance to the village, and the village attractiveness by compromising this feature - The precedence this will set for other development - The availability of other housing sites within the village - The impact this development will have on stretched local amenities including the school and doctors"	The respondent supports the Councils non preference of this site.
Muir of Ord	Mr And Mrs Nicholson(01014)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01014/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	"Supports non-preference of sites H4 for the following reasons:- There are a number of unused or not fully developed sites within the village boundary which would meet the Council's future housing needs for the village. Both sites fall outwith the present settlement boundary in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. Having these two sites would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- The site impinges directly on the northern approach to the village which is visually attractive and has some features worth of preservation such as the succession of traditional buildings constructed in	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>Tarradale stone, the geomorphologically significant drumlins on H4 and the associated Ord Lochans area which may have merit in being subject of a village features preservation/conservation scheme in keeping with the current paths, parks and open space provision.- Local residents near H4 experience water drainage problem in periods of heavy rainfall with ponding on the A862 and run-off down The Meadows, Ord Road and Chestnut Drive. These roads offer rising access to the A862 which together with the existing conditions of drainage and poor visibility, offer challenging exits.- Egress from H4 next to Ord Arms Hotel would be very close to egress from Ord Road on the opposite side creating danger for pedestrians. School children would be likely to use the footbridge over the railway on their way to Tarradale Primary School and respondent questions if this would constitute a desirable element in a safe route to school.- Service Constraints. Access to the village by car would be over the already lights-controlled bridge over the railway. Already concerns about the bridge's deteriorating condition and weight bearing capacity. Tarradale Primary School has little or no spare capacity and concerns about capacity of local doctor's surgery."</p>	
Muir of Ord	Mrs Annabel Maclean(01133)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01133/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	<p>"Supports non-preference of sites H4 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access routes from A862 which could not cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand.- H4 presents an attractive geological and local landmark feature to village entrance, providing visual and leisure amenity.- H4 is not compatible with existing development and land uses of farm and stables, hotel, residential properties.- Potential coalescence with housing group at Home Farm junction."</p>	
Muir of Ord	Gilmar Green(01135)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01135/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	<p>"Supports non-preference of sites H4 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access routes from A862. Access to H9 would be outwith the 30mph zone and between a dangerous corner before Home Farm junction and a blind summit as you enter the village, which would be to the right of the exit to H4. The Home Farm and Chapleton Farm single track road junctions would be unable to cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe</p>	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand. - H4 presents an attractive open space, geological and local landmark feature to village entrance, providing visual and leisure amenity to locals and visitors.- H4 is not compatible with neighbouring existing buildings and land uses of farm and stables, hotel, residential properties. Is more suited as valued green space.- H4 would dilute cultural heritage of historic, traditional buildings on countryside approach to village.- Potential coalescence with housing group at Home Farm junction."</p>	
Muir of Ord	Ms Catherine Hamilton(01137)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01137/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	<p>"Supports non-preference of sites H4 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access routes from A862 which could not cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand.- H4 presents an attractive geological and local landmark feature to village entrance, providing visual and leisure amenity.- H4 is not compatible with existing development and land uses of farm and stables, hotel, residential properties.- Potential coalescence with housing group at Home Farm junction."</p>	
Muir of Ord	Linda And Alastair Bell(01147)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01147/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	<p>"Supports non-preference of sites H4 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access routes from A862 which could not cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand.- H4 presents an attractive geological and local landmark feature to village entrance, providing visual and leisure amenity.- H4 is not compatible with existing development and land uses of farm and stables, hotel, residential properties.- Potential coalescence with housing group at Home Farm junction."</p>	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	To The Occupier(01148)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01148/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	"Respondents agrees with the Council's non-preference for housing development on H4 for the reasons outlined in the significant cons row of the MIR and for the reasons outlined below:-	Outwith settlement boundary in RACE Local Plan and MIR; -
Muir of Ord	Mr John D Murrie(01182)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01182/1/003	Muir of Ord H04	"Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H4 for the following reasons:- There are no trees nor signs of previous development on the land- Existing problems with drainage would be exacerbated with housing development"	
Muir of Ord	Mr And Mrs PN Moore(01275)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01275/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	"The respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for housing development for the following reasons- the reasons given in the MIR and also- the areas are outwith the settlement boundary and this will effect its rural approach- there is no safe route for pedestrians/ school kids- drainage and sewerage will be problematic- demand for new houses needs to be assessed - H4 is a geological feature- the proposed footpath would affect their privacy, outlook and security"	
Muir of Ord	Anonymous 9(01341)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01341/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	"The respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for housing for the following reasons- the reasons given in the MIR - they lie outwith the settlement boundary for Muir of Ord, and would set precedent for further development - there is no suitable access routes from the A862 with sufficient capacity for the increased traffic generated- there are no cycle routes, footways, or safer route to school- there are no adequate water, or sewerage capacity and there is recognised flood risk- these sites in addition to the preferred site would be beyond housing need requirements- the sites are too distant services and the services could not cope with the additional demand- the sites would risk coalescence with separate housing group at the Home Farm junction- H4 would effect the attractive geological feature at the village entrance, and is not compatible with existing land uses "	
Muir of Ord	Anonymous 10(01342)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01342/1/001	Muir of Ord H04	"The respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for housing for the following reasons- the reasons given in the MIR - they lie outwith the settlement boundary for Muir of Ord, and would set precedent for further development - there is no suitable access routes from the A862 with sufficient capacity for the increased traffic generated- there are no cycle routes, footways, or safer route to school- there are no adequate water, or sewerage capacity and there is recognised flood risk- these sites in addition to the preferred site would be beyond housing need requirements- the sites are too distant services and the services could not cope with the additional demand- the sites would risk coalescence with separate housing group at the Home Farm junction- H4 would effect the attractive geological feature at the village entrance, and is not compatible with existing land uses "	The respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for housing

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/007	Muir of Ord H05	Support the retention of the lower part of the site as open space, wetlands and suds basin where there is a risk of flooding. Also support the continued allocation for housing in line with the approved development.	
Muir of Ord	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/232	Muir of Ord H05	"SEPA have no objection provided the findings of the FRA are followed - no development in flood risk areas. Drainage needed further consideration when we were last consulted in 2007 but a matter for the Council."	"Inclusion of text to state development to be carried out in line with the previous FRA recommendations. Flood Risk Assessment required to support any planning application."
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/003	Muir of Ord H05	Site is partly constructed. Reference to open space is erroneous as the area is wetland, Suds basin and access roads.	
Muir of Ord	Mr John D Murrie(01182)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01182/1/006	Muir of Ord H05	"Respondent objects to preferred status of H5 due to past and present issues with flooding/drainage on the site (see original rep for specific details/photos). Respondent also questions how adjacent land to the site (assumed H6) has been suggested as this is outwith the Local Plan area. "	
Muir of Ord	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/098	Muir of Ord H06	Concerns re possible adverse effect on area of mixed woodland within site. Cites national and Highland policy protection for such woodland. Wants evidence of over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, loss minimisation, pre-determination species survey and high standard of compensatory planting. Believes there are many other more suitable sites within settlement.	Non-retention of site option.
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/008	Muir of Ord H06	This site should not be allocated or included within the settlement boundary. The site has restricted access and significant infrastructure constraints, the road serving the site is single track in poor condition and has a high volume of traffic. Changes to the topography would increase flood risk downhill also the site will have impacts as is visible from the village High Street. There is no mains sewerage available to the street.	
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/004	Muir of Ord H06	Site is a combination of bog and scrub served by a heavily used single track road. Would have significant visual impact on the community. Prefer the site identified in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan - Ardnagrask, Corrie Road with access from the two laned section of road.	
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/003	Muir of Ord H06	This site consists almost entirely of woodland which would be lost if developed. There are no footpath connections to the settlement and the road would also require widening, on land in other ownerships. It is incorrect to say the site has "no infrastructure constraints".	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/011	Muir of Ord H07	Would allow for more appropriate and favourable development than H4, H6 or H9 and meet housing need as outlined in Highland Wide Development Plan. Need to address capacity of Balvaird junction, which would face increased pressure.	
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/005	Muir of Ord H07	There are 3 different landowners on this site, a masterplanned approach would be required to address issues relating to the development of the site.	
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/006	Muir of Ord H07	Any extension to the number of units on site would be dependant on compliance to current planning conditions. Would object to any increase in numbers on this site.	
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/004	Muir of Ord H07	This site has several different ownerships and understand that not all are willing to release the land for development. This is likely to compromise a masterplanned approach and limit development to the southern frontage to Balvaird Road..	
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/012	Muir of Ord H08	Development on this site near completion so not necessary to allocate in plan.	
Muir of Ord	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/233	Muir of Ord H08	"No Flood Risk Assessment required "	
Muir of Ord	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/234	Muir of Ord H08	"SEPA do not object. Flood risk should be considered as part of the drainage proposals for the development in consultation with the Council. "	"SEPA seek insertion of text stating Flood risk should be considered as part of the drainage proposals for the development."
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/006	Muir of Ord H08	Any extension to the number of units on site would be dependant on compliance to current planning conditions. Would object to any increase in numbers on this site.	
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/005	Muir of Ord H08	This development is substantially complete and is unlikely to contribute towards the land supply for the 5 year period of the plan.	
Muir of Ord	Mr John D Murrie(01182)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01182/1/005	Muir of Ord H08	Respondent objects to past and present development on H8 due to the flooding/drainage impact it has had on his land. It is believed that the site was previously an extension of the Ord Lochans and acted as a basin to the surrounding area. Respondent outlines the history of problems with the site	Removal of site

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				(see original rep for more details).	
Muir of Ord	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/101	Muir of Ord H09	Supports non-preferred of site because of potential adverse effect on Inventory woodland.	Non-retention of site option.
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/013	Muir of Ord H09	This area is long established woodland with a variety of wildlife e.G. Red Kites, Pine Martins, Woodpeckers, Badgers. Three water ways running through site, which is boggy and has potential for flooding. No suitable access to site from A862 and not possible to adjoin footpaths to adjacent residential area, which is privately owned. The site lies outwith the settlement boundary and would set a precedent for further un-needed extension to Muir of Ord. The site has a lack of safe travel routes and distant from services in centre of village. Development here would risk social coalescence with the cluster of houses at the Home Farm junction. The boundary should be retained as a natural boundary preventing further extension of the residential envelope. Support the Councils non-preferred status of this site.	
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/007	Muir of Ord H09	Support Council's non-preference status of this site.	
Muir of Ord	Mr William Sutherland(00782)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00782/1/004	Muir of Ord H09	"Does not support development on H9 for the following reasons:-	Impact upon wildlife including red kites, woodpeckers, red squirrels, roe deer, pine martins and badgers-
Muir of Ord	Mr M And R Grant(00860)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00860/2/001	Muir of Ord H09	"Do not support any development on H9 for the following reasons:-	Negative visual impact;-
Muir of Ord	Mr Jim And Maureen Thomson(00872)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00872/1/004	Muir of Ord H09	"Respondent lives close to H9 and does not support development on these sites for the following reasons:-	Proximity to respondents house;-
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	Re-states the request for the inclusion of housing development land at H9 and the detailed development potential should reflect the framework plan submitted to the Call-for-Sites request. This framework is re-submitted and indicates the retention of important amenity woodland alongside the provision of path connections to existing developments to the south. It was previously stated that the development would be developed in a woodland setting. Thereference in the MIR to "loss of established woodland" is misleading.The	Inclusion of H9 in Proposed Plan in line with landowner's framework plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				case for inclusion of this site for future development is strengthened as it is more effective than other of the site options in Muir of Ord.	
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/008	Muir of Ord H09	<p>"In light of comments regarding the housing land supply ""preferred"" sites in Muir of Ord will be limited to the remaining land at Broomhill (H5) and the Wards (H8) together with MU2, part of H7 and the smaller sites of H1 and H2. Site H9 has significant attributes as a housing site, which were pointed out at the Call for Sites stage. We are concerned that these attributes and the information supplied at the time appear to have been disregarded in preparing the Main Issues Report which was misleading to the wider community. In light of this we wish to re-iterate the following from the Call for Sites submission: -</p> <p>1. With regard to the overall servicing of the site:- road access would be from the A862, Beauly to Dingwall road which is also a bus route; - there are opportunities for remote foot/cycle path connections from the existing housing development to the south;- foul drainage will be to the Muir of Ord system and works with capacity for 580 housing units equivalent; and - water supply is available from the local network and WTW with capacity for 2000+ housing units equivalent. 2. With regard to constraints and how can they be resolved or reduced:- no part of the site is shown to be in the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk area;- no part of the site is Prime quality agricultural land;- the areas of woodland are not protected by a TPO; - although appearing to have a Semi-Natural and Ancient Woodland designation, subject to a conditions survey, the woodland will largely be maintained to help integrate future development into the landscape and maintain the local amenity of the area;- a single low voltage power line passes through the southern part of the land, which could be undergrounded or diverted or alternatively development setback and safeguarding distances maintained from this; and - development of the site will not affect any areas with built, cultural or natural heritage qualities"</p>	Inclusion of H9 in Proposed Plan in line with landowner's framework plan
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/009	Muir of Ord H09	<p>"3. With regard to potential benefits that will result to the wider community from the site's development:- housing will require compliance with the Council's affordable housing policies and developers will make contributions towards improved education facilities, public transport infrastructure and active travel connections; and- a considerable area of amenity woodland and open space along the watercourse will be made available to the wider community for informal recreation purposes with connecting paths. 4. With regard to travel patterns from the site's development:- the land is located within 1.2 km of the railway station, village centre and key existing community facilities such as the primary school, library and village hall;- the Ord Arms Hotel is within 400 m of the site; - there is potential to develop a network of remote paths connecting to the existing network to the south; and - a local bus service presently runs along</p>	Inclusion of H9 in Proposed Plan in line with landowner's framework plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				the A862 road adjacent to the site with an opportunity to provide a bus lay-by/stop and shelter along the main road. "	
Muir of Ord	Mr And Mrs James Milne(00939)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00939/1/001	Muir of Ord H09	"Respondent supports the Councils non preference of this site due to various concerns listed below. - Loss of privacy, and amenity- The proposed development being out of keeping with the design and character of the area by siting, size and design- Its adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area - Concern about the relationship of layout and siting to adjoining building, spaces and views- The inconsistency of proposed houses with the existing building line - It would impact on the undeveloped, open character - The legal right of access they have to this site for service of soakaway and emptying the septic tank - The habitat this provides to wildlife including some protected species - No economic argument for this site with the sites allocated for housing in the village - The impact this development will have on stretched local amenities including the school and doctorsRegarding the sketch development framework the respondent has the following comments - Concern that this does not show the power line and the southwest boundary is considered to be inaccurate as the owner does not own the land from the proposed site to the pumping station- Scottish Hydroelectric Power System plan shows that the high voltage line (not a single low voltage line) passes through the whole site and the respondent is concerned about the setback and safeguarding constraints this will have on the proposal "	
Muir of Ord	Mr And Mrs Nicholson(01014)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01014/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"Supports non-preference of sites H9 for the following reasons:- There are a number of unused or not fully developed sites within the village boundary which would meet the Council's future housing needs for the village. Both sites fall outwith the present settlement boundary in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. Having these two sites would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- The site impinges directly on the northern approach to the village which is visually attractive and has some features worth of preservation such as the succession of traditional buildings constructed in Tarradale stone.- Local residents experience water drainage problem in periods of heavy rainfall with ponding on the A862 and run-off down The Meadows, Ord Road and Chestnut Drive. These roads offer rising access to the A862 which together with the existing conditions of drainage and poor visibility, offer challenging exits.- School children would be likely to use the footbridge over the railway on their way to Tarradale Primary School and respondent questions if this would constitute a desirable element in a safe route to school.- Service Constraints. Access to the village by car would be over the already lights-controlled bridge over the railway. Already concerns about the bridge's deteriorating condition and weight bearing capacity. Tarradale Primary School	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				has little or no spare capacity and concerns about capacity of local doctor's surgery."	
Muir of Ord	Mrs Annabel Maclean(01133)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01133/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"Supports non-preference of sites H9 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access routes from A862 which could not cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand.- H9 is of agricultural use and the woodland provides habitat for wildlife including protected species e.G. Pine Martins, Red Kites, Woodpeckers.- H9 would dilute cultural heritage of historic, traditional buildings on countryside approach to village.- Potential coalescence with housing group at Home Farm junction."	
Muir of Ord	Gilmar Green(01135)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01135/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"Supports non-preference of site H9 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access routes from A862. Access to H9 would be outwith the 30mph zone and between a dangerous corner before Home Farm junction and a blind summit as you enter the village, which would be to the right of the exit to H4. The Home Farm and Chapleton Farm single track road junctions would be unable to cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand. - H9 is of agricultural use and the woodland provides habitat for wildlife including protected species e.G. Pine Martins, Red Kites, Woodpeckers.- H9 would dilute cultural heritage of historic, traditional buildings on countryside approach to village.- Potential coalescence with housing group at Home Farm junction."	
Muir of Ord	Ms Catherine Hamilton(01137)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01137/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"Supports non-preference of sites H9 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				routes from A862 which could not cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand.- H9 is of agricultural use and the woodland provides habitat for wildlife including protected species e.G. Pine Martins, Red Kites, Woodpeckers.- H9 would dilute cultural heritage of historic, traditional buildings on countryside approach to village.- Potential coalescence with housing group at Home Farm junction."	
Muir of Ord	Linda And Alastair Bell(01147)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01147/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"Supports non-preference of sites H9 for the reasons listed under significant cons in the MIR and for the following reasons:- Outwith Muir of Ord settlement boundary in Ross and Cromarty East LP and MIR. Acts as an attractive, natural buffer zone preventing extension of the residential envelope. Would set a precedent for future development outwith Muir of Ord.- No suitable access routes from A862 which could not cope with increased traffic.- No suitable transportation, cycle routes, pavements or safe routes to school.- Inadequate water, drainage and sewerage and flood risk.- Excessive to housing need Preferred sites in MIR adequately meet projected housing need.- Distant from centre of village and services. Current services could not meet extra demand.- H9 is of agricultural use and the woodland provides habitat for wildlife including protected species e.G. Pine Martins, Red Kites, Woodpeckers.- H9 would dilute cultural heritage of historic, traditional buildings on countryside approach to village."	
Muir of Ord	To The Occupier(01148)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01148/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"Respondents agree with the Council's non-preference for housing development on H9 for the reasons outlined in the significant cons row of the MIR and for the reasons outlined below:-	Outwith settlement boundary in RACE Local Plan and MIR; -
Muir of Ord	Mr John D Murrie(01182)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01182/1/004	Muir of Ord H09	"Respondent supports the non-preferred status of H9 for the following reasons:- The information given in the call for sites form is not accurate and the power line is a high voltage line with extensive earth system within the site (see attached Scottish Hydro map)- The existing drain from Balvaird is a health hazard and may need to be culverted due to effluent.- The drain from the Meadows must be maintained.- The south west area partly floods and provides some protection from flooding on respondents land- Land grading will be needed which will cause drainage problems downstream- Proposed openspace on "development sketch" is too steep to use for amenity space.- Boundary is incorrect at south west corner as the applicant does not have ownership of the sewage pumping station on Maltings site (see attached map)"	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Mr And Mrs PN Moore(01275)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01275/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"The respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for housing development for the following reasons- the reasons given in the MIR and also- the areas are outwith the settlement boundary and this will effect its rural approach- the access arrangements are not good particularly for H9- there is no safe route for pedestrians/ school kids- drainage and sewerage will be problematic- demand for new houses needs to be assessed - H9 is important habitat for wildlife (kites, pine marten, red squirrel, nesting tree sparrows, woodpeckers and other more common species)- the proposed footpath would affect their privacy, outlook and security"	
Muir of Ord	Anonymous 9(01341)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01341/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"The respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for housing for the following reasons- the reasons given in the MIR - they lie outwith the settlement boundary for Muir of Ord, and would set precedent for further development - there is no suitable access routes from the A862 with sufficient capacity for the increased traffic generated- there are no cycle routes, footways, or safer route to school- there are no adequate water, or sewerage capacity and there is recognised flood risk- these sites in addition to the preferred site would be beyond housing need requirements- the sites are too distant services and the services could not cope with the additional demand- the sites would risk coalescence with separate housing group at the Home Farm junction- H9 would result in loss of agricultural land and woodland which provides habitat for a wide range of wildlife including protected Species (such as pine martens, red kites and woodpeckers) and would impact on the rural character of this area"	
Muir of Ord	Anonymous 10(01342)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01342/1/002	Muir of Ord H09	"The respondent supports the Council's non preference of these sites for housing for the following reasons- the reasons given in the MIR - they lie outwith the settlement boundary for Muir of Ord, and would set precedent for further development - there is no suitable access routes from the A862 with sufficient capacity for the increased traffic generated- there are no cycle routes, footways, or safer route to school- there are no adequate water, or sewerage capacity and there is recognised flood risk- these sites in addition to the preferred site would be beyond housing need requirements- the sites are too distant services and the services could not cope with the additional demand- the sites would risk coalescence with separate housing group at the Home Farm junction- H9 would result in loss of agricultural land and woodland which provides habitat for a wide range of wildlife including protected Species (such as pine martens, red kites and woodpeckers) and would impact on the rural character of this area"	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/100	Muir of Ord MU01	Requests HRA conformity check re potential adverse effect on Inner Moray Firth SPA re connectivity between geese feeding areas and designation.	Any developer requirements resulting from HRA.
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/015	Muir of Ord MU01	"Housing on this site would be far from the centre of the village and would require significant developer investment in a safe ""active travel"" route to the village centre and the school, without requiring crossing the main road. Coalescence to Windhill, which is a separate housing group outwith the Muir of Ord settlement boundary. Not appropriate for retail as it is outwith the commercial boundary and would split the village. The standing stones are an important heritage feature and would have to be safeguarded as part of any developments design. Continued agricultural use would be preferred in the absence of development proposals. Housing on west and Industrial use on east side of main road would provide a clear separation of land-usage, fit sympathetically with existing Cairns housing development, and provide the best solution in terms of visual amenity. Visual amenity is an important aspect when considering the use of this site, which is the entrance to the village from Beauly and already has the Industrial estate on the opposite side. Southern boundary to be amended to exclude southernmost existing field to leave standing stones in field setting & protect separate identity of Windhill settlement."	"Allocation of site for housing only development. Modification of site boundary to exclude lower field and modification of SDA to reflect this."
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/009	Muir of Ord MU01	Site is not close to local facilities/amenities. Site must contain elements of open space for active recreation. Standing stone within the site needs to be protected alongside a full archaeological survey. An outline masterplan should be provided to support inclusion of development site.	Developer requirements for open space for active recreation, Standing stone consideration and protection, full archaeological survey, outline masterplan.
Muir of Ord	The Iain Elliot Partnership(00781)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00781/1/001	Muir of Ord MU01	"Support's preferred status of MU1 in the MIR. Indicative masterplan proposes the following uses: -	>3 hectares business and office use and general industrial/workshop – help address shortage of such space in the area;-
Muir of Ord	Lochluichart Estate North(00916)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00916/1/007	Muir of Ord MU01	This site is more distant than H9 from the village centre and related facilities, including the primary school. This site may be more appropriate for business/light industrial uses given likely opposition to the inclusion of the northern extension of I1 by the Black Isle Show Society.	Removal of housing from the mix of uses.
Muir of Ord	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/036	Muir of Ord MU01	Historic Scotland (HS) state that this allocation contains the scheduled monument Windhill, standing stone N of (Index no. 3128). HS suggest that developer requirements should require an appropriate area be left around the monument in order to protect its immediate setting.	Developer requirements should require an appropriate area be left around the monument in order to protect its immediate setting.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/009	Muir of Ord MU02	Significant improvements to surrounding area eg. Black Isle Road, would be required for safe pedestrian access. Developer would need to create safe "active travel" routes into village centre. Supportive of development as Housing. No real mixed use is being proposed or suitable, if approved should be designated as housing only.	"Change use of site to housing only.Developer requirements for active travel and pedestrian routes."
Muir of Ord	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/235	Muir of Ord MU02	"SEPA do not object. Recommend drainage and flooding be considered as part of the drainage strategy for the site. "	"SEPA seek insertion of text stating Flood risk should be considered as part of the drainage proposals for the development."
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/010	Muir of Ord MU02	Site is contained within existing Local Plan but has significant road traffic and pedestrian issues that need to be overcome prior to re-inclusion of the site. Community use should be to west of site to tie with adjacent development with access taken to east of site to avoid conflict with access of existing development. As a gateway site this development should reflect the density of neighbouring developments. Concern over the proximity of site to potentially contaminated land.	Developer requirements for pedestrian and road traffic improvements, Community use to be included to the west of the site. Investigations into possibility of contaminated land.
Muir of Ord	Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00962/1/001	Muir of Ord MU02	Supports principle of development but wishes as landowner a housing only allocation with capacity for 120 units because the site is already allocated for housing development in the adopted local plan and that its suggested layout is logical and feasible.	Inclusion of housing only allocation with capacity for 120 units.
Muir of Ord	Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00962/1/007	Muir of Ord MU02	Support for a higher density housing allocation on site MU2 and a confirmed housing allocation on site MU3.	Support for a higher density housing allocation on site MU2 and a confirmed housing allocation on site MU3.
Muir of Ord	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/102	Muir of Ord MU03	Supports non-preference of site because of potential adverse effects on great crested newt habitat and woodland.	
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/010	Muir of Ord MU03	Considering other proposed developments this would be excessive to housing need as it would be a large scale development with potential for 200- 300 houses. Too much expansion too soon. Black Isle Road and junction between A862 and A835 would need considerable improvements. Proposed housing would be out with settlement boundary. The watercourse leading into Lily Loch should not be disrupted. For clarity, this should be treated as two sites: (Non-Preferred) Housing and Safeguarded green space for community use, which had been included in previous RACE Local Plan. Supportive of green space not supportive of housing.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/236	Muir of Ord MU03	"SEPA do not object. Recommend drainage and flooding be considered as part of the drainage strategy for the site. "	"SEPA seek insertion of text stating Flood risk should be considered as part of the drainage proposals for the development."
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/011	Muir of Ord MU03	Support the Council's non-preferred status of this site, and developable land on this site lies outwith the existing settlement boundary, remote from the town centre with significant pedestrian issues. There are protected species inhabiting the western half of the overall site.	
Muir of Ord	Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00962/1/002	Muir of Ord MU03	Disagrees with Council's non-preferral of site because; the site lies in the most logical direction for short, medium and long term growth close to Muir of Ord town centre and the primary school with good active travel accessibility; it is not affected by flooding or other constraints that affect other Muir of Ord site options; the amenity area around Loch Gun Toin would not be developed and be made more accessible for wildlife and people as a green network; the settlement boundary would be rounded off once adjoining had been developed, and; the site's development would allow an improvement to the B9169/A832 to be made.	Endorsement of site within Proposed Plan for short, medium and long term housing development.
Muir of Ord	Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00962/1/007	Muir of Ord MU03	Support for a higher density housing allocation on site MU2 and a confirmed housing allocation on site MU3.	Support for a higher density housing allocation on site MU2 and a confirmed housing allocation on site MU3.
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/014	Muir of Ord B01	Supportive of safeguarding showground for existing uses and encouraging further all year round tourism and amenity use.	
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/014	Muir of Ord B01	Support the retained use on this site.	
Muir of Ord	Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00962/1/006	Muir of Ord B01	Support site - no reasons stated.	
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/005	Muir of Ord C01	Not supportive of generic housing development on this site. The potential for sheltered housing in association with the new Urray House development could be supported. The loss of green space on this site is important to the residents of the care home and the community as a whole.	Community use should be defined as care home and sheltered housing only.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Muir of Ord	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/013	Muir of Ord C01	Support this site although it apperas to conflict with site H3.	
Muir of Ord	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/099	Muir of Ord I01	Concerns re possible adverse effect on area of woodland within site. Cites national and Highland policy protection for such woodland. Wants evidence of over-riding public benefits, no alternatives, loss minimisation, pre-determination species survey and high standard of compensatory planting. Believes woodland also performs an important green network connectivity function.	Developer requirement for retention of a belt of this woodland.
Muir of Ord	Muir Of Ord Community Council(00308)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00308/1/016	Muir of Ord I01	Need for area to expand industrial estate for local businesses which provide employment. Loss of woodland and car park for Black Isle Show.	
Muir of Ord	Mackay, Robertson And Fraser Partnership(00962)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00962/1/006	Muir of Ord I01	Support site - no reasons stated.	
North kessock	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/004	North Kessock General	Request for skateboard park/BMX track in Bellfield area. Other such parks have a chequered history, but an area for vigorous adventure within the village envelope is needed.	Allocation of land for skateboard/BMX track in Bellfield area.
North kessock	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/005	North Kessock General	Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan mentions the shore from Charleston to Redcastle excluding any development and structures unless it is for landscape and wild-life interpretation. Consider this needs to be part of LDP but should be extended to include shore line from Kessock Pier to Avoch.	Safeguard land between Kessock Pier and Avoch from any development with the exception of landscaping and wild-life interpretation.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
North kessock	Ms Anne Thomas(01208)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01208/1/005	North Kessock General	<p>The respondent has the following suggestions/comments to make with regard to North Kessock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern about the lack of other uses accomodated beyond housing sites - concerned that the hotel and garage of the original proposal may no longer be proposed - suggests that there should be more businesses located within the village to reduce comuting - suggests a community growing space within the new Tulloch development - considers that there are several sites within the new development that would be suitable for community growing spaces and an area at Gordon's park is suggested for a community orchard - a community compost space has been proposed on community council land towards the campsite - expresses concern regarding the lack of signposting for the cycle path on the old A9 from the Kessock Bridge to Dingwall - considers that much more could be made of 'Green Tourism' particularly cycling opportunities - considers there is a need to link the cycle route along the A9 through the route past the wildlife park to the monument. It is considered that the small section between this monument and Station Rd in Avoch if provided with a cycle track would really open up options for travelling by bike from Rosemarkie, Fortrose, Avoch and Munloch and would be a huge resource for tourists - it is considered that the route from Station Rd Avoch to Fortrose along the old railway line is a bit muddy at times and could do with being upgrated and made into an official cycle route - feels that the bus service has severe gaps in its timetable and that the more frequent buses that are accessed from the A9 are difficult to get to due to lack of a footpath to the bus stop beyond the village to the northwest 	<p>The respondent seeks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more specific business allocations - more land set aside for community uses including community gardens within the Tulloch development and a community orchard is suggested for an area of land at Gordon's Park - support for their community compost site on land towards the campsite - signposting for the cycle path on the old A9 from the Kessock Bridge to Dingwall - a link to the cycle route along the A9 by providing the small section between this monument and Station Rd in Avoch and upgrading of the route from Station Rd Avoch to Fortrose along the old railway line and make it into an official cycle route

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
North kessock	Ms Anne Thomas(01208)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01208/1/006	North Kessock General	<p>The respondent has the following suggestions/comments to make with regard to North Kessock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong consideration should be given to a new layby near the underpass to the village heading towards Inverness and a layby with footpath connection to the new housing area on the village side. - Alternatively there could be a footbridge across the A9 to link these two bus stops. - There should also be a cycle accessible footpath under the Kessock Bridge at the top to link the bus stops just North of the bridge to each other. The existing route was unsuitable for many bus users and is now blocked. A simple path down the bank and route past the cage from the North Kessock side would enable a safe route avoiding crossing of the A9. There is already a path on the far side. - This path should also be used to access the attractive woodland walks at Ord Hill and signposted from the Tourist information office. There is currently a missed opportunity with tourists stopping there not being able to easily access the wonderful country walks on the other side of the A9 safely without a huge detour. - criticises the fact that solar panels were not fitted as standard on the the houses being built on the southern slope - considers that houses on the slope slope should be orientated to make the most of solar gains. - suggests that the road through North Kessock past the school should become a 20mph zone. 	<p>The respondent has the following suggestions/comments to make with regard to North Kessock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong consideration should be given to a new layby near the underpass to the village heading towards Inverness and a layby with footpath connection to the new housing area on the village side. - Alternatively there could be a footbridge across the A9 to link these two bus stops. - There should be a cycle accessible footpath under the Kessock Bridge at the top to link the bus stops just North of the bridge to each other. A simple path down the bank and route past the cage from the North Kessock side would enable a safe route avoiding crossing of the A9. - This path should also be used to access the attractive woodland walks at Ord Hill and signposted from the Tourist information office. - Considers that solar panels should be fitted as standard on the the houses being built on the southern slope - Considers that houses on the slope slope should be orientated to make the most of solar gains. - Suggests that the road through North Kessock past the school should become a 20mph zone.
North kessock	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/001	North Kessock H01	Issues with drainage and currently has a lot of debris from traffic on the A9.	
North kessock	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/237	North Kessock H01	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Recommend a buffer zone to the watercourse or similar be applied in consultation with the Council. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of application if development encroaches on the watercourse or include crossings.	SEPA seek developer requirements recommending a buffer zone to the watercourse or similar be applied and for Flood Risk Assessment to be required in support of application if development encroaches on the watercourse or include crossings.
North kessock	Mr Graham Low(00739)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00739/1/001	North Kessock H01	Respondent concerned by further development west of Bellfield House and the continuing Tulloch Homes development.	
North kessock	Mr Rolf Schmidt(00773)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00773/1/001	North Kessock H01	<p>Respondent made following points about H1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retain trees adjacent to burn at Bellfield as they are important for character of village. - Retain "The Dell" as public amenity. - Supports inclusion of another bus stop. 	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
North kessock	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/4/001	North Kessock H01	<p>Broadland Properties Ltd is the owner of substantial land holdings over the remainder of Bellfield and Lettoch Farms, North Kessock.</p> <p>Extensive land here forms part of the existing Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan expansion allocation and has planning permission for an integrated mixed development of housing with open space, tourism, leisure and recreation facilities. Many draft proposals have been mooted for the non-residential land but none have yet materialised into formal proposals and submitted as full planning applications. However development is progressing well with the housing development which forms the largest proportion of site option H1 in the MIR. The layout submitted with the master plan application indicated other land for commercial development, including a filling station, shop units, a travel lodge hotel, restaurant/ public house, tourist/visitor information centre and an unspecified community building in the north eastern area of the adopted Local Plan allocation and MIR site H1. It is considered unfortunate that the area for the filling station does not feature at all in the MIR.</p>	The landowner seeks the allocation of this land for wider uses and/or for the allocation to be reconfigured to reflect the approved masterplan/call for sites submission.
North kessock	Miss Sheila Rattray(00681)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00681/1/001	North Kessock H02	<p>The Landowner of H2 H3 in the RACE plan, objects to the now non-preferred status of the sites in the IMFLDP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the land at H3 being partially developed - the sites having easy road access at lower Craigton and water sewage connections - the land is not prime agricultural land, it relates well with existing houses at Craigton, - the topography/levels require no resultant underbuilding or using environmental impacts. <p>The respondent also argues that the removal of H2 and H3 will cause a monopoly of allocated land as the only other housing site is owned by one person. It is also highlighted that the existing RACE allocations are accepted by the community and new allocations may result in objections from local residents.</p> <p>The respondent questions the reasons for not re-allocating the sites as they are suitable infill sites which would provide housing for 5-10 houses and offer an excellent alternative to the large scale homes which are being developed by Tullochs. It was suggested at the evening workshop that the reason for not allocating the sites was that it was limited to 5-6 houses. Respondent highlights that the sites is 3.27 hectares which would provide space for a lot more than 5-6 houses.</p> <p>Finally the respondent argues that the site should be considered in the IMFLDP rather than being assessed against HwLDP policies (as stated in non-preferred reasons) as this will meet the development objectives of the Council.</p>	Requests that sites H2 and H3 are reallocated as housing sites.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
North kessock	Mr Peter Rattray(01079)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01079/1/001	North Kessock H02	Objects to non-preferral of site because: of previous policy support for development at this location including the adopted local plan allocation; a specific, policy allocation gives more comfort that a future application will be supported than a settlement boundary; a positive allocation would reduce risk for the developer and therefore make land release more likely, and; the landowner has a genuine desire to release the land as evidenced by the fact that an architect has been employed to test the site's feasibility and layout.	Retention of site within Proposed Plan as specific housing allocation.
North kessock	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/002	North Kessock H03	Land needs to be made available for an alternative access to Upper Craigton in likely event of the current road collapsing. Road through H3 would make construction of new road from hairpin bend easier and safer.	Safeguard land within H3 for alternative road access to Upper Craigton.
North kessock	Miss Sheila Rattray(00681)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00681/1/001	North Kessock H03	<p>The Landowner of H2 H3 in the RACE plan, objects to the now non-preferred status of the sites in the IMFLDP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the land at H3 being partially developed - the sites having easy road access at lower Craigton and water sewage connections - the land is not prime agricultural land, it relates well with existing houses at Craigton, - the topography/levels require no resultant underbuilding or using environmental impacts. <p>The respondent also argues that the removal of H2 and H3 will cause a monopoly of allocated land as the only other housing site is owned by one person. It is also highlighted that the existing RACE allocations are accepted by the community and new allocations may result in objections from local residents.</p> <p>The respondent questions the reasons for not re-allocating the sites as they are suitable infill sites which would provide housing for 5-10 houses and offer an excellent alternative to the large scale homes which are being developed by Tullochs. It was suggested at the evening workshop that the reason for not allocating the sites was that it was limited to 5-6 houses. Respondent highlights that the sites is 3.27 hectares which would provide space for a lot more than 5-6 houses.</p> <p>Finally the respondent argues that the site should be considered in the IMFLDP rather than being assessed against HwLDP policies (as stated in non-preferred reasons) as this will meet the development objectives of the Council.</p>	Requests that sites H2 and H3 are reallocated as housing sites.
North kessock	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/103	North Kessock B01	Requests developer requirement for great crested newt species survey as site adjacent to water body.	Developer requirement for great crested newt species survey.
North kessock	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/003	North Kessock B01	Concern over change in types of land uses supported and enlargement of site compared to the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan. Support retention of description in existing local plan. Concern that justification for enlargement is based upon loss of developable land due to construction of new tree belt, however do not agree that new tree belt occupies much land on existing allocated site. Future development should be predicated on the construction of a golf course. Area to south of the farm road from Bellfield to Lettoch should not be built on as this would allow the houses remaining to be built to become amenity housing bordering a golf course which was the reason permission was	Replication of text for B1 from Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan and a smaller allocation

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				originally given.	
North kessock	Mr Graham Low(00739)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00739/1/001	North Kessock B01	Respondent concerned by further development west of Bellfield House and the continuing Tulloch Homes development.	
North kessock	Mr Graham Low(00739)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00739/1/002	North Kessock B01	Respondent would only support the development of a golf course on this site but no other development. If golf course is not delivered then it should remain as agricultural land.	
North kessock	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/4/002	North Kessock B01	<p>The landowners considers continuing poor market conditions mean that the proposed golf course with associated club house, country club/ hotel and other unspecified leisure uses, are not expected to happen in the short to medium term future.</p> <p>They request as they did through the Call for Sites process that the area for the associated club house etc be extended and re-configured from the planning permission . This is to allow potential for a wider range of leisure, tourism and employment uses, the setting back of buildings from the trunk gas main to the north and to account for the detailed access arrangements resulting from the approved housing layout over adjoining land. This would also allow a better and more widespread arrangement of buildings to take advantage the superb views to the south and south west and the setting around the small loch.</p> <p>It is still intended that this larger area of land (B1 in the MIR) should accommodate a golf club house, indoor sports/leisure club, hotel, etc. But also offer scope for holiday apartments, offices and other business uses mainly associated with leisure and tourism. It is hoped that this greater flexibility will make the land more financially attractive to potential developers.</p> <p>From the debate at the North Kessock MIR workshop it appears that the local community council will not support B1. More specifically, they seem concerned about including land in the south eastern area between the proposed access and existing farm track (a Core Path) and doubted the uses would relate to a golf course. We did point out at the workshop that this area includes a 30 metres wide tree belt planted up in the last two years to fulfil one of the conditions of planning permission for the housing to the east. The developable area is therefore already reduced and the adjacent housing buffered by the structural planting. It is also a fact that the outline planning permission for the overall development does not tie other uses down to be associated with golf.</p>	The landowner objects to the current extent of B1 considering that it should be extended and reconfigured to accord with their Call for Site submission.
Munlochy	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/009	Munlochy General	School site in Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan needs to remain allocated. Site at North Kessock lay empty for many years whilst the Education Department considered various options.	Allocate school site as per Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/005	Munlochy H01	Supports site.	
Munlochy	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/5/001	Munlochy H01	<p>The landowner confirms the availability of H1. Discussions have been held with HC Housing and Property who own the adjacent land to the west through which vehicular access will be taken. Interest has been shown in this land being acquired for future Council house building. With potential for 10 or more houses they consider that this would more than cover the affordable housing requirement associated with potential residential development on the Millbank Road site (MU1 and part of H6).</p> <p>They point to the attributes of this site which were identified in the Strategic Environmental Assessment form submitted at the Call for Sites stage. In terms of mitigation they identify a need to retain existing woodland and supplement with new planting along the north boundary to buffer development from the A832 road, the commercial garage, filling station and bus depot.</p>	The landowner supports the allocation of H1 for housing. In terms of mitigation they identify a need to retain existing woodland and supplement with new planting along the north boundary to buffer development from the A832 road, the commercial garage, filling station and bus depot.
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/005	Munlochy H02	Supports site.	
Munlochy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/238	Munlochy H03	SEPA do not object. Small watercourse should be considered as part of drainage, site design and layout.	SEPA seek insertion of text stating the small watercourse should be considered as part of drainage, site design and layout.
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/005	Munlochy H03	Supports site.	
Munlochy	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/010	Munlochy H04	Do not support housing development on H4 as the access is not adequate.	Non-allocation of H4 in the Proposed Plan
Munlochy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/239	Munlochy H04	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. The site is partially within the fluvial flood map, but has been developed already. It seems some additional development will be added to the site to 'complete' it, and it is not clear where that would take place. Suggest the text states a FRA will be required and may significantly affect the development options for the site. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	Inclusion of developers requirements to cover Flood Risk Assessment and morphological issues if this site is to be allocated.
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/006	Munlochy H04	Objects to site H4 as it is too hazardous.	Remove housing allocation.
Munlochy	Mrs Karin Kremer(00729)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00729/1/006	Munlochy H05	Respondent suggests that allotments may be a more appropriate use at H5 .	Suggested that H5 could be used as allotments.
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/007	Munlochy H05	Site should be retained as a potential school site. Rest of H5 could be used for amenity purposes. Housing would have too much of a visual impact.	Allocate site for a new school and for open space.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Munlochy	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/2/002	Munlochy H05	Notes site H5 is identified in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan for a possible school site subject to an on-going review of the need for improved primary school accommodation. However should this school site no longer be required respondent considers H5 should be allocated for housing. Considers H4 has capacity for a low density development of 4 houses. Respondent is frustrated at the lack of clarity provided from the Council with regards to what the current situation is on the need for improved primary school accommodation. Hopes that the agent's submissions for Tore and Avoch in addition to those for Munlochy should at least result in an investigation being carried out by the Council into future needs and provisions for these communities.	Allocation of H5 for housing in the Proposed Plan unless site is required for new primary school
Munlochy	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/104	Munlochy H06	Supports non-preferred of site because of potential adverse impact upon Munlochy Valley GCR site.	
Munlochy	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/012	Munlochy H06	Concerned about massive visual impact from many places outwith the Munlochy.	
Munlochy	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/014	Munlochy H06	Understand developers agent of the opinion that MU1 would need to be extended to include H6 to make development of the site for mixed uses economically viable. If MU1 is to include H6 then concern is expressed for the massive visual impact from many places outwith the village. Support existing boundary of MU1 as it is screened by trees, H6 is not.	
Munlochy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/240	Munlochy H06	SEPA do 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. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. Big Burn runs very near to the boundary of the site, the water body is at good status for morphology but is very close to the moderate boundary. The classification is based on remotely sensed data. The main pressure used in classification is low impact realignment. It is likely that at least some of the low impact realignment is actually high impact realignment. This means that the true classification is probably less than good for morphology. A full water body survey would be needed to confirm this. The section of burn along the boundary does not appear to have been historically realigned but this should be checked. If realigned then restoration or at least space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. There is also a historically straightened minor watercourses running through the site. Space should be allowed for restoration and development of future natural processes on this.	SEPA request inclusion of developers requirements to cover Flood Risk Assessment and morphological issues of this site is to be allocated.
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/008	Munlochy H06	Supports non-preference of site H6 as it is premature. H6 can be reviewed again in 10 years time. Housing on the site would have too much visual impact.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Munlochy	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/1/001	Munlochy H06	<p>Supports the preference for MU1 to be allocated for mixed use, but considers the site should be extended to include the western half of H6. Justification for this is that it will help provide additional housing potential to make the overall development feasible and provide land for community facilities.</p> <p>Should MU1 and the western half of H6 be allocated in the LDP the respondent would expect a master plan to be prepared through a public engagement exercise. This would give residents an opportunity to help determine the layout and distribution of uses aided by more information on the demand for business/office space, community facilities and size of extension to the village car park. Site has potential to sustain and enhance employment and expand or improve the range of community facilities in association with traffic management measures.</p> <p>Masterplan would also guide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design of buildings; - Number of houses; - how affordable requirement will be met; - phasing; - woodland safeguards; - buffer zones from adjacent burns; - open space; - path links; and - planting on eastern edge to integrate development into the landscape. <p>Notes agent held separate meeting with Knockbain Community Council to present the proposals</p>	Expansion of MU1 to include western half of H6 in Proposed Plan
Munlochy	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/013	Munlochy MU01	Support development of site for commercial space with an increase of footpaths around and within the village. Concern gradient of field will not bode well for the road access, especially in winter. Also concern that increased traffic will make it dangerous for children getting out of cars in the car park.	
Munlochy	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/014	Munlochy MU01	Understand developers agent of the opinion that MU1 would need to be extended to include H6 to make development of the site for mixed uses economically viable. If MU1 is to include H6 then concern is expressed for the massive visual impact from many places outwith the village. Support existing boundary of MU1 as it is screened by trees, H6 is not.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Munlochy	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/241	Munlochy MU01	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. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. Big Burn runs very near to the boundary of the site. The water body is at good status for morphology but is very close to the moderate boundary. The classification is based on remotely sensed data. The main pressure used in classification is low impact realignment. It is likely that at least some of the low impact realignment is actually high impact realignment. This means that the true classification is probably less than good for morphology. A full water body survey would be needed to confirm this. The section of burn along the boundary does not appear to have been historically realigned but this should be checked. If realigned then restoration or at least space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. There is also a historically straightened minor watercourses running through the site. Space should be allowed for restoration and development of future natural processes on this.	SEPA seek developer requirements to cover FRA and morphological issues.
Munlochy	Mrs Karin Kremer(00729)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00729/1/007	Munlochy MU01	Respondent supports the preferred status of MU1.	
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/009	Munlochy MU01	Extend MU1 eastwards and zone for business and cultural needs.	Extend MU1 eastwards and zone for business and cultural needs.
Munlochy	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/1/001	Munlochy MU01	<p>Supports the preference for MU1 to be allocated for mixed use, but considers the site should be extended to include the western half of H6. Justification for this is that it will help provide additional housing potential to make the overall development feasible and provide land for community facilities.</p> <p>Should MU1 and the western half of H6 be allocated in the LDP the respondent would expect a master plan to be prepared through a public engagement exercise. This would give residents an opportunity to help determine the layout and distribution of uses aided by more information on the demand for business/office space, community facilities and size of extension to the village car park. Site has potential to sustain and enhance employment and expand or improve the range of community facilities in association with traffic management measures.</p> <p>Masterplan would also guide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design of buildings; - Number of houses; - how affordable requirement will be met; - phasing; - woodland safeguards; - buffer zones from adjacent burns; - open space; - path links; and - planting on eastern edge to integrate development into the landscape. <p>Notes agent held separate meeting with Knockbain Community Council to present the proposals</p>	Expansion of MU1 to include western half of H6 in Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Munlochy	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/011	Munlochy B01	Support extension of B1 to the east as this would improve road safety as it would allow a new road to Killen to be created through units suitable for craft workshops. However if east part of site was developed first this may delay the much needed tidying up of the area around B1.	Extend B1 to the east.
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/010	Munlochy B01	Extend B1 eastwards and improve "crossroads".	Extend B1 eastwards.
Munlochy	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/3/001	Munlochy B01	Supports the preference for B1 to be allocated for business/tourism use. However notes that as there is currently no commercial interest in the site timescales for development are likely to be in the medium to long term. Nevertheless the site is free from constraints and could be delivered in the short term if a developer came forward. Notes that development of the site requires access to be taken via an improved A832/B9161 junction from the Culbokie leg to improve the safety of the existing junction. States that neither the landowner nor the Council are in a position to make these road improvements, and therefore suggests that the business/tourism allocation should be extended or reconfigured to cover the triangular field to the north east of the junction. Such an arrangement would allow the site to be more marketable as it fronts a tourist route and has an attractive outlook towards Munlochy Bay and therefore would suit a well designed tourist/commercial facility. Structural tree planting along eastern edge would mitigate any landscape impact. Site could also create local employment opportunities.	Extended or reconfigured business/tourism allocation at B1 to cover the triangular field to the north east of the junction
Munlochy	Mr Anthony Neil Morey(00774)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00774/1/002		Agrees with items listed in Key Development Issues for Munlochy and agrees with the principle of developers helping to address these objectives and requirements.	
Portmahomack	Tarbat Community Council(00323)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00323/1/001	Portmahomack General	Appreciate that the choice of land for development in Portmahomack is limited and that plans must be made for possible future development.	
Portmahomack	Wood(00776)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00776/1/002	Portmahomack General	Questions whether the road will need to be widened between Rockfield and Portmahomack to cope with increased traffic volumes.	
Portmahomack	J.A. Wiscombe(00777)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00777/1/002	Portmahomack General	Agrees with items listed under Key Development Issues. Bus routes on Tarbatness Road are non existent and not viable.	
Portmahomack	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/105	Portmahomack H02	Requests HRA conformity check because of potential adverse effect upon feeding ground connectivity to Loch Eye and Dornoch Firth & Morrich More SPAs.	Any developer requirements resulting from HRA conformity check.
Portmahomack	Tarbat Community Council(00323)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00323/1/002	Portmahomack H02	Concerned that following on from the improvements to Tarbatness Road in respect of flood prevention measures, which means that part of the road is single track, the road may not be suitable for carrying increased traffic due to housing development at development at H2.	
Portmahomack	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/105	Portmahomack H03	Requests HRA conformity check because of potential adverse effect upon feeding ground connectivity to Loch Eye and Dornoch Firth & Morrich More SPAs.	Any developer requirements resulting from HRA conformity check.
Portmahomack	Tarbat Community Council(00323)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00323/1/003	Portmahomack H03	Concerned that following on from the improvements to Tarbatness Road in respect of flood prevention measures, which means that part of the road is single track, the road may not be suitable for carrying increased traffic due to	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				housing development at development at H3.	
Portmahomack	J.A. Wiscombe(00777)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00777/1/004	Portmahomack H04	Supports non-preference of sites H4.	
Portmahomack	J.A. Wiscombe(00777)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00777/1/006	Portmahomack H05	Supports non-preference of sites H5.	
Seaboard Villages	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/106	Seaboard Villages General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).	Settlement-wide developer requirement for species surveys (including reptiles).
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/002	Seaboard Villages General	Clear from MIR evening meeting that despite the need for housing sites in and around the Seaboard Villages there is limited availability for such development. As a responsible landowner with long family history in the area would like to see responsible and meaningful development in the villages, which will sensitive to the historical built environment and encourage more enterprise, tourism and employment.	Allocation of additional housing and mixed use sites
Seaboard Villages	Mr John MacIntosh(00994)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00994/1/001	Seaboard Villages General	Requests new site east of Shore Street for house plots and shared amenity area at Shandwick on part of amenity area safeguard notation because: land better suited for residential development; some amenity space could be retained closer to the shore, and; development would be sympathetic to existing settlement pattern.	Requests new site for 4 house plots and shared amenity area, north east of 10 Shore Street, Shandwick.
Seaboard Villages	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/007	Seaboard Villages H01	Respondent thinks site H1 is unnecessary in the present climate. Would lead to loss of farmland.	Removal of site.
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/004	Seaboard Villages H01	Considered a poor site as it is a small area constrained by steep banking to the west and existing dwelling houses and gardens to the east; access is poor and the site has remained undeveloped since it was sold for development in the 1970s.	Assume removal of site H1 from the Proposed Plan
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/005	Seaboard Villages H02	Attractive housing site; good road access; views over Moray Firth but understand is limited to 19 units.	
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/007	Seaboard Villages H03	Reasonably attractive housing site, although existing houses command views over the Moray Firth. Community Council suggested the MIR evening meeting that site may be required in the near future for the erection of a new school and playing fields as other local schools are expected to close due to falling school rolls.	
Seaboard Villages	Greg Hay(00377)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00377/1/001	Seaboard Villages H04	Support the non-preferred status of site H4 (and of the adjacent site H5). They should remain non-preferred for the foreseeable future and beyond. Stated reasons include the negative impact that the respondent considers an allocation for development would have on the value of existing semi-remote houses in the area (including their own) and on the ability to sell such existing properties.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/003	Seaboard Villages H04	Landowner of sites H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 notes these are the only new proposed sites around the existing villages boundary. Considers that after presenting vision for these sites to attendees of the MIR evening workshop there appeared to be consensus for supporting development on these sites, particularly H7 and H8 and in respect of smaller developments at H4, H5 and H6. Considers that Community Councillors present who had initial concerns about these sites, due to a fear of mass development, we're reassured that large scale development would not take place and that the landowner is simply responding to real demand for housing sites in the villages. No intention of selling to a developer for inappropriate housing but would welcome opportunity to consider options for making use of land owned around the villages which would have a positive impact on the community. Respondent is constantly approached by locals who wish to build their own house, clear there is a real lack of the type of housing local desire. Wishes the amended boundaries and uses explained in representation be included within the village boundary as they provide the villages with suitable alternatives to the limited selection currently on offer and provide a growth opportunity in terms of enhancing the viability of local facilities. No prime agricultural land will be lost and historic and natural assets will not be compromised.	Allocation amended housing and mixed use sites at H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 in Proposed Plan
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/010	Seaboard Villages H04	Wishes to reduce area considered for housing as shown on enclosed map. Considers this to be the most appropriate location for housing.	Allocation of amended area for housing in Proposed Plan
Seaboard Villages	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/045	Seaboard Villages H04	Historic Scotland (HS) welcome the recognition within the Main Issues Report of the potential significant impacts associated with this housing allocation on the scheduled monument Hilton of Cadboll, chapel 500m NNW of (Index no. 90320) (also a Property in Care of Scottish Ministers). In light of this HS welcome that the allocation is not preferred by the Council.	
Seaboard Villages	Greg Hay(00377)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00377/1/002	Seaboard Villages H05	Support the non-preferred status of site H5 (and of the adjacent site H4). They should remain non-preferred for the foreseeable future and beyond. Stated reasons include the negative impact that the respondent considers an allocation for development would have on the value of existing semi-remote houses in the area (including their own) and on the ability to sell such existing properties.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/003	Seaboard Villages H05	Landowner of sites H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 notes these are the only new proposed sites around the existing villages boundary. Considers that after presenting vision for these sites to attendees of the MIR evening workshop there appeared to be consensus for supporting development on these sites, particularly H7 and H8 and in respect of smaller developments at H4, H5 and H6. Considers that Community Councillors present who had initial concerns about these sites, due to a fear of mass development, we're reassured that large scale development would not take place and that the landowner is simply responding to real demand for housing sites in the villages. No intention of selling to a developer for inappropriate housing but would welcome opportunity to consider options for making use of land owned around the villages which would have a positive impact on the community. Respondent is constantly approached by locals who wish to build their own house, clear there is a real lack of the type of housing local desire. Wishes the amended boundaries and uses explained in representation be included within the village boundary as they provide the villages with suitable alternatives to the limited selection currently on offer and provide a growth opportunity in terms of enhancing the viability of local facilities. No prime agricultural land will be lost and historic and natural assets will not be compromised.	Allocation amended housing and mixed use sites at H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 in Proposed Plan
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/011	Seaboard Villages H05	Wishes to reduce area considered for housing as shown on enclosed map. Seeking limited extension to existing group of dwelling houses similar to many other groups of housing in the area, for example Rockfield, Bogbain Road, Cadboll Road etc.	Allocation of amended area for housing in the Proposed Plan.
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/003	Seaboard Villages H06	Landowner of sites H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 notes these are the only new proposed sites around the existing villages boundary. Considers that after presenting vision for these sites to attendees of the MIR evening workshop there appeared to be consensus for supporting development on these sites, particularly H7 and H8 and in respect of smaller developments at H4, H5 and H6. Considers that Community Councillors present who had initial concerns about these sites, due to a fear of mass development, we're reassured that large scale development would not take place and that the landowner is simply responding to real demand for housing sites in the villages. No intention of selling to a developer for inappropriate housing but would welcome opportunity to consider options for making use of land owned around the villages which would have a positive impact on the community. Respondent is constantly approached by locals who wish to build their own house, clear there is a real lack of the type of housing local desire. Wishes the amended boundaries and uses explained in representation be included within the village boundary as they provide the villages with suitable alternatives to the limited selection currently on offer and provide a growth opportunity in terms of enhancing the viability of local facilities. No prime agricultural land will be lost and historic and natural assets will not be compromised.	Allocation amended housing and mixed use sites at H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 in Proposed Plan

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/012	Seaboard Villages H06	Wishes H6 to be considered for mixed use with potential for housing and business development. Business use would be appropriate as a warehouse used by Glenmorangie distillery lies adjacent to the site and the site is enclosed by woodland to the north and east. Community Councillors at MIR evening meeting indicated they would be in favour of small business development which could create local employment opportunities. Area shown on enclosed map.	Change of Use of allocation of H6 for mixed use comprising housing and business development in Proposed Plan.
Seaboard Villages	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/008	Seaboard Villages H07	Supports non-preference of sites H7 and H8. Questions whether this expansion of settlement is practical or required. Also questions why oil pipeline is not a concern. Would interfere with views to the open sea.	
Seaboard Villages	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/242	Seaboard Villages H07	SEPA do 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 to ensure the site is not flooded from the west. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. Watercourse appears to be contained, but if did flood would be onto a downward sloping site. Without an assessment it is difficult to assess the risk.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/003	Seaboard Villages H07	Landowner of sites H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 notes these are the only new proposed sites around the existing villages boundary. Considers that after presenting vision for these sites to attendees of the MIR evening workshop there appeared to be consensus for supporting development on these sites, particularly H7 and H8 and in respect of smaller developments at H4, H5 and H6. Considers that Community Councillors present who had initial concerns about these sites, due to a fear of mass development, we're reassured that large scale development would not take place and that the landowner is simply responding to real demand for housing sites in the villages. No intention of selling to a developer for inappropriate housing but would welcome opportunity to consider options for making use of land owned around the villages which would have a positive impact on the community. Respondent is constantly approached by locals who wish to build their own house, clear there is a real lack of the type of housing local desire. Wishes the amended boundaries and uses explained in representation be included within the village boundary as they provide the villages with suitable alternatives to the limited selection currently on offer and provide a growth opportunity in terms of enhancing the viability of local facilities. No prime agricultural land will be lost and historic and natural assets will not be compromised.	Allocation amended housing and mixed use sites at H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 in Proposed Plan
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/013	Seaboard Villages H07	Wishes area of site to be reduced and considered for mixed use rather than solely housing. Flat site of marginal agricultural quality. Notes Community Councillors supported the site at the MIR evening meeting. Amended site area to leave a good corridor of vision from the road to the Pictish Cross Slab.	Change of Use of allocation to amend site H7 for mixed use in the Proposed Plan.
Seaboard Villages	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/008	Seaboard Villages H08	Supports non-preference of sites H7 and H8. Questions whether this expansion of settlement is practical or required. Also questions why oil pipeline is not a concern. Would interfere with views to the open sea.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Seaboard Villages	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/243	Seaboard Villages H08	SEPA do 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. The watercourse possibly could be dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in the vicinity of the watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. Topographical survey to compare site to Coastal Flood level of 3.28m AOD.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/003	Seaboard Villages H08	Landowner of sites H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 notes these are the only new proposed sites around the existing villages boundary. Considers that after presenting vision for these sites to attendees of the MIR evening workshop there appeared to be consensus for supporting development on these sites, particularly H7 and H8 and in respect of smaller developments at H4, H5 and H6. Considers that Community Councillors present who had initial concerns about these sites, due to a fear of mass development, we're reassured that large scale development would not take place and that the landowner is simply responding to real demand for housing sites in the villages. No intention of selling to a developer for inappropriate housing but would welcome opportunity to consider options for making use of land owned around the villages which would have a positive impact on the community. Respondent is constantly approached by locals who wish to build their own house, clear there is a real lack of the type of housing local desire. Wishes the amended boundaries and uses explained in representation be included within the village boundary as they provide the villages with suitable alternatives to the limited selection currently on offer and provide a growth opportunity in terms of enhancing the viability of local facilities. No prime agricultural land will be lost and historic and natural assets will not be compromised.	Allocation amended housing and mixed use sites at H4, H5, H6, H7 and H8 in Proposed Plan
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/014	Seaboard Villages H08	Wishes to split site into two areas as shown on enclosed map. Proposes H8a should remain in agricultural use. Proposes the villages boundary should be extended to include H8b to allow for housing or holiday home development as it follows the natural spread of the existing settlement along the coastline. The site currently has two dilapidated properties and an abandoned quarry; sensitive development of this area would improve the current state of the site and create an attractive addition to the villages.	Allocation of amended H8 for housing in the Proposed Plan
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/006	Seaboard Villages MU01	Community Council support small business development on this site to complement existing business premises nearby and because it is within active travel distance of the villages. Consensus MU1 is not an attractive site for housing development.	Change use to Business/light industrial use
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/008	Seaboard Villages MU02	Large, useful site. However Community Council suggested the landowner does not want to release the site for development. Unavailability of the site will considerably reduce availability of new housing in the villages.	
Seaboard Villages	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/009	Seaboard Villages MU03	Assume respondent supports MU3. Questions where oil pipeline is.	Show oil pipeline .
Seaboard Villages	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/244	Seaboard Villages MU03	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. The watercourse possibly could be dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in the vicinity of the watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. Topographical survey to compare to Coastal Flood level of 3.28m AOD.	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
Seaboard Villages	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/009	Seaboard Villages MU03	Most ideally suited for quality housing development and/or holiday accommodation. Good access to main road, village and the beach.	
Strathpeffer	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/109	Strathpeffer General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for great crested newt species survey where development proposed close to water body.	Settlement-wide developer requirement for great crested newt species survey where development proposed close to water body.
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/001	Strathpeffer General	<p>Consider Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan allocation at Strath View which has now been built out was a poor allocation due to access and visual impacts, many of the houses remain empty after 4 years.</p> <p>Settlement boundary is replicated from Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan and does not represent the true village boundary.</p> <p>Concerned no consultation on village objectives has taken place, for example exploiting visitor potential. This requires that planning takes into account the setting of the village and its presentation to visitors.</p> <p>Interested in design that builds community. School and community represent progress but more remains to be done. Allocation of land at the top of the school playing field for children/youth activities would be a further step.</p> <p>Strathpeffer conservation area should be shown on all maps used for planning so that development that could visually compromise the area can be identified.</p> <p>Centre of Strathpeffer should remain within a clearly defined valley to allow it to retain its visual integrity. Limited expansion opportunities within Strathpeffer due to natural and built heritage constraints in all directions.</p> <p>Greater emphasis should be given to local employment opportunities in the plan rather than concentrating on housing requirements. Concerned Strathpeffer is becoming a commuter village.</p> <p>Significant drainage issues remain, must be addressed before additional development is supported.</p> <p>Loch Kinellan and Kinellan area on the edge of the village supports 20-25% of Slavonian Grebe which are a rare species. Note SNH and RSBP will comment.</p> <p>Consider additional retail space and approximately 50 car parking spaces are required in the village centre.</p> <p>Consider main requirement is for affordable housing, but this must be provided as part of private developments, good example is at Ardival Court.</p> <p>Interested in scheme of expansion that helped improve Park Terrace area of the village.</p>	<p>Allocate land at top end of school playing field for children/youth facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identify Strathpeffer Conservation Area on Proposed Plan map - overcome drainage issues before supporting additional development - allocate land for retail use in village centre - allocate land for approximately 50 parking spaces in village centre - expand Park Terrace area
Strathpeffer	The Castle Leod Maintenance Trustees(00607)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00607/2/002	Strathpeffer General	Note Strathpeffer Community Council stated at MIR evening workshop that they were interested in appropriate office/light industrial plans appropriately sited below the former rail station to employ village residents and increase retail opportunities in the village. Agents confirms concerned landowner, Cromartie Estate, would welcome, and promote a business/tourism/retail allocation within this area.	Allocation of land north of former rail station for business/tourism/retail use.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Strathpeffer	Andy Wilcox And Caroline Rham(00752)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00752/1/001	Strathpeffer General	Suggests new site at Kinellan Farmhouse for limited farm style housing as an expansion of site H2 and/or H6 because: part of the additional land will be required for road access (or at least pedestrian) connection between H2 and H6; part of it was allocated in the adopted local plan; the Category C listing of Kinellan Farmhouse isn't significant in that the listed features are visually separate from the suggested site; the site is a natural rounding off of the village boundary; water and sewerage connections can be made; the site is lower lying than surrounding development and therefore will not have any undue landscape or visual impact; no woodland will be affected by the site's development; no ransoms affect the site's development, and; the proposed siting, design and layout of the development will offer something more appropriate to Strathpeffer's architectural identity than volume builders standard housing schemes.	Expansion of H2 and/or H6 to include Kinellan Farm House.
Strathpeffer	Mr Charlie And Sonia Ramsay(00894)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00894/1/001	Strathpeffer General	Jamestown should be considered in the context of total housing capacity of Strathpeffer and Contin as it is 1.5 miles equidistant between the two villages. There is sufficient housing capacity within the two villages in relation to the services provided.	
Strathpeffer	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/107	Strathpeffer H01	Concerns about site because of proximity to semi-natural Inventory woodland and that road access to it would involve woodland loss. Cites national and THC policy protection for such woodland. Suggests alternative access routes should be considered. If not then over-riding public benefits should be demonstrated, alternatives ruled out, losses minimised, pre-determination surveys undertaken and high standard of compensatory planting.	Alternative access to site not involving woodland loss or developer requirements to minimise woodland loss for pre-determination surveys and high standard of compensatory planting.
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/003	Strathpeffer H01	Do not support H1 for housing development as currently presented for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable housing may not be provided on site; - Negative visual impact towards the Heights; - Lack of active travel connections; - If vehicular access is to be taken from a new access to the north would encourage; commuting and discourage community integration; - Green belt should be provided at top third of field to protect conservation area; and - Settlement boundary falls to the south of the Eagle Stone and not around H1. 	Non-allocation of H1 in Proposed Plan unless allocation is altered.
Strathpeffer	The Castle Leod Maintenance Trustees(00607)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00607/1/001	Strathpeffer H01	The landowner hopes that the access route (map provided) which has been subject of much work and negotiation with the Forestry Officer Robert Patton and which minimises adverse impact on the mature tree avenue will be referenced in the IMFLDP.	Reference to agreed access arrangement in Proposed Plan.
Strathpeffer	The Castle Leod Maintenance Trustees(00607)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00607/2/001	Strathpeffer H01	Note Strathpeffer Community raised concerns at MIR evening workshop that site would be developed for 'executive housing' with no alignment to local housing needs. Provided draft site layout illustrating site capacity of 40-50 units of a range of different house types including open space, therefore this is not the case. Request this is considered when providing individual site capacities in the Proposed Plan.	Allocation of H1 for 40-50 units in Proposed Plan
Strathpeffer	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/011	Strathpeffer H02	Comment that there may be significant natural heritage issues in terms of the potential impact on protected species.	Developer requirement mitigation text in Proposed Plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Strathpeffer	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/108	Strathpeffer H02	Concerns re proximity to protected species (Slavonian Grebe) breeding site (Loch Kinellan). Potential adverse effect on species via recreational disturbance and/or reduction in water quality. Believes there are other better alternative development sites within village and so site should not be retained and SDA should be drawn in at this location. If site retained suggests rigorous (HRA) check on its impacts and inclusion of resultant mitigation as developer requirements.	Non-retention of site option and SDA drawn in at this location. If site retained suggests rigorous (HRA) check on its impacts and inclusion of resultant mitigation as developer requirements.
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/004	Strathpeffer H02	Object to allocation of H2 for the following reasons: - setting of Loch Kinellan as a visitor resource is better protected by a green buffer between the village and the hamlet of Kinellan; - impact upon designated species; and - existing drainage issues need addressed.	Non-allocation of H2 in Proposed Plan unless reasons for objecting to site can be satisfied
Strathpeffer	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/245	Strathpeffer H02	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/005	Strathpeffer H03	Support allocation of H3 for housing as the low cost housing is well designed. Interested in detailed design of private housing on the site due to its prominence and potential impact upon the conservation area.	
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/006	Strathpeffer H04	Support Council's non-preference for housing development on H4. Site would have negative visual impact; existing access road in terms of width and visibility is inadequate and drainage is unsatisfactory.	
Strathpeffer	Mr Duncan MacGregor(01294)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01294/1/001	Strathpeffer H04	The landowner objects to the non preference of these sites for housing for the following reasons - it is their intention to provide affordable housing on these sites - the affordable housing in the village and help retain young families and help support the school - does not consider the impact on Castle Leod designed landscape to be an issue (it was not an issue with previous development in this area) - the sites are a continuation of previous development here - the sites already allocated all have access difficulties and so H4 and H5 should be considered as an alternative.	Allocation of H4 and H5 for housing in Proposed Plan.
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/007	Strathpeffer H05	Support Council's non-preference for housing development on H5. Site would have negative visual impact; existing access road in terms of width and visibility is inadequate and drainage is unsatisfactory.	
Strathpeffer	Mr Duncan MacGregor(01294)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01294/1/001	Strathpeffer H05	The landowner objects to the non preference of these sites for housing for the following reasons - it is their intention to provide affordable housing on these sites - the affordable housing in the village and help retain young families and help support the school - does not consider the impact on Castle Leod designed landscape to be an issue (it was not an issue with previous development in this area) - the sites are a continuation of previous development here - the sites already allocated all have access difficulties and so H4 and H5 should be considered as an alternative.	Allocation of H4 and H5 for housing in Proposed Plan.
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/008	Strathpeffer H06	Do not support housing development on H6 until drainage issues are addressed.	Non-allocation of H6 until drainage issues are addressed.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Strathpeffer	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/246	Strathpeffer H06	SEPA do not object. Can be dealt with as part of the drainage strategy for the site but will need careful consideration in conjunction with Highland Council.	
Strathpeffer	Mr Alastair Dunbar(01015)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01015/1/002	Strathpeffer H06	<p>Supports the Council's preference for housing development on H6 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close proximity to local facilities; - Minor landscape impact that can be mitigated; and - Any potential impact on Tree Preservation Order is not significant. <p>Notes there is a surface water drainage issue in Strathpeffer. However considers this is for Scottish Water for address and should not inhibit development.</p> <p>Consider allocation in RACE plan restricts capacity of site. Site capacity should be increased to allow for higher density development in the Proposed Plan to allow more sustainable use of land and flexibility for small or affordable homes.</p> <p>Considers the Council is making exceptionally unreasonable demands in return for use of a road verge at Kinellan Drive, to access this site and other beyond. Contradicts Local Plan that acknowledges the problem ransom strips can create in preventing viable delivery. Council being more reasonable about price of verge is hindering the delivery of much needed affordable housing.</p>	Increase site capacity in Proposed Plan (comapred to RACE)
Strathpeffer	Sheena Clark(00240)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00240/1/001	Strathpeffer H07	The Council indicates non-preference for the site. However the respondent, who is of the site owner (John P Clark Ltd), cites endorsement by the Council's TEC Services of the potential access improvements that development could provide opportunity for - a new and safer access into Jamestown on the west side in lieu of the existing access - and hopes this will find favour with the community.	Allocation of H7 in the Proposed Plan
Strathpeffer	Sheena Clark(00240)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00240/2/002	Strathpeffer H07	Propose changing the use of this site to "Mixed" commercial and residential usage, also proposing creating a new access road into the hamlet on the West-side. The development will include diversifying of existing agricultural business into an Educational Activity Centre, bringing employment to the local area and increasing the tourist footprint for Jamestown. We are also proposing zoning for residential use and which could (with a feasibility study) include affordable and other housing usage and a potential Residential Retirement Home, also happy to consider a reducing the size of the land zoned that would fit with the access road infrastructure.	Allocation of H7 for mixed commercial and residential use.
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/009	Strathpeffer H07	Support Council's non-preference for housing development on H7 as it is contrary to the preferred other settlements policy in the MIR; constitutes large scale housing development in the countryside and would be a highly intrusive and totally inappropriate expansion to Jamestown.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Strathpeffer	Simon Bates(00376)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00376/1/002	Strathpeffer H07	Support the non-preferred status of this site. There are other, preferred sites which relate better to the nearby settlement of Contin and provide adequate land supply to accommodate demand for growth. The non-preferred sites would be superfluous and would stretch infrastructure too far. This site is well outside any Settlement Boundary and has no support from the community of Jamestown. The landowners are understood to be interested now in promoting an alternative, mixed use, proposal but the ideas lack detail.	
Strathpeffer	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/192	Strathpeffer H07	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Strathpeffer	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/247	Strathpeffer H07	SEPA do not object. Could be dealt with by buffer or development set-back from watercourse. Not likely to affect significant area of site. No Flood Risk Assessment required provided development does not encroach on the watercourse or include crossings.	SEPA request development requirement for buffer or development set-back from watercourse.
Strathpeffer	Mr George Baxter Smith(00654)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00654/1/002	Strathpeffer H07	The respondent supports the Councils non preference of this site for housing. Respondent is concerned about the location of this proposal outwith the village and how it would integrate with the village, and that the "Potential for new safer vehicular access point to Jamestown" is not deliverable because this is considered to rely on land acquisition from 8 property owners.	
Strathpeffer	Mrs Pamela Bogan(00670)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00670/1/001	Strathpeffer H07	Supports the Council non-preference of H7 for the following reasons: - Jamestown is a unique Hamlet and should be retained as such, not a sprawling urban housing estate; - road infrastructure is already inadequate in terms of dangerous bends, visibility splays, lack of pavements, excessive traffic speeds (despite the introduction of a 40 mph limit) and road safety for children accessing school transport; - further saturation of housing would present further danger, be totally ludicrous and not in keeping with the area - would negatively impact those who have chosen to quite semi-rural lifestyle and would prove in later years to be a thorn in the Council's side	
Strathpeffer	Mr Charlie And Sonia Ramsay(00894)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00894/1/003	Strathpeffer H07	Supports Councils non-preference of H7 for the following reasons: - Jamestown is a sustainable community but it has no facilities so most movements are made by car. - Road safety. Proposals for a new road access do not address the sub standard internal road network and further development would exacerbate the already overloaded road infrastructure. - Mixed use may have a more significant visual impact on the landscape and detract from the juxtaposition of houses on the natural western boundary. Further development should be confined to main settlements of Contin and Stratpeffer where services and housing capacity exist.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Strathpeffer	Bob And Lynne Robertson(00978)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00978/1/001	Strathpeffer H07	Object to any development on site H7 in Jamestown. Consider that any proposals for the site would not contribute to the township for the following reasons: - would not blend into the landscape; - could not integrate into the settlement and would blot its outline; - amenities required to support new development would not allow new residents to integrate with the existing community; and - promises of improved footpath connections to Contin would be of little benefit as the existing community uses Strathpeffer as its main service centre so should not be used as a justification for development.	
Strathpeffer	Mr Colin Ross(01276)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01276/1/001	Strathpeffer H07	The respondent supports the Council's non preference of this site for housing for the following reasons - there is a burn that runs through the site adjacent to the dyke, and a seasonal burn on the west perimeter - it would have a negative impact on the public view into Jamestown - it would be loss of good agricultural land	
Strathpeffer	Ms Margaret Levy(01280)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01280/1/001	Strathpeffer H07	The respondent supports the Council's non preference of this site for housing for the following reasons - the road network is not sufficient and the proposed new access will not address the safety concerns of the road within jamestown - development should be directed to Contin or Strathpeffer where there are facilities	
Strathpeffer	F. Munro(01281)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01281/1/001	Strathpeffer H07	The respondent supports the Council's non preference of this site for housing for the following reasons - the road network within jamestown is insufficient - development should be directed to Strathpeffer and Contin where there are facilities	
Strathpeffer	Strathpeffer Community Council(00321)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00321/1/010	Strathpeffer B01	Support B1 for business/tourism development, has potential to give village commercial 'heart'. Welcome re-opening of station as visitor facility but more interested in appropriate office/light industrial plans which are sited below the station which might offer employment to village residents, and in increased retail opportunities that will bring people to the village.	
Strathpeffer	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/248	Strathpeffer B01	No Flood Risk Assessment required	
Strathpeffer	Mr Kit Bower(00754)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00754/1/005		The views of the community council on Strathpeffer are the same as this respondent.	Non allocation of H2 in Proposed Plan unless reasons for objecting to the site can be satisfied.
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/002	Tain General	More land should be identified for light industrial use.	Allocation of additional light industrial sites.
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/005	Tain General	Should consider a roundabout at Morangie Road junction onto the A9 in the interests of safety and to facilitate better access to future development in the area.	Inclusion of cross-settlement issue for improved road safety at Morangie Road/A9 Junction.
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/008	Tain General	Duthac House is due to become redundant; it should be identified for Community Use.	Allocate Duthac House for Community Use.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/009	Tain General	Assumed respondent objects to settlement boundary of Tain. Community Council is examining prospects for a wind project on 5Ha of fields (common good fund ownership) between the railway line and the coast at Blarliath; respondent suggested that it could be included within the settlement boundary.	Modify SDA to include area between Blarliath and the railway line for wind energy project.
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/012	Tain General	Appropriate land should be identified for a business/research and development park either potentially on the open triangular field on the west side of the by-pass opposite H1. The respondent has also discussed the open triangular field on the west side of the by-pass opposite H1with Glenmorangie Distillery and the respondent believes the distillery would be amenable to its consideration within the life of the proposed plan.	Allocation of new site on west side of by-pass for business use
Tain	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/029	Tain General	Development west of the A9 should be resisted.	Remove all allocations to west of A9.
Tain	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/017	Tain General	All the developments proposed within the Tain area should take access from the local road network. An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. It would be expected that existing junctions will be used to access the proposed sites.	Access strategy for Tain (including cumulative effect of development) should be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland
Tain	Balnagown Estate(00964)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/003	Tain General	Suggests that the East Ross Housing Market Area total housing land requirement should be apportioned between the main settlements in that area. Believes that Tain should accommodate 25% of that total equating to 277 units in the 2011-2015 period and 243 units in 2015-2020.	Settlement-specific housing land requirement targets for all major settlements including Tain.
Tain	Mr Henry Bowden(01309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01309/1/001	Tain General	Objects to any expansion of Tain beyond its existing developed boundaries and to H8 in particular because: there are ample development sites within existing boundaries; local opinion is against such expansion and this should be listened to; loss of private greenfield view, and; loss of residential amenity in terms of private garden space being overlooked by development of H8 site.	
Tain	MacDonald And Muir(01324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01324/1/003	Tain General	The owners of Glenmorangie Distillery seek the allocation of land adjacent to the distillery as an expansion safeguard along with land approved for warehouses for the following reasons - to ensure that there is sufficient land to meet future needs and accommodate future expansion proposals - to consolidate the position of the distillery in the local economy - because it is desirable for the land to be specifically allocated, rather than relying on Policy 41 of the HwLDP, and the wider countryside status of the land, as this is considered to set an unclear policy context for future expansion proposals	The owners of Glenmorangie Distillery seek the allocation of land adjacent to the distillery as an expansion safeguard along with land approved for warehouses
Tain	Mrs Suzanna Stone(00017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00017/5/004	Tain H01	The landowner therefore considers the development of these two sites provide housing in close proximity to an employment site would further support the principles of sustainable travel and integrated land use and that residents from these sites will be able to utilise tourist facilities that could be developed on the site.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	MacDonald And Muir(01324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01324/1/001	Tain H01	The landowner supports the Council's preference of this site for housing development for the following reasons - there is an extant planning permission for 66 houses - it is an effective site which meets with the Council's key development issues for Tain - it is a logical expansion site infilling between the A9, Morangie road, and existing settlement	
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/249	Tain H02	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA needs to consider small watercourse, culvert upstream and downstream of the site and must show there isn't an increased risk to downstream properties 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.
Tain	AWG Property Ltd(01246)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01246/1/001	Tain H02	The respondent supports the allocation of H2 for housing and has the following comments to make - the site has an extant planning permission for residential development and permission was recently granted for a revised access - AWG Property Ltd remain committed to delivering the site for housing in the very near future.	
Tain	Mrs Suzanna Stone(00017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00017/5/004	Tain H03	The landowner therefore considers the development of these two sites provide housing in close proximity to an employment site would further support the principles of sustainable travel and integrated land use and that residents from these sites will be able to utilise tourist facilities that could be developed on the site.	
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/007	Tain H03	Assumed respondent objects to site H3 on basis of deliverability as the site has been allocated for housing for many years.	Remove site.
Tain	Mr Denoon(00078)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00078/1/001	Tain H04	Supports the inclusion of land within his ownership being allocated as a housing site (RACE 17 site). There was permission for housing which only lapsed due to the current economic situation and the site is still advertised for sale. Considers that the site is within an easy walk of all local amenities and is closer to the secondary school than other supported housing sites. Also considers that this site would support use of the bus and train service due to its proximity to their stations and that this site would promote walking more than the other housing sites.	Include site 17 from RACE as a housing allocation.
Tain	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/009	Tain H04	Respondent supports preferred status of H4 and C4 but highlights that there are reasons for extending the boundary to increase the area of land for housing.	Extend the area allocated for Housing.
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/250	Tain H05	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA would need to consider partly culverted watercourse next to site (could investigate possibly opening it as part of the development but would need to show that the flood risk was not increased). A Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tain	Stuart Campbell(00264)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00264/1/001	Tain H06	Comments that development in Tain should be retained within the bypass - limiting what they consider to be 'urban sprawl' which does not provide as good access to the town centre.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/008	Tain H06	Supports the non-preferred status of the sites H6 and H7. The Council should view these as long term allocation in future plans.	
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/251	Tain H06	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA may be required if development is proposed close to the watercourse this could be adequately dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in vicinity of the watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tain	Balnagown Estate(00964)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00964/1/008	Tain H06	Opposes non-preferred of site because: there is a shortfall in the housing land requirement for Tain compared to the capacity of preferred sites and the addition of this site would provide choice and flexibility if preferred sites don't come forward; precedent for further development outwith A9 bypass already set; distance to town centre outwith active travel range but new commercial centre will be accessible, and; little visual impact from A9 compared to other similar alternatives and further planting could be incorporated into development.	Support for site in Proposed Plan for 80 dwellings at least as a longer term development site.
Tain	Stuart Campbell(00264)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00264/1/001	Tain H07	Comments that development in Tain should be retained within the bypass - limiting what they consider to be 'urban sprawl' which does not provide as good access to the town centre.	
Tain	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/008	Tain H07	Supports the non-preferred status of the sites H6 and H7. The Council should view these as long term allocation in future plans.	
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/252	Tain H07	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA may be required if development is proposed close to the watercourse this could be adequately dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in vicinity of the watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tain	Stuart Campbell(00264)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00264/1/001	Tain H08	Comments that development in Tain should be retained within the bypass - limiting what they consider to be 'urban sprawl' which does not provide as good access to the town centre.	
Tain	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/007	Tain H08	Respondent states that the site was subject to a failed attempt to create allotments and as a result should be removed from the Plan and the boundary be reduced. This will remove the potential for the site to be developed into housing as there is already a range of housing sites in Tain.	Removal of C2/H8 allocation from the IMF LDP and modification of SDA.
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/253	Tain H08	SEPA do not object. No Flood Risk Assessment required, but drainage will need careful consideration.	SEPA request reference to drainage being a key consideration for this site.
Tain	Mrs Maureen Butchard(01149)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01149/1/001	Tain H08	Supports the Council's non-preference for allocation H8 for housing as respondent is concerned development of the site will devalue her property which lies adjacent to the site.	
Tain	Mr Henry Bowden(01309)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01309/1/001	Tain H08	Objects to any expansion of Tain beyond its existing developed boundaries and to H8 in particular because: there are ample development sites within existing boundaries; local opinion is against such expansion and this should be listened to; loss of private greenfield view, and; loss of residential amenity in terms of private garden space being overlooked by development of H8 site.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	Stuart Campbell(00264)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00264/1/001	Tain H09	Comments that development in Tain should be retained within the bypass - limiting what they consider to be 'urban sprawl' which does not provide as good access to the town centre.	
Tain	Stuart Campbell(00264)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00264/1/002	Tain H09	As owners of the St Vincents farmhouse they have access rights here that cannot be given away by the farm owner.	
Tain	Mrs Kate Grant(00380)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00380/1/001	Tain H09	Supportive of non-preferred status of H9 and MU4 as they are premature to future requirements. Respondent farms the land and has a great interest in its future. All the land owned by the Council, including 90acres to the North of Tain, should be developed before H9/MU4.	Land owed by Highland Council to the North of Tain to be included in proposed plan.
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/254	Tain H09	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA may be required if development is proposed close to the watercourse this could be adequately dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in vicinity of the watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of the planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tain	Mr Mackenzie, Mrs Charlish, Mrs Leonard(00603)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00603/1/001	Tain H09	<p>Object to the non-inclusion of the site MU4 and suggest that this site could provide, in line with the need identified by the Community Council, for a new business/science technology park to take advantage of opportunities related to the Nigg Energy Park. We believe that this site would be ideal to meet the aspirations of the community in this respect.</p> <p>Factors pointing to Tain being a suitable location for providing support to the Nigg Energy Park include the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tain offers excellent local services and a historic environment which provide a strong foundation for growth; - it is the nearest significant population centre to Nigg and it should grow as a result of approval of an ASDA superstore and of a masterplan for housing development - it's situation beside the A9 and its rail connections make it well placed to develop as a location for business activities complementary to Nigg; - location of such activities at Tain would increase local employment opportunities and thus reduce the need to travel from the Easter Ross peninsula to Inverness and elsewhere. <p>This site offers several factors for supporting activities at the Nigg Energy Park including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it extends to 55 acres (22 ha.) and is large enough to accommodate a variety of uses - residential, commercial and community; - the north-east part of the site is adjacent to recent development by the Highland Housing Alliance and could be suitable for housing; - the main part of the site offers significant potential for business development of a high amenity, campus type. This could be eminently suitable for the Nigg related use envisaged by the Community Council; - it offers an excellent business environment with fine views, a southerly aspect 	Include MU4/H9 in the proposed plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>and the possibility of the use of renewable energy; - St Vincent is large enough to accommodate structural open space and parkland which could address community needs</p>	
<p>Tain</p>	<p>Mr Mackenzie, Mrs Charlish, Mrs Leonard(00603)</p>	<p>IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00603/2/001</p>	<p>Tain H09</p>	<p>PART 1</p> <p>Object to the Council's stated non-preference for these sites. Sites MU4 and H9 (land at St Vincent) should be allocated in the Proposed Plan in entirety, and development phased (plan provided). MU4 (part H9) is available in the short term; there are no burdens that prevent early release. H9 as represented in the MIR is misplaced; the short term housing opportunity extends significantly further west and the Proposed Plan should reflect that as part of the allocation of MU4 sought.</p> <p>Tain is a key centre, within the strategic growth corridor, close to future employment at Nigg, served by national road and rail and with identity and quality urban environment. The town is a natural focus for development, presents opportunity to reduce travel to work and absorb growth to sustain services.</p> <p>The land at St Vincent should be preferred as a mixed use site by virtue of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - its position in relation to future and longer term expansion; - potential to develop 22ha sufficient to accommodate residential, commercial and community uses; - established connections to the town and proximity of schools and health facilities; - potential to phase development with scope for access from four directions; - suitability of north-east part of site for housing, adjoining and linked to existing 	<p>Allocate MU4 for Mixed Use development, including an enlarged H9 as provision for housing development in the short term.</p>

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>housing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - main part of site having potential for business campus development; - fine views, southerly aspect and possible use of renewable energy; - large enough for structural open space and parkland which could address community needs, where an early commitment would enable a landscape structure to get underway; - a fine 19th century steading suitable for alternative use and a community focus; - its location adjoining a substantial land bank owned by The Highland Council; - that it is easily accessible from the A9 without generating external employment traffic within the town's tight network of streets. <p>CONTINUED IN PART 2</p>	
Tain	Mr Mackenzie, Mrs Charlish, Mrs Leonard(00603)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00603/2/002	Tain H09	<p>PART 2 (CONTINUED FROM PART 1)</p> <p>Economic Development - The land at St Vincent should be preferred to accommodate a new business or science and technology park which should meet the Community Council's desire for such a facility to take advantage of the prospective Nigg Energy Park. Scottish Planning Policy provides a context; a long term approach is needed in order to seize employment opportunities. Even if there is land available at other locations, including brownfield, this site has merits in terms of scale and location, is deliverable and would particularly suit high-tech business use.</p> <p>Housing - Land west of the bypass is without doubt a location for future development, given existing and planned development there. Sites MU4 and H9 provide opportunity to round off the settlement form, are discrete in terms of visibility and are attached by reservation of access to adjoining housing development. Other land, identified in the MIR as preferred, may not be available and in any case MU4 and H9 would restore better choice and balance in housing land across Tain. MU4 and H9 has been subject of earlier significant interest by the Highland Housing Alliance.</p> <p>Open Space - A recreation field could be provided as part of development, serving existing and future residents and helping to meet the Council's standards for open space provision in Tain.</p> <p>Conclusion - Whilst recognition of development potential of land at St Vincent</p>	Allocate MU4 for Mixed Use development, including an enlarged H9 as provision for housing development in the short term.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				within the MIR is to be welcomed, the above factors demonstrate the land not to be "premature to any future requirement" in respect of housing, business or open space. It should therefore be recognised as preferred and allocated in the Proposed Plan given its capacity for mixed use, locational advantage and the contribution development at St Vincent would make to the shape and structure of the town and its economic prospects.	
Tain	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/010	Tain MU01	Supports the mixed use allocation of MU1 but argues that the proposed access being taken from a new roundabout on Knockbreck Road is unfeasible in the current economic conditions and delaying construction. An alternative would be access from Seaforth Road for an early phase of development.	
Tain	Mr Leo Daly(01017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01017/1/001	Tain MU01	Respondent, acting for landowner, supports preferred status of MU1, MU2 and MU3 sites in Tain as: - the site is available for development - there is a current approved Masterplan for much for the sites	
Tain	ASDA Stores Limited(01070)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01070/1/002	Tain MU01	Supports identification of MU1 for housing, community and retail uses. Notes that 'investment in road access improvements required' is listed as a significant con in MIR, however the development of the supermarket will facilitate the construction of two roundabouts that will facilitate development of the remainder of the MU1 site.	
Tain	Mrs S.G.H. Stone(01179)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01179/1/001	Tain MU01	Respondent supports the allocation of these sites.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	Mrs Suzanna Stone(00017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00017/5/003	Tain MU02	<p>Respondent objects to the allocation of MU2 for development, because it is considered that MU1 and MU3 are sufficient and that MU2 in addition to these sites, is excessive and unjustified.</p> <p>The respondent considers that given the historic development rate within Tain with effective allocated sites it is considered that there is neither the need nor demand in Tain for scale of development proposed.</p> <p>The respondent also considers that MU2 does not direct growth to the most appropriate location as it is remote from the settlement and the services available in the town centre. Furthermore the respondent considers that there are no public transport services located within proximity to the site and that development would not therefore encourage active travel. The respondent considers this to be unsustainable and to contravene Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) which presumes against development that would increase reliance on the private car.</p> <p>Access to MU2 would be taken from an unclassified road. It is considered by the respondent that this road is narrow and not to be capable of accommodating the levels of traffic that would be generated. It is considered that the road network as it presently stands cannot support development of MU2 alongside the other allocations.</p> <p>Furthermore the respondent considers that the local primary schools of Knockbreak and Craighill are operating at over capacity and that forecasts show that neither can support development of MU2.</p> <p>The respondent also considers that the development of MU2 will extend Tain to the south which is considered not to be characteristic with development in Tain predominately being to the west of the settlement. It is considered that in doing so it will surround Knockbreak House on all sides by development thereby affecting its setting. Also the respondent is concerned that MU2 will result in the loss of prime quality agricultural land.</p>	Removal of MU2
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/003	Tain MU02	Business use at MU2 not considered appropriate if access can only be taken through existing/proposed residential areas due to limited access opportunities and lack of high visibility.	Removal of business from the mix of acceptable uses on the site if access is through residential development.
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/255	Tain MU02	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA may be required if development is proposed close to the watercourse this could be adequately dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in vicinity of the watercourse. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of the planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tain	Mr Leo Daly(01017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01017/1/001	Tain MU02	<p>Respondent, acting for landowner, supports preferred status of MU1, MU2 and MU3 sites in Tain as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site is available for development - there is a current approved Masterplan for much of the sites 	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	Mr Leo Daly(01017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01017/1/002	Tain MU02	<p>Respondent supports MU2 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does not suffer from flooding - only part of the site is prime agricultural land - existing woodland help to contain the site visually and screen from the A9 - A timber pole mounted power line passes through the northern part of the land. The setback or safeguarding distance is indicated on the Site Constraints plan. - The Highland Environmental Record indicates only the former Knockbreck Toll House, listed (Cat C(S)) within the site. This was formerly used as an office for the roads depot but has been vacant for a number of years. Consideration has been given to taking down and reconstructing the building on a more prominent site at the entrance to Tain and bringing it back into a beneficial use. - There are no other natural or cultural heritage features within the site. - The food park and other employment uses will offer local job opportunities. - Residential development will require compliance with the Council's affordable housing policies and make contributions towards improved education and public transport facilities. - Additional land for open space/recreation. - Enhance the southern approach to Tain especially if the former roads depot is brought back into use. - Located within 1.4 km of Tain town centre - Less than 1 km from the nearest primary school and 1.5 km from Tain Royal Academy. - Community, sports club, retail and office developments are proposed on other land at Knockbreck within 400 metres with potential to develop a network of paths connecting to these and existing uses. - A local bus service presently runs along the B9174 road close to the site. 	
Tain	Mrs S.G.H. Stone(01179)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01179/1/002	Tain MU02	<p>Respondent objects to the allocation of this site for development.</p> <p>Respondent considers the site unsuitable because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is inappropriate to develop on land south and east of the mussel beds to protect them from the possibility of pollution (and considers that previous planning applications have been refused on this basis) - of the impact it would have on Tain's main approach - it will not be a positive impact on Tain <p>Respondent objection is both personal and on behalf of the Tain & District Tourist Association which the respondent is vice chair of.</p> <p>Respondent has concerns about the Highland Council's insufficient community engagement on this site.</p>	Removal of site MU2
Tain	Mr Leo Daly(01017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01017/1/001	Tain MU03	<p>Respondent, acting for landowner, supports preferred status of MU1, MU2 and MU3 sites in Tain as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site is available for development - there is a current approved Masterplan for much for the sites 	
Tain	Mrs S.G.H. Stone(01179)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01179/1/001	Tain MU03	Respondent supports the allocation of these sites.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	Stuart Campbell(00264)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00264/1/001	Tain MU04	Comments that development in Tain should be retained within the bypass - limiting what they consider to be 'urban sprawl' which does not provide as good access to the town centre.	
Tain	Stuart Campbell(00264)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00264/1/002	Tain MU04	As owners of the St Vincents farmhouse they have access rights here that cannot be given away by the farm owner.	
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/004	Tain MU04	Assumed that respondent supports non-preference of site MU4. Business use at MU4 not considered appropriate if access can only be taken through existing/proposed residential areas due to limited access opportunities and lack of high visibility.	
Tain	Mrs Kate Grant(00380)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00380/1/001	Tain MU04	Supportive of non-preferred status of H9 and MU4 as they are premature to future requirements. Respondent farms the land and has a great interest in its future. All the land owned by the Council, including 90 acres to the North of Tain, should be developed before H9/MU4.	Inclusion of land owed by Highland Council to the North of Tain to be included in proposed plan.
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/256	Tain MU04	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. FRA may be required if development is proposed close to the watercourse this could be adequately dealt with by allocating greenspace or a buffer zone in vicinity of the watercourse Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of the planning application if close to the watercourse.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and possible requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.
Tain	Mr Mackenzie, Mrs Charlish, Mrs Leonard(00603)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00603/1/001	Tain MU04	<p>Object to the non-inclusion of the site MU4 and suggest that this site could provide, in line with the need identified by the Community Council, for a new business/science technology park to take advantage of opportunities related to the Nigg Energy Park. We believe that this site would be ideal to meet the aspirations of the community in this respect.</p> <p>Factors pointing to Tain being a suitable location for providing support to the Nigg Energy Park include the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tain offers excellent local services and a historic environment which provide a strong foundation for growth; - it is the nearest significant population centre to Nigg and it should grow as a result of approval of an ASDA superstore and of a masterplan for housing development - it's situation beside the A9 and its rail connections make it well placed to develop as a location for business activities complementary to Nigg; - location of such activities at Tain would increase local employment opportunities and thus reduce the need to travel from the Easter Ross peninsula to Inverness and elsewhere. <p>This site offers several factors for supporting activities at the Nigg Energy Park including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it extends to 55 acres (22 ha.) and is large enough to accommodate a variety of uses - residential, commercial and community; - the north-east part of the site is adjacent to recent development by the Highland Housing Alliance and could be suitable for housing; 	Include MU4/H9 in the proposed plan.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the main part of the site offers significant potential for business development of a high amenity, campus type. This could be eminently suitable for the Nigg related use envisaged by the Community Council; - it offers an excellent business environment with fine views, a southerly aspect and the possibility of the use of renewable energy; - St Vincent is large enough to accommodate structural open space and parkland which could address community needs 	
Tain	Mr Mackenzie, Mrs Charlish, Mrs Leonard(00603)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00603/2/001	Tain MU04	<p>PART 1</p> <p>Object to the Council's stated non-preference for these sites. Sites MU4 and H9 (land at St Vincent) should be allocated in the Proposed Plan in entirety, and development phased (plan provided). MU4 (part H9) is available in the short term; there are no burdens that prevent early release. H9 as represented in the MIR is misplaced; the short term housing opportunity extends significantly further west and the Proposed Plan should reflect that as part of the allocation of MU4 sought.</p> <p>Tain is a key centre, within the strategic growth corridor, close to future employment at Nigg, served by national road and rail and with identity and quality urban environment. The town is a natural focus for development, presents opportunity to reduce travel to work and absorb growth to sustain services.</p> <p>The land at St Vincent should be preferred as a mixed use site by virtue of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - its position in relation to future and longer term expansion; - potential to develop 22ha sufficient to accommodate residential, commercial and community uses; - established connections to the town and proximity of schools and health facilities; - potential to phase development with scope for access from four directions; - suitability of north-east part of site for housing, adjoining and linked to existing 	Allocate MU4 for Mixed Use development, including an enlarged H9 as provision for housing development in the short term.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>housing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - main part of site having potential for business campus development; - fine views, southerly aspect and possible use of renewable energy; - large enough for structural open space and parkland which could address community needs, where an early commitment would enable a landscape structure to get underway; - a fine 19th century steading suitable for alternative use and a community focus; - its location adjoining a substantial land bank owned by The Highland Council; - that it is easily accessible from the A9 without generating external employment traffic within the town's tight network of streets. <p>CONTINUED IN PART 2</p>	
Tain	Mr Mackenzie, Mrs Charlish, Mrs Leonard(00603)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00603/2/002	Tain MU04	<p>PART 2 (CONTINUED FROM PART 1)</p> <p>Economic Development - The land at St Vincent should be preferred to accommodate a new business or science and technology park which should meet the Community Council's desire for such a facility to take advantage of the prospective Nigg Energy Park. Scottish Planning Policy provides a context; a long term approach is needed in order to seize employment opportunities. Even if there is land available at other locations, including brownfield, this site has merits in terms of scale and location, is deliverable and would particularly suit high-tech business use.</p> <p>Housing - Land west of the bypass is without doubt a location for future development, given existing and planned development there. Sites MU4 and H9 provide opportunity to round off the settlement form, are discrete in terms of visibility and are attached by reservation of access to adjoining housing development. Other land, identified in the MIR as preferred, may not be available and in any case MU4 and H9 would restore better choice and balance in housing land across Tain. MU4 and H9 has been subject of earlier significant interest by the Highland Housing Alliance.</p> <p>Open Space - A recreation field could be provided as part of development, serving existing and future residents and helping to meet the Council's standards for open space provision in Tain.</p> <p>Conclusion - Whilst recognition of development potential of land at St Vincent</p>	Allocate MU4 for Mixed Use development, including an enlarged H9 as provision for housing development in the short term.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				<p>within the MIR is to be welcomed, the above factors demonstrate the land not to be "premature to any future requirement" in respect of housing, business or open space. It should therefore be recognised as preferred and allocated in the Proposed Plan given its capacity for mixed use, locational advantage and the contribution development at St Vincent would make to the shape and structure of the town and its economic prospects.</p>	
Tain	Mrs Suzanna Stone(00017)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00017/5/002	Tain B01	<p>The Landowner supports the Councils preference of B1 within the IMFLDP.</p> <p>The landowner considers that B1 is ideally located to accommodate high quality business and tourism use with the Blairliath Industrial Estate lying to the south east of the site and with B1 is well located to accommodate expansion of this industrial estate. Furthermore B1 lies in close proximity to the A9 which provides access to the north and south of Tain. It is therefore considered to be well placed to take advantage of this road link.</p> <p>The landowner considers B1 is well placed to take advantage of access to and from the site by a variety of sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling and public transport and that B1 therefore supports sustainable travel and guidance contained within Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) which endorses sustainable development such as this. Furthermore B1 is bound to the south by H3 and to the south west by H1.</p>	
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/001	Tain B01	<p>Appropriate land should be identified for a business/research and development park either on B1.</p> <p>Following discussions between the Community Council and Glenmorangie Distillery the respondent believes that the distillery has plans for the whole field identified as B1 therefore the need to identify additional business land is essential.</p>	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tain	Mrs S.G.H. Stone(01179)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01179/1/001	Tain B01	Respondent supports the allocation of these sites.	
Tain	MacDonald And Muir(01324)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01324/1/002	Tain B01	The landowner supports the Council's preference of this site for business development considering this to be a logical site for expansion of existing commercial facilities including small supermarket and a garden centre and leading onto the Shore Road Industrial Estate.	
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/257	Tain C01	SEPA do not object. No Flood Risk Assessment required, but drainage will need careful consideration.	SEPA request reference to drainage being a key consideration for this site.
Tain	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/007	Tain C02	Respondent states that the site was subject to a failed attempt to create allotments and as a result should be removed from the Plan and the boundary be reduced. This will remove the potential for the site to be developed into housing as there is already a range of housing sites in Tain.	Removal of C2/H8 allocation from the IMF LDP and modification of SDA.
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/258	Tain C02	SEPA do not object, but drainage will need careful consideration.	SEPA request reference to drainage being a key consideration for this site.
Tain	Mr Steve Simpson(01224)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01224/1/001	Tain C02	Respondent objects to this site being preferred for community uses for the following reasons - the allotments proposal is no longer deemed viable - there are alternative sites available within existing Tain boundary (please double check my interpretation of this representation as it was difficult to read)	Remove allocation.
Tain	Mr Denoon(00078)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00078/1/001	Tain C04	Supports the inclusion of land within his ownership being allocated as a housing site (RACE 17 site). There was permission for housing which only lapsed due to the current economic situation and the site is still advertised for sale. Considers that the site is within an easy walk of all local amenities and is closer to the secondary school than other supported housing sites. Also considers that this site would support use of the bus and train service due to its proximity to their stations and that this site would promote walking more than the other housing sites.	Include site 17 from RACE as a housing allocation.
Tain	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/006	Tain C04	Respondent thinks C4 is an error as only the north-east part of it is earmarked for cemetery use. There is a lapsed residential planning permission on the remainder of the site. C4 should be a housing site.	Allocation of C4 as a housing site
Tain	Albyn Housing Society Ltd(00419)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00419/1/009	Tain C04	Respondent supports preferred status of H4 and C4 but highlights that there are reasons for extending the boundary to increase the area of land for housing.	Extend the area allocated for Housing.
Tain	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/259	Tain C04	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Small watercourse to the south which is culverted. Opposite side of the road so it may not be an issue but basic FRA could be submitted to ensure no overland flow issues. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	Flood Risk Assessment Required to support any planning application on the site.
Tore	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/110	Tore General	Requests settlement-wide developer requirement for great crested newt species survey where development proposed close to water body.	Settlement-wide developer requirement for great crested newt species survey where development proposed close to water body.
Tore	Killlearnan Community Council(00297)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00297/2/002	Tore General	Respondent supports the items listed under Key Development Issues for Tore .	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/030	Tore General	Development here requires proper masterplanning to ensure that there is a viable settlement where people can live, work and shop rather than continuation of the current sporadic development.	
Tore	Mr Torquil Fraser(00617)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00617/1/001	Tore General	<p>Suggests the fruit farm they own at Ryfield (shown on map) should be considered for housing including affordable housing development (50-70 houses+), retail, community, and open space.</p> <p>They have submitted a Call for Sites form, the key details of which are provided here.</p> <p>Suggests Ryefield farm has good access to A9 from south east and there are good bus routes running past Tore. If there is sufficient critical mass then connection to public sewer would be Muir of Ord or North Kessock.</p> <p>Suggests that there are no valuable trees or heritage features, and that the development would allow for better foul drainage and perhaps a playing field and larger school.</p> <p>Considers the site has easy access to public transport (bus) and has the cycle path link to Dingwall and Inverness.</p> <p>Suggests that the land has good bore hole water temperature for ground source heat pumps, is south facing for solar gain and panels, and that tree planting could achieve shelter from wind.</p> <p>The site has a farm shop and a tourist bunkhouse and is currently in agricultural use (fruit farm) but is not prime land.</p> <p>There is a small burn onsite but this is unlikely to need channelled, and only minor contouring of landform is envisaged.</p> <p>Considers that it may provide opportunities to improve the green network and new paths could be created to link with the Black Isle Pathway.</p>	Seeks inclusion of the fruit farm they own at Ryfield (shown on map) for housing, retail, community, open space, and affordable housing development (50-70 houses+).
Tore	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/018	Tore General	An appropriate access strategy taking into account the cumulative impact of the various development opportunities and in particular the impact to Tore Roundabout needs to be established and the effects discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland.	Discuss and agree an access strategy with Scottish Government.
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/260	Tore H01	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. There is a record (LA biannual report) that culvert blocks and flooding of the field has occurred previously. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application. A FRA would consider the culverts both upstream and downstream of the site.	SEPA seek developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application that considers the culverts both upstream and downstream of the site.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/261	Tore H02	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA consider that there are strong land-use planning grounds for ensuring that connection to public sewer is secured through the planning process. As stated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, Tore suffers from very poor ground conditions and there are existing pollution problems associated with current proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore. As was demonstrated by the evidence presented by SEPA at the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, there is a risk that development of private foul drainage systems in a village environment will lead in the future to damage to the water environment caused by failures to maintain these private systems. Therefore whilst this individual private foul drainage system may, if operated and maintained correctly, meet the requirements of the environmental legislation, the proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore is unsustainable and poses unacceptable long term risks to the water environment and public health. It is in the interests of developers and the environment to ensure that whenever possible connection to public sewer is made and separate private discharges which undermine the increasing need for improvements to the existing collecting system within the whole of Tore are avoided. Continuing to permit the construction of discrete private foul drainage systems will undermine the demand for a coherent collecting system serving the whole of Tore which may, in the longer term, constrain development in Tore. The most likely solution for treating sewage from a large population would be a long pipe to the Moray Firth. Scottish Water should be consulted to ascertain a long term solution for Tore is allocations are proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text requiring the provision for a sewer drainage solution to serve the whole of Tore.
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/262	Tore H03	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA consider that there are strong land-use planning grounds for ensuring that connection to public sewer is secured through the planning process. As stated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, Tore suffers from very poor ground conditions and there are existing pollution problems associated with current proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore. As was demonstrated by the evidence presented by SEPA at the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, there is a risk that development of private foul drainage systems in a village environment will lead in the future to damage to the water environment caused by failures to maintain these private systems. Therefore whilst this individual private foul drainage system may, if operated and maintained correctly, meet the requirements of the environmental legislation, the proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore is unsustainable and poses unacceptable long term risks to the water environment and public health. It is in the interests of developers and the environment to ensure that whenever possible connection to public sewer is made and separate private discharges which undermine the increasing need for improvements to the existing collecting system within the whole of Tore are avoided. Continuing to permit the construction of discrete private foul drainage systems will undermine the demand for a coherent collecting system serving the whole of Tore which may, in the longer term, constrain development in Tore.	SEPA request insertion of text requiring the provision for a sewer drainage solution to serve the whole of Tore.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Allangrange Farming Company Limited(01063)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01063/1/001	Tore H03	Development Interest objects to non-preference of site H3 and would like H3 included within Tore settlement boundary for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would have limited visual impact - would round off existing housing group (7 houses) in the area - sits well within the existing development pattern being similar in spacing, scale and density of Tore which is a dispersed rural settlement - already a number of settlements located along the old road to North Kessock - Industrial uses are proposed on an adjacent site indicating an expansion of the village in this direction - lack of pedestrian links and public transport are not unusual for a dispersed rural settlement. Distances from H3 to community facilities are not great - existing Tore burial ground is located further from the core of Tore than H3. 	Development interest seeks allocation of this site for housing.
Tore	Killlearnan Community Council(00297)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00297/2/005	Tore MU01	Supports MU1 for major development, but only in principle. Respondent is not convinced that future development of the site will benefit the existing settlement and the community. Due to the location of the roundabout and associated road network, there are existing pedestrian and road safety issues in and around Tore. Any future development could be one way to incorporate necessary improvements in safety infrastructure for all sections of the village and the need for a park and ride facility.	Retention of site but developer requirements for village wide safety improvements, park and ride facility and mix of uses to clearly demonstrate net benefit to the community.
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/264	Tore MU01	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA consider that there are strong land-use planning grounds for ensuring that connection to public sewer is secured through the planning process. As stated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, Tore suffers from very poor ground conditions and there are existing pollution problems associated with current proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore. As was demonstrated by the evidence presented by SEPA at the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, there is a risk that development of private foul drainage systems in a village environment will lead in the future to damage to the water environment caused by failures to maintain these private systems. Therefore whilst this individual private foul drainage system may, if operated and maintained correctly, meet the requirements of the environmental legislation, the proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore is unsustainable and poses unacceptable long term risks to the water environment and public health. It is in the interests of developers and the environment to ensure that whenever possible connection to public sewer is made and separate private discharges which undermine the increasing need for improvements to the existing collecting system within the whole of Tore are avoided. Continuing to permit the construction of discrete private foul drainage systems will undermine the demand for a coherent collecting system serving the whole of Tore which may, in the longer term, constrain development in Tore. The most likely solution for treating sewage from a large population would be a long pipe to the Moray Firth. Scottish Water should be consulted to ascertain a long term solution for Tore is allocations are proposed. Big Burn runs along the boundary of and through the site.	SEPA request insertion of text requiring the provision for a sewer drainage solution to serve the whole of Tore.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/265	Tore MU01	PART 2 of SEPA comment on MU1. The water body is at good status for morphology but is very close to the moderate boundary. The main pressure used in classification is low impact realignment. It is likely that at least some of the low impact realignment is actually high impact realignment. This means that the true classification is probably less than good for morphology. A full water body survey would be needed to confirm this. The section of burn along the boundary has both clearly been historically realigned so would be a potential restoration site. Restoration or at least space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. This is likely to require quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also a number of other historically straightened and potentially culverted minor watercourses running through the site and a lochan. De-culverting should be requested and space allowed for restoration and development of future natural processes on these. Could be addressed through appropriate layout avoiding low lying areas and adequate drainage measures. FRA may be required if development encroaches onto watercourses. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application if proposals near watercourse.	SEPA seek developer requirements for possible FRA (depending on vicinity of proposed development to watercourses) and for water body surveys with requirement for de culverting, restoration, or at least space for restoration and allowance for future natural processes..
Tore	Mr Torquil Fraser(00617)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00617/1/002	Tore MU01	Concerned about the business impact on their adjacent fruit farm, farm shop, pick your own and bunkhouse business from development of MU1.	Objects to MU1 if their fruit farm is not allocated for housing including affordable housing, retail, community, and open space.
Tore	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/9/001	Tore MU01	Supports the preference for MU1 to be allocated for mixed use . Considers mixed uses should include housing, business, industrial, commercial, education, community hall, playing field and other community uses. Purpose of development is to create a more sustainable community in terms of local jobs and services. As such pre-requisites for development are as follows: - New public drainage system; - New community primary school and playing field on east side of A9; - Enhanced public transport; and - Creation of improved pedestrian links, in particular a footbridge over the A9 from the west side - Improvement of the A832 eastern approach to the Tore roundabout, with a new approach bypassing the existing eastern part of the village and the existing approach stopped up; - Submission of a Transport Assessment; - Most likely a masterplan approach involving the three principle landowners of MU1, any other landowners of allocated land, and the wider community; - Ground conditions and lack of suitable water courses locally would not allow development of on-site foul drainage arrangements. It is considered that with sufficient critical mass (the allocation of MU2) effluent could be piped to the public WWTW serving Muir of Ord and Beauly, which currently has capacity for 580 house unit equivalents.	Allocation of this site.
Tore	Killlearnan Community Council(00297)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00297/2/006	Tore MU02	Supports non-preference of MU2.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/274	Tore MU02	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA consider that there are strong land-use planning grounds for ensuring that connection to public sewer is secured through the planning process. As stated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, Tore suffers from very poor ground conditions and there are existing pollution problems associated with current proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore. As was demonstrated by the evidence presented by SEPA at the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, there is a risk that development of private foul drainage systems in a village environment will lead in the future to damage to the water environment caused by failures to maintain these private systems. Therefore whilst this individual private foul drainage system may, if operated and maintained correctly, meet the requirements of the environmental legislation, the proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore is unsustainable and poses unacceptable long term risks to the water environment and public health. It is in the interests of developers and the environment to ensure that whenever possible connection to public sewer is made and separate private discharges which undermine the increasing need for improvements to the existing collecting system within the whole of Tore are avoided. Continuing to permit the construction of discrete private foul drainage systems will undermine the demand for a coherent collecting system serving the whole of Tore which may, in the longer term, constrain development in Tore. The most likely solution for treating sewage from a large population would be a long pipe to the Moray Firth. Scottish Water should be consulted to ascertain a long term solution for Tore is allocations are proposed. Big Burn runs along the boundary of and through the site.	SEPA request insertion of text requiring the provision for a sewer drainage solution to serve the whole of Tore.
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/275	Tore MU02	PART 2 of SEPA comment on site. The water body is at good status for morphology but is very close to the moderate boundary. The main pressure used in classification is low impact realignment. It is likely that at least some of the low impact realignment is actually high impact realignment. This means that the true classification is probably less than good for morphology. A full water body survey would be needed to confirm this. The section of burn along the boundary has both clearly been historically realigned so would be a potential restoration site. Restoration or at least space for future restoration and allowance for future natural processes must be allowed for in the development. This is likely to require quite a bit of morphological assessment. There is also a number of other historically straightened and potentially culverted minor watercourses running through the site and a lochan. De-culverting should be requested and space allowed for restoration and development of future natural processes on these. Could be addressed through appropriate layout avoiding low lying areas and adequate drainage measures. FRA may be required if development encroaches onto watercourses. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of planning application if proposals near watercourse.	SEPA seek developer requirement for possible Flood Risk Assessment and for de-culverting and space allowance for natural processes to occur.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Broadland Properties Ltd(01197)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01197/9/002	Tore MU02	<p>Objects to the non preference of MU2 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - as the only difference between MU1 and 2 is public transport connections and MU2 being for longer term; - to allow proper planning of the wider site including structure planting, drainage and new access to the A9 - to help justify the first time waste water treatment provision - or provide sufficient critical mass to enable effluent to be piped to the public WWTW in Muir of Ord and Beaully; - to enable development based on a design concept which could see the village as a commercial focus, other employment generating focal points, and a choice of housing; - to help meet Black Isle housing requirement in medium to long term (with ownership constraints particularly over H2); - given industrial site I2 has little support from the community and is non preferred, and lack of activity on I1. <p>Purpose of development is to create a more sustainable community in terms of local jobs and services. As such pre-requisites for development are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new public drainage system; - new community primary school and playing field on east side of A9; - enhanced public transport; and - creation of improved pedestrian links, in particular a footbridge over the A9 from the west side - improvement of the A832 eastern approach to the roundabout, with a new approach bypassing the existing eastern part of the village and the existing approach stopped up; - submission of a Transport Assessment; - most likely a masterplan approach involving the three principle landowners of MU1, any other landowners of allocated land, and the wider community; - ground conditions and lack of suitable water courses locally would not allow development of on-site foul drainage arrangements. It is considered that with sufficient critical mass (the allocation of MU2) effluent could be piped to the public WWTW serving Muir of Ord and Beaully, which currently has capacity for 580 house units. 	Seeks allocation of MU2 at least for longer term. .

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/263	Tore C01	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA consider that there are strong land-use planning grounds for ensuring that connection to public sewer is secured through the planning process. As stated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, Tore suffers from very poor ground conditions and there are existing pollution problems associated with current proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore. As was demonstrated by the evidence presented by SEPA at the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, there is a risk that development of private foul drainage systems in a village environment will lead in the future to damage to the water environment caused by failures to maintain these private systems. Therefore whilst this individual private foul drainage system may, if operated and maintained correctly, meet the requirements of the environmental legislation, the proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore is unsustainable and poses unacceptable long term risks to the water environment and public health. It is in the interests of developers and the environment to ensure that whenever possible connection to public sewer is made and separate private discharges which undermine the increasing need for improvements to the existing collecting system within the whole of Tore are avoided. Continuing to permit the construction of discrete private foul drainage systems will undermine the demand for a coherent collecting system serving the whole of Tore which may, in the longer term, constrain development in Tore. The most likely solution for treating sewage from a large population would be a long pipe to the Moray Firth. Scottish Water should be consulted to ascertain a long term solution for Tore is allocations are proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text requiring the provision for a sewer drainage solution to serve the whole of Tore.
Tore	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/111	Tore I01	Concerns about potential adverse effect on long established plantation origin Inventory woodland that covers part of site. Cites THC policy protection for such woodland. Suggests over-riding public benefits should be demonstrated, alternatives ruled out, losses minimised, pre-determination surveys undertaken and high standard of compensatory planting. Believes woodland fulfils important visual screen function to A9. Asserts MU1 site is a better alternative for the uses proposed.	Non-retention of site option. If not then developer requirements for losses to be minimised, pre-determination surveys undertaken and high standard of compensatory planting.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/273	Tore I01	<p>SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA consider that there are strong land-use planning grounds for ensuring that connection to public sewer is secured through the planning process. As stated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, Tore suffers from very poor ground conditions and there are existing pollution problems associated with current proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore. As was demonstrated by the evidence presented by SEPA at the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, there is a risk that development of private foul drainage systems in a village environment will lead in the future to damage to the water environment caused by failures to maintain these private systems. Therefore whilst this individual private foul drainage system may, if operated and maintained correctly, meet the requirements of the environmental legislation, the proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore is unsustainable and poses unacceptable long term risks to the water environment and public health. It is in the interests of developers and the environment to ensure that whenever possible connection to public sewer is made and separate private discharges which undermine the increasing need for improvements to the existing collecting system within the whole of Tore are avoided. Continuing to permit the construction of discrete private foul drainage systems will undermine the demand for a coherent collecting system serving the whole of Tore which may, in the longer term, constrain development in Tore. The most likely solution for treating sewage from a large population would be a long pipe to the Moray Firth. Scottish Water should be consulted to ascertain a long term solution for Tore is allocations are proposed.</p>	SEPA seek public sewer connection for any new development in Tore.
Tore	Jonathan And Alistair Martin(01057)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01057/1/001	Tore I01	<p>Comment from landowner of land to the south of I1, Tore Grain Mill and agricultural storage complex. Notes complex lies within I1, however concerned that boundary is too restrictive to allow the potential future expansion of the mill and the processing of by-products.</p> <p>Note site is described as being allocated in the RACE plan however, this is not correct as only the area of woodland lying north of the I1 label on the plan is currently allocated. Appears that an attempt has been made to link the Tore mill complex with the current allocation to bring it into the Tore Settlement Development Area, stretching it further away from the village centre.</p> <p>Consider it might be appropriate for the complex to be left in the open countryside and further development treated on its merits. However, if the Council feels that the site and land for its potential expansion should be included within the settlement development area with a specific boundary then it should take in more land to the south and south east side. Would give greater flexibility and also help reduce the potential impact on the amenity of existing houses.</p> <p>Where boundaries are drawn should be discussed with the owners of the mill complex and adjacent land to help ascertain any constraints and operational needs. Also need to include sufficient land to allow for suitable landscape buffering on the southern edge and between the A9 and developable land on the west side. Provides annotated aerial photograph of the area to illustrate</p>	Either expansion of I1 site to south and south east or removal of I1 from settlement development area.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
				points made and which shows that access to the suggested expansion area to north of the mill is blocked by development.	
Tore	Killearnan Community Council(00297)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00297/2/007	Tore I02	Respondent notes that I2 is outwith the settlement boundary. If the site was to be included the respondent would prefer to have it a mixed use rather than industrial use.	
Tore	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/266	Tore I02	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. SEPA consider that there are strong land-use planning grounds for ensuring that connection to public sewer is secured through the planning process. As stated in the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, Tore suffers from very poor ground conditions and there are existing pollution problems associated with current proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore. As was demonstrated by the evidence presented by SEPA at the Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, there is a risk that development of private foul drainage systems in a village environment will lead in the future to damage to the water environment caused by failures to maintain these private systems. Therefore whilst this individual private foul drainage system may, if operated and maintained correctly, meet the requirements of the environmental legislation, the proliferation of private foul drainage systems within Tore is unsustainable and poses unacceptable long term risks to the water environment and public health. It is in the interests of developers and the environment to ensure that whenever possible connection to public sewer is made and separate private discharges which undermine the increasing need for improvements to the existing collecting system within the whole of Tore are avoided. Continuing to permit the construction of discrete private foul drainage systems will undermine the demand for a coherent collecting system serving the whole of Tore which may, in the longer term, constrain development in Tore. The most likely solution for treating sewage from a large population would be a long pipe to the Moray Firth. Scottish Water should be consulted to ascertain a long term solution for Tore is allocations are proposed.	SEPA request insertion of text requiring the provision for a sewer drainage solution to serve the whole of Tore.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Nigg	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/012	Nigg General	Respondent states that the dark green area over Hill of Nigg designated as preferred open is welcomed as it identifies it as land not to be developed. However the open space referred to is actually non-preferred so assumed that respondent objects to this non-preference.	
Nigg	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/011	Nigg B01	The symbol used for the ferry at B1 is not in the key. Respondents questions if ferry will be run all year when Nigg Energy Park goes into full production. The ferry should be on a tourist route. Respondent would like it to be mentioned that B1 is an ideal point to observe cruise liners. The re-opening of the hotel is a private decision by the owner.	
Nigg	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/268	Nigg B01	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. This is a proposed ferry connection so would meet the exceptions of SPP. Basic topographic data provided only ferry development proposed and any buildings located outwith flood envelope.	SEPA request text inserted to Proposed Plan indicating that an assessment of flood risk and basic topographic data should be provided to support ferry proposals.
Nigg	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/112	Nigg I01	Requests re-statement of developer requirements from site policy within HwLDP and Nigg Masterplan to demonstrate HRA conformity. Also same site boundary as HwLDP should be used (especially to exclude the Inventory woodland close to Pitcalzean House and the Rosemarkie and Shandwick Coast SSSI). Species surveys should include reptiles.	Re-statement of developer requirements from site policy within HwLDP and Nigg Masterplan. Also same site boundary as HwLDP should be used. Requirement for species surveys should include reptiles.
Nigg	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/010	Nigg I01	Respondent objects to the boundary of I1. The industrial area as shown is too large. The boundary should: - only go up to the road on the west side. - On east side it should skirt the private properties on east side of road and houses and hotel at beach. - Should only go a short way up the road going to quarry and up to Pitcalzean House in a northern direction. - Boundary seems to have been drawn to include the quarry but from quarry to almost the B9175 there is a private road. The Council has no right to designate private houses, land and public roads as industrial.	Modification of the I1 boundary to reflect HwLDP
Nigg	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/267	Nigg I01	SEPA do not object provided the following developer requirements included in Proposed Plan. Development on lower areas are mostly at risk from coastal flooding and any mitigation needs to be proposed depending on type of development. On other parts of the site fluvial flood risk should be considered including any existing culverts. Extreme sea level information available on request. Flood Risk Assessment will be required in support of any planning application.	SEPA request insertion of text to indicate potential flood risk and requirement for Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
Nigg	St Francis Group(01081)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01081/1/001	Nigg I01	<p>Respondent, acting on behalf of St Francis Group, supports the preferred status of I1 in Nigg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Development Strategy in relation to the Council's option to support the delivery of an effective land supply for new business and industrial development. And the submission has demonstrated the land at Pitcalzean Farm is an effective site suitable to accommodate new business and industrial development. - Supports the opportunity to regenerate Nigg; improve access, create new jobs and deliver a major new investment to the Highlands. - Supports the Council's preference for I1 for industrial and business use at Nigg. And particularly welcomes the Council's positive assessment of the opportunity for the site to accommodate industry which has specialist large-scale space requirements, e.G. Renewable energy plant / components or mailers relating to decommissioning and subsea marine fabrication. - Respondent highlights the effectiveness of land at Pitcalzean Farm for future industrial and business development related to the Nigg Yard. This has been demonstrated through studies examining proximity to natural heritage interests; the visual impact of the proposed expansion and the physical capacity of the site to accommodate development characteristics and requirements of the offshore renewable industry. 	
Nigg	RSPB Scotland(01186)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01186/1/008	Nigg I01	RSPB consider that all mixed use and industrial sites within Nigg 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