

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Rolf Schmidt	North Kessock	2 How to use this website and make comments on this consultation >> 2.1	This map does not work
Mr Keith Urquhart	Special Landscape Areas	3 Suggested new or removing existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 3.1	Our comment relates to the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA. The IMFLDP Main Issues Report of Spring 2012 on page 11 identified in red suggested exclusions from this SLA. We strongly object to those exclusions as illogical as the landscape in those areas is the same as that of the surrounding SLA. The only motivation for excluding those areas appears to be the potential for allowing industrial windfarm development and their associated infrastructure, which will destroy the unspoilt wild nature of the SLA, and ruin the views from the shores of Lochindorb. The map on Page 11 of the MIR proposed preferred extension to the north of the SLA (shown in blue) and suggested extensions to the north and the south west of the SLA (shown in green). We support both the preferred and suggested extensions of the SLA set out in the MIR as appropriate and logical. With regard to Section 3 of the IMFLDP Additional Sites Consultation - at 3.4.9 the wording is unclear but there appears to be the suggestion that the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA should be removed. If that is a proposal to remove this whole SLA from its designation we strongly object to that suggestion and again believe that such a proposition can only stem from vested interest in a desire to introduce large scale industrial windfarms into this wild landscape area. As Section 3.1 states that these suggestions are "Non Preferred" we take it that the suggestion at 3.4.9 will be firmly resisted, and we support that.
Mr Archie Macnab	Special Landscape Areas	3 Suggested new or removing existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 3.3	Direct: 01463663478 E-mail: simon.allison@crofting.scotland.gov.uk Date: 27th June 2013 Dear Sirs PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: INNER MORAY FIRTH ALTERNATIVE SITES AND USES CONSULTATION Thank you for your consultation invitation on the proposed site inclusions and alternative site uses for the Inner Moray Firth local development plan. The Crofting Reform (Scotland) Act 2010 placed a duty on the Crofting Commission to produce a Plan which would set out policy to how the Commission would exercise its legislative functions. In the compiling of this Plan the Commission consulted with Local Authorities in crofting areas, HIE and other appropriate organisations / persons. It is envisaged the Plan will clearly explain the policy behind the Commission's regulatory decisions thus making the regulation of crofting understood more. Additionally, it is envisaged the Plan will guide planning authorities when considering development applications and in their drafting of Local Development Plans with regards to land under crofting tenure. The Crofting Commission in its decision-making remit as the crofting regulator regards crofts, common grazings and the crofting system as a precious and finite resource which must be both protected and nurtured for future generations. In consideration of an application to remove land from crofting tenure through the regulatory process of decrofting the Commission as part of its determination will take into account previous history of decrofting and division. Furthermore, the Commission will need to be satisfied that the extent of area applied for is appropriate in the context of the croft extent, location siting and the land quality of the proposed area. This is to ensure the furtherance of the practical working viability for the remaining area of land on the croft and the avoidance to necessitate the creation of long access road through the croft as a result of the location siting of the development being in the middle of the c
Mr Keith Urquhart	Special Landscape Areas	3 Suggested new or removing existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 3.4	With regard to Section 3 of the IMFLDP Additional Sites Consultation - at 3.4.9 the wording is unclear but there appears to be the suggestion that the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA should be removed. If that is a proposal to remove this whole SLA from its designation we strongly object to that suggestion and again believe that such a proposition can only stem from vested interest in a desire to introduce large scale industrial windfarms into this wild landscape area. As Section 3.1 states that these suggestions are "Non Preferred" we take it that the suggestion at 3.4.9 will be firmly resisted, and we support that.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Ms Hilda Hesling	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.4 SLA EXT 1 Suggested extensions to Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA >> 4.4.1	Schoolhouse, Abriachan, Inverness, IV3 8LB Email: hilda.hesling1066@btinternet.com ; tel 01463 861352 to: Highland Council, planning department (IMFLDP), Glenurquhart Road, Inverness June 30th 2013 Inverness West Community Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, response to online consultation, June 2013 suggested extension to the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig Special Landscape Area We write in response to the comments of Highland Council on the extension to the above SLA proposed by Inverness West Community Council and supported by Kiltarlity Community Council and a number of local residents (online comments). We attach our landscape response as a pdf in tabular form, together with some photographs to illustrate specific points: the 'intimate mix of landscape elements and changing visual interest' and 'smaller patches of higher amenity value woodland.' This was prepared by Caroline Stanton, CMLI, who has considerable experience in landscape designation, including working with John Richards on the Inverness and District Landscape Character Assessment and many other LCAs. We would also point out that the Loch Laide area in Abriachan was considered for designation as an AGLV in its own right in the 1991 Drumnadrochit and Fort Augustus Local Plan, and the Council's reason for this was because it 'offers a marked contrast to the open moorland which occupies the bulk of higher ground above Loch Ness.' We enclose a copy of the proposal. In addition we note that current Scottish Planning Policy 2010 recommends (para 140) that a purpose of local landscape designation be to 'safeguard and promote important settings for outdoor recreation and tourism locally', criteria which clearly apply to the well-trodden section of the Great Glen Way which passes through Caiplich, the walking and cycling paths of the Abriachan Forest Trust (30,000 visitors per annum) and the section of the A833 passing through Culnakirk and Glenconvinth, highly popular with cyclists. This is echoed
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.4 SLA EXT 1 Suggested extensions to Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA >> 4.4.1	We agree with the rationale for not including the new area suggested as extensions to this SLA.
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.4 SLA EXT 1 Suggested extensions to Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA >> 4.4.2	We agree with the rationale for not including the new area suggested as extensions to this SLA.
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.4 SLA EXT 1 Suggested extensions to Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA >> 4.4.3	We agree with the rationale for not including the new area suggested as extensions to this SLA.
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.5 SLA EXT 2 Suggested extension/contraction to Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA >> 4.5.1	We agree with the rationale for not extending the SLA to the east of Moy.
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.5 SLA EXT 2 Suggested extension/contraction to Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA >> 4.5.2	In some respects altering (reducing) the southern boundary to fit better with the extent of the National Park's boundary makes good sense. However there is a concern that without a clear methodology by which SLA boundaries were originally drawn up, then altering them also makes little sense. On the other hand this amendment won't make a huge difference to the protection of the area and tidies things up from a planning perspective.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Keith Urquhart	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.5 SLA EXT 2 Suggested extension/contraction to Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA >> 4.5.2	With regard to Section 4.5.2 we support the proposed slight amendment of the southern boundary of the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA to better accord with the line of the hill tops, and also support resisting any more substantial reduction for the reasons given that the landscape characteristics and special qualities of the SLA as mentioned are very much in evident within this southern area of open uplands.
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.6 SLA EXT 3 Suggested extensions to Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA >> 4.6.1	This SLA is about the variety that the Sutors themselves provide and a land based extension along the Black Isle would be at odds with the existing character of the Sutors and therefore we agree with the rationale for not including the new area suggested as extensions to this SLA.
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.6 SLA EXT 3 Suggested extensions to Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA >> 4.6.2	This SLA is about the variety that the Sutors themselves provide and a land based extension along the Black Isle would be at odds with the existing character of the Sutors and therefore we agree with the rationale for not including the new area suggested as extensions to this SLA.
Mr Andrew Brown	Special Landscape Areas	4 Contraction or extension of existing Special Landscape Areas (SLA) >> 4.6 SLA EXT 3 Suggested extensions to Sutors of Cromarty, Rosemarkie and Fort George SLA >> 4.6.3	We agree with the rationale for not including the new area suggested as extensions to this SLA.
Mr Norman And Christina Chisholm	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.3 HINT NS1 Non Preferred Suggested Contraction - North of Kildary, Easter Ross >> 5.3.1	Contraction in this location clearly cannot be properly justified in this case. Norman & Christina Chisholm The GlenKindeaceBy Invergordon IV18 0LL
Janet Scott	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr	This area has been subject to past local public inquiries and in the past Highland Council Road Dept have also warned against further development around the Tordarroch road. The Council proposal to retain the current hinterland boundary and consider this area under the Housing in the Countryside (Hinterland areas) policy is therefore the most appropriate for this locality.
Franz Brulisauer	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr	Dear Sir or Madam, creating a 'new development zone' south of Farr (HINT NS4) does not appear like a well-considered choice. The following points must be considered before progressing this idea:- A considerable amount of HINT NS4 is prone to flooding- A power line crosses this area with negative knock on effects on attractiveness for housing developments as well as healthy and safety implications during and after development- prehistoric ruins within and in ultimate vicinity of boundary might be negatively affected- rich wildlife in this area would be negatively impacted- there is no free capacity of current infrastructure, this in particular refers to local roads. Any new development would require extensive investments in new infrastructure driving up the costs disproportionately for the developmental potential 30.6.13, Franz Brulisauer, Armadale, Farr

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Stuart Paterson (Company Secretary)	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr	The changes proposing to shrink the hinterland boundary in favour of development would not be appropriate to School Wood which is part of an area managed by Strathnairn Community Woodlands to conserve, regenerate and promote the restoration of predominantly native woodlands in the geographical area of Strathnairn. The wood is as an important part of Scotland's native environment that is being developed for the benefit of the public. During the consultation for the purchase of Milton Wood and School Wood the community expressed the ambition to join the woods with a footpath and any development in this area would make this ambition difficult to achieve. The retention of the current policy framework as referred by the Council in paragraph 2 would be more appropriate in this area.
Duncan Scott	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr >> 5.6.1	The current Council position "that the retention of the hinterland boundary, and application of the Housing in the Countryside (Hinterland areas) policy, is a more appropriate mechanism, in this location, for providing policy guidance on the potential development opportunities in relation to existing housing group" was arrived at following previous public local inquiries. It was, and still remains, the appropriate policy for this area.
Peter W Christie	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr >> 5.6.1	5.6.1 This comment is confined to the area between the River Nairn and the B851 road although some of the comments are applicable to the whole area. The retention of the current policy framework as referred by the Council in paragraph 2 would be more appropriate in this area. My reasons for this are:-The land to the west of the defined area is marked as having hut circles, ring cairns and other remains of archeological interest. The area would have to be surveyed and recorded by an archeologist before any development was permitted. The access from the minor road from Tordarroch on to the B851 has very poor visibility and is extremely dangerous. No development should be allowed unless the developer provides an alternative access that complies with modern highway standards. The north boundary includes a part of School Wood. This wood was sold to the community by the Forestry Commission and if any part of this wood is sold for development a large part of the money raised would have to be returned to the Forestry Commission. During the consultation for the purchase of Milton Wood and School Wood the community expressed the ambition to join the woods with a footpath and any development in this area would make this ambition difficult to achieve. There has been a lot of 'ad-hoc' development within this area, this has had the result of making the River Nairn and the river bank an important wild life corridor. Development along the east bank of the River Nairn should not be included as part of the Development Plan. The area contains important evidence of glacial action in the form of boulder chains and erratics. These have not been properly researched and should not be disturbed. Peter W Christie
Peter Reynolds	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr >> 5.6.1	1) The highlighted area contains archaeological and geological sites of interest. 2) Parts of the highlighted area are immediately adjacent to the rivers Farnack and Nairn and are regularly affected by flooding. 3) Building close to the rivers could lead to problems due to the increased number of septic tanks. 4) Apart from improvements associated with windfarm developments the local roads are crumbling - can they sustain increased traffic levels?

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Eunice Wilkie	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr >> 5.6.1	I would like to comment on the proposed housing development indicated on the area outlined in the map. I strongly object to this proposal. Cluster housing across this land would fundamentally change the nature of the countryside in this location, and also impact on the wildlife here. I have seen badgers, deer, including young every summer, a Scottish wildcat sighted consistently in the past (I believe there was or is a den within this area), and a wide variety of birds including birds of prey and even sightings of golden eagles in this area. Development here would inevitably impact upon the wildlife that roam the fields shown on the map. The roads in this area would also need further upgrading if further development is carried out, particularly the junction onto the B851 from the Dunlichity turn which is already hazardous. The river shown on the north-west boundary of the development area is often high following rain, and development at this river bank might lead to flooding. On a personal note, development in the fields around our house will seriously impact upon the value of our property and on our quality of life. The view we currently have across unspoiled countryside is the main attraction of our house and the reason we moved here. I know this alone will make no difference to whether this development proposal is successful, but we would ask that consideration is given to compensation offered to houses affected in this way. I believe they are mainly ourselves and a handful of neighbours. Please note these comments and take them into account in your considerations.
Paul Robinson	Hinterland Boundary	5 Hinterland >> 5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr >> 5.6.1	It is hard offer support to these proposals when no information on how the existing housing cluster and landscape are to be protected has been provided. Will the protection be superior or inferior to that provided by retaining the hinterland boundary? Why seek a contraction in areas within and adjacent to the existing housing cluster if the cluster is to be protected anyway?
James Mallows	Cromarty	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.1	There was a presumption in favour of planning consent for the area of ground at Barkly Cottage, Cromarty, IV118YQ, and as landowner I see no reason why this should not persist.
3A Partnership Ltd	Inverness Mixed Use	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.10 Site: INVERNESS NS19A, Land adjacent to Drummoissie Hotel (East)	We refer to the above and the Council's invitation for representations by 30th June 2013. We respond on behalf of our client 3A Partnership. Our client would welcome the allocation of (the east) part of the land that was the subject of our earlier representation lodged in response to the Main Issues Report. In addition and also in support of the above allocation, we wish to respond to the stated "pros" and "cons" (6.10.1) with the following points: (1) the site would not be visually prominent if the adjoining buffer to the A9 is confirmed, and need not be prominent even if sensitive, well designed development was to extend closer to the A9; (2) distance from commercial centres should be regarded as a "pro" rather than a "con". The site is close to the City Centre, close to the District Centre at Inshes, close to the neighbourhood centres at Milton of Leys and Cradlehall/Westhill and closer still – indeed almost adjacent – to the allocated and evolving Inverness Gateway which is a potential commercial "hub"; and to the established Drummoissie Hotel and Bogbain Farm, the former having been approved for a major hotel and tourist-related extension; (3) if the final point refers to urban "form", the proposal would not in fact extend the urban form further south. It would be well within the limits of the Inverness Gateway allocation and would be within the settlement boundary the Council itself identified in the Main Issues Report. Thank you for considering these further representations. CM-GHJ21-06-13 6.10 INVERNESS NS19A, Land adjacent to Drummoissie Hotel (East)
Mr Andrew Brown	Inverness Mixed Use	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.10 Site: INVERNESS NS19A, Land adjacent to Drummoissie Hotel (East) >> 6.10.1	Badger survey and protection plan if required (consider also cumulative effect)
Mr Andrew Brown	Muir of Ord	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.12 Site: MUIR OF ORD NS130, Glen Ord Distillery >> 6.12.1	Recommend survey for great crested newt, with protection plan if necessary

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Neil Gray	Muir of Ord	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.13 Site: MUIR OF ORD NS22, SW Muir of Ord	The proposal site NS22 is already identified as a 5ha 'expansion' Site Reference 16, in the adopted Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan, February 2007. The Local Plan indicates a site capacity for 22 houses. The proposals are also described as "Long term/low density. Subject to access and master plan/development brief." To date, no planning application(s) have come forward to indicate any development intentions for this site, despite having been confirmed an allocation in the adopted local plan in February 2007 – some six years ago. It is considered that other sites with demonstrable development potential should now be encouraged and be preferred by Highland Council at this formative stage of plan review and replacement. The most up to date Highland Housing Land Audit 2010 also identifies the proposal site (reference MURD16). It reports how the site is constrained by ownership issues and is therefore not effective. The Scottish Government's advice on the effectiveness of housing sites is contained in Planning Advice Note 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits. Paragraph 59 states: "Where sites which form part of the established housing land supply are identified as non-effective, the audit should identify the nature of the constraint and the necessary action and time required for resolution of the constraint to allow house building. Planning authorities, housing and infrastructure providers should work together to ensure constraints inhibiting the development of sites are removed, particularly where the site is needed or expected to contribute to the housing land requirement during the life of the development plan. In a small minority of cases it may prove impossible to remove development constraints. Where this occurs, the site should be removed from the audit of housing land supply." It is clear from the Highland Housing Land Audit 2010, that the nature of the site constraint is known (i.e. land ownership), however it does not appear that necessary a NS22 Corrie Road, Muir of Ord
Mr Andrew Brown	Muir of Ord	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.13 Site: MUIR OF ORD NS22, SW Muir of Ord >> 6.13.1	Scope to make Site H6 adjacent (woodland) from the MIR non-preferred, rather than allocate both?
Natasha Douglas	Nairn	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.14 Site: NAIRN NS4, Househill	Site: NAIRN NS4, Househill Objection is made to the identification of site reference NS4 Househill as a preferred alternative site for development within the alternative site and land use consultation. It is requested that NS4 is not carried forward into the proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). Instead MIR site reference H1 should be identified as a preferred option for development within the proposed LDP. The Highland wide Local Development Plan 2012 (HwLDP) states the spatial strategy for Nairn as focusing on 'short term development at Lochloy, Sandown and initial phases at Delnies and Nairn South' and considers that 'Nairn South may have the potential to serve much of the longer term housing requirements for Nairn'. The HwLDP goes on to identify these allocations in Map 9 Nairn. The HwLDP does not identify any allocations at Houshill or to the south east of the River Nairn for development. During the Examination in Public into the HwLDP the Reporter found that the direction for growth proposed was acceptable as it replicated the A96 growth Corridor Development Framework (September 2007) and carried forward allocations from the Nairnshire Local Plan 2000. Accordingly development at NS4 for housing conflicts with the spatial strategy for development adopted by the HwLDP. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) explains that development plans should provide clear guidance on 'what will or what will not be permitted and where. This should be very clear from the proposals map' (paragraph 14), SPP goes on to state that development plans should 'concentrate on what will happen, where and why' (paragraph 17). The HwLDP identifies the direction for the growth of Nairn to be to the west, south west and east of the town. The south east of Nairn is not a direction for growth. Objections were previously submitted with regards to MIR preferred site MU6 requesting its removal. Site NS4 is seen as an extension to MU6 and accordingly any development in this direction lacks consist
Mr Andrew Brown	Nairn	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.14 Site: NAIRN NS4, Househill >> 6.14.1	Woodland on site – species survey and protection plan/retention of as much woodland as possible/compensatory tree planting.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Scotia Homes, Barratt East Scotland And Robertson Homes	Nairn	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.14 Site: NAIRN NS4, Househill >> 6.14.1	We object to the inclusion of Site NAIRN NS4 in the Proposed LDP for further housing. Previous submissions were made on the MIR, objecting to the allocation of site MU6 at Househill. Site MU6 is located immediately adjacent to the current preferred alternative site NS4. It is considered that our previous submission on the MIR, expressing concerns over a further housing allocation in this location, continues to apply to site NS4. We would be grateful if this submission, which is attached, is taken into consideration on this consultation. (Highland Council Ref: IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01310/1/001). The Council confirms in Section 1 of this consultation that "comments received will help us to decide whether any of these alternative sites or land uses are suitable and should therefore be identified as additional or alternative sites to those included in the Main Issues Report."We maintain concern that this consultation continues to provide the same ambiguity expressed on the MIR consultation. In short, it is not clear from the Council's statement above, whether other sites previously identified in the MIR in Nairn will be removed or diluted in site area and replaced with the 'Preferred Alternative' site at Househill (NS4). If this is the Council's approach, this is considered unjustified on planning grounds in relation to sites MU4 and MU5. We support the continued commitment to Sites MU4 and MU5 in preference to a Preferred Alternative, which currently does not have any development plan commitment, such as Househill, for the reasons provided in the submission attached on the MIR consultation (IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01310/2/001).In addition, it is relevant that the Planning, Environment and Development Committee of the Council adopted the finalised version of the Nairn South – Strategic Masterplan on 15 May 2013. The Masterplan identifies the proposed phasing for Nairn South, including sites MU4 and MU5. We are committed to assisting the Council in delivering the Masterplan' Nairn South & Househill
Mr Ken Bowlts	Nairn	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.14 Site: NAIRN NS4, Househill >> 6.14.1	We acknowledge the written statement of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan and its status as a preferred alternative site extending the SDA boundary to the edge of the woodland. We agree that this does form a more logical boundary to Nairn, being adjacent to existing housing and forming a connection to the proposed mixed use site (MU6). Reading other comments submitted, it appears that MU6 has support given that it has fewer access issues and is able to integrate with the proposed bypass.The area of land under our client's ownership is bounded by trees to the south and west and has the Grantown Road to the north and east. Any development within this area would be arranged with consideration to these trees and planting. Any concerns to the woodland area within this area would, of course, be subject to assessment as part of the Planning Application of the impact on the existing trees and on the listed Househill House.The woodland area to the south west would act as a suitable backdrop of mature trees to the settlement. We trust that you will find the above to be acceptable and that our comments will be given due consideration as part of the next stage of the Local Plan.Submitted by Bowlts Chartered Surveyors on behalf of Mr Duncan McTavish 27.06.2013 6.14 Site: NAIRN NS4, Househill
Mr Rolf Schmidt	North kessock	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.15 Site: NORTH KESSOCK NS122, Land at Bellfield >> 6.15.1	After receiving your letter of 16 May ref. IMFLDP, I have tried to access the details of to which the letter refers for my area via the internet links given in the letter.However the map related to the proposals cannot be accessed (message: service unavailable). Can you please send me the information for: " Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses - 6.15 Site: NORTH KESSOCK NS122, Land at Bellfield " by post. Address: 17 Millbank, North Kessock, IV1 3XJ.Many thanks.Rolf Schmidt

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Kit Bowen	Strathpeffer	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.16 Site: STRATHPEFFER NS2, Kinellan Mid	The Strathpeffer Community Council (SCC) have already spent some considerable time in giving their views which were detailed in a full response to you dated July 2012. The SCC, following their meeting on 10 June, are astounded that no reference has been made by the planning department to their concerns about drainage expressed in their response at para 8. These drainage issues are well known and of major concern. There is adequate evidence that the village drainage system is at or beyond capacity (e.g. water emerging from drains, tarmac lifting in The Square, well documented concerns about the main culvert under the village). This is why the SCC requested that there should be no development in H2 and H6, which development will inevitably result in increased run off, until either the matter was resolved or the SCC was satisfied that a proper hydrological survey showed that there was sufficient drainage capacity. No survey has been presented. Instead a new area for development has been proposed, presumably on the grounds that it is smaller than H2 or H6. It is the view of the SCC that this is a blatant Trojan horse, aiming to obtain access onto the public highway, specifically for H2, contrary to earlier indications which suggested that access would be onto Kinellan Drive through H6 on its southern boundary. Once established the pressure to develop H2 and H6 will be incremental, ignoring the fundamental need to address the drainage issue now before any further development in the H2 and H6 area is permitted. The SCC vigorously and unanimously object to this proposal, and to the manner in which it is presented. For example it is impossible from the web site to print of a map of the new proposal, and there has been no adequate publicity for those likely to be affected in Kinellan Drive. The 'pro' given by the planning department that the site was in the soon to be superseded Ross and Cromarty East Local Plan is inaccurate: the new area is outwith H2 and H6 which the
Caroline Rham	Strathpeffer	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.16 Site: STRATHPEFFER NS2, Kinellan Mid	The lower part of the site sits between two areas which are already designated for residential development. Its owners have also, for 20 years, owned the C-Listed Kinellan Farmhouse that sits above it. During that time it has been re-roofed, refurbished and sympathetically restored from its 'uninhabitable' status back to a family home retaining its original integrity. The applicant intends to continue living in the farmhouse and would not condone any development that jarred within its curtilage. Rather it is their intention, if permitted, that any development on the site below the farmhouse would replicate the property's former stable block which was previously sited to its rear (now demolished and replaced by two comparatively modern houses). Additionally this site slopes down away from the farmhouse and towards the former low authority housing development and would thus create minimal impact on all existing housing in the surrounding hamlet and particularly the Farmhouse. On the second point – impact on the Slavonian grebes on Loch Kinellan - the applicant is one of a number of local residents who jointly purchased the loch in 2003 for the specific purpose of maintaining its principal role as a wildlife habitat. The grebes appeared on the loch some 8 years ago which coincided with a significant rise in the number of houses developed in the hamlet. Since that time the grebes have become established inhabitants. Currently 10 houses are situated closer to Loch Kinellan than the proposed site. On any day the number of visitors driving to Kinellan to walk or cycle around the loch outnumbers the number of local residents who use it for amenity. It could be concluded that it is unlikely that further development on this modest piece of ground would adversely affect the expansion of the grebe population and, indeed, the applicants would be very keen to contribute to any proposals to support the preservation of the loch's ground nesting birds. Kinellan Mid

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Caroline Rham	Strathpeffer	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.16 Site: STRATHPEFFER NS2, Kinellan Mid	The lower part of the site sits between two areas which are already designated for residential development. Its owners have also, for 20 years, owned the C-Listed Kinellan Farmhouse that sits above it. During that time it has been re-roofed, refurbished and sympathetically restored from its 'uninhabitable' status back to a family home retaining its original integrity. The applicant intends to continue living in the farmhouse and would not condone any development that jarred within its curtilage. Rather it is their intention, if permitted, that any development on the site below the farmhouse would replicate the property's former stable block which was previously sited to its rear (now demolished and replaced by two comparatively modern houses). Additionally this site slopes down away from the farmhouse and towards the former low authority housing development and would thus create minimal impact on all existing housing in the surrounding hamlet and particularly the Farmhouse. On the second point – impact on the Slavonian grebes on Loch Kinellan - the applicant is one of a number of local residents who jointly purchased the loch in 2003 for the specific purpose of maintaining its principal role as a wildlife habitat. The grebes appeared on the loch some 8 years ago which coincided with a significant rise in the number of houses developed in the hamlet. Since that time the grebes have become established inhabitants. Currently 10 houses are situated closer to Loch Kinellan than the proposed site. On any day the number of visitors driving to Kinellan to walk or cycle around the loch outnumbers the number of local residents who use it for amenity. It could be concluded that it is unlikely that further development on this modest piece of ground would adversely affect the expansion of the grebe population and, indeed, the applicants would be very keen to contribute to any proposals to support the preservation of the loch's ground nesting birds. Kinellan Mid
Mr Andrew Brown	Strathpeffer	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.16 Site: STRATHPEFFER NS2, Kinellan Mid >> 6.16.1	Proximity to Loch Kinellan (breeding Slavonian Grebe) – need to ensure no adverse impact, both alone and in combination with other potential housing sites here (H2 and H6 in the MIR) – species survey (including for Slavonian grebe and Great crested newt) should be a requirement, plus a Protection Plan, which should include recreation management to avoid disturbance.
Mr Andrew Brown	Tain	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.17 Site: TAIN NS23, Glenmorangie >> 6.17.1	Screen as part of the HRA re proximity to Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC and Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet SPA. Avoidance of any adverse effects on the special qualities of the Dornoch Firth NSA through sensitive siting, design and landscaping.
Mr John Stott	Tore	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.19 Site: TORE NS128, Grain Mill extension	Knockbain Community Council would like to make the following comments in relation to this site: We consider that there is already sufficient land north of this site which has been zoned for industrial use. We do not consider the access to this site to be sufficient given that this is already a heavily used and narrow road. We consider that industrial use close to the cemetery would be in-appropriate. We consider this land to be of good agricultural quality. John L. Stott (Secretary) Knockbain Community Council Tore NS128
Mr Andrew Brown	Tore	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.19 Site: TORE NS128, Grain Mill extension >> 6.19.1	Scope to make part of Site I1 adjacent from the MIR (ancient woodland Type 2b – long established of plantation origin) non-preferred, rather than allocate both?
Mr Andrew Brown	Alness	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.2 Site: ALNESS NS107, Dalmore Distillery >> 6.2.1	Screen as part of the HRA re proximity to Cromarty Firth SPA
Mr Andrew Brown	Alness	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.5 Site: ALNESS NS132, Alness Point Business Park >> 6.5.1	Screen as part of the HRA re proximity to Cromarty Firth SPA (recognising that this is an existing business site)

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Neil Gray	Beauly	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.6 Site: BEAULY NS133, House of Beauly	Site proposal NS133 has an extensive planning history which is relevant to this consultation. Most recently, a Planning Permission in Principle proposal to demolish and redevelop the property for house plots was refused permission (ref: 12/02876/PIP). There is currently an undetermined planning application for the sub-division of the vacant former retail/tourism unit to form 3 no. units with external alterations and car parking (ref: 13/002240/FUL).Simpson Builders Ltd does not object to the redevelopment of this site, as it is for a vacant property, on a brownfield site. It is also located immediately adjacent to Simpson Builders' recently completed development of a variety of private and affordable homes and a planning application (ref: 12/04082/FUL) for a 'courtyard style' residential development is pending decision. The redevelopment of the former House of Beauly site would therefore benefit the local amenity and surroundings. However, Simpson Builders Ltd wishes to emphasise the planning history of the proposal site as being material to any assessment of the suitability of the site for a proposed future use.In the description, Highland Council refers to "site of vacant former retail/tourism unit remaining a business/tourism site" and the proposed use being for "business/tourism". From view of the plans for the current planning application 13/002240/FUL, the development is however for a retail convenience store with 2 office units. Should the planning application for retail and offices be successful and proceed to implementation, then it is considered that there would be little need or point of the Council allocating the site for future re-development in the Local Plan. If however the Council continues to see preference with the proposed alternative site and use then it is respectfully suggested that the 'Proposed Use' is modified to a broader use, such as "Mixed Use Commercial". It is noted how in the Main Issues Report consultation undertaken in April 2012 Beauly NS133 and Beauly NS25
The Trustees Of The Cawdor Scottish Discretionary Trust	Cawdor	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.7 Site: CAWDOR NS1, Cawdor Village Centre	REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF CAWDOR ESTATE G H JOHNSTON BUILDING CONSULTANTS LTDWe refer to the above and the Council's invitation for representations by 30th June 2013. We respond on behalf of our client Cawdor Estate. Cawdor Estate would wish to encourage redevelopment of this parcel of land provided that any future use is compatible with, and does not undermine the Masterplan proposed as part of the Highland wide Local Development Plan. The site is brownfield and it is within the Masterplan search area "allocation". The site has been used previously we understand for a joiners workshop and funeral directors, and as a garage and presently accommodates a bottle bank. Cawdor Estate would agree that it could be suitable in principle therefore for business uses of a similar character; and for residential. Cawdor Estate would not oppose other uses, but these should proceed as part of the Masterplan. In that regard, commercial uses - retail, leisure, tourist and office - are planned "village centre activities". A viable village centre - with sufficient mixed use activity and critical mass - is vital to the functioning and character of the Masterplan; and to the concept that each phase should support local employment and services. A piecemeal approach to such uses and the village centre could be avoided by an appropriate policy (and cross reference with suitable use classes. A positive, but balanced approach would avoid promoting use classes 1-2 outwith the Masterplan). Design would be compatible with Conservation Area policies; and policies are in place to protect trees. The above is consistent with our representations on the Main Issues Report, in particular that the Council fully respects the policy objectives of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. In that regard it is essential that any preconceived phasing of development ahead of the masterplan process concluding or any fragmentation of the masterplan "footprint" is discouraged. A successful mas 6.7 Cawdor NS1, Cawdor Village Centre
Mr Andrew Brown	Cawdor	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.7 Site: CAWDOR NS1, Cawdor Village Centre >> 6.7.1	Woodland on site; impact on part of green network by river; species survey and protection plan if necessary; maintenance of woodland alongside river; measures for compensatory tree planting.
The Dowager Countess Cawdor	Cawdor	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.7 Site: CAWDOR NS1, Cawdor Village Centre >> 6.7.1	Please see attached comments on behalf of Cawdor Castle Limited Cawdor NS1, Cawdor Village Centre

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Fraser Stewart	Cromarty	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.8 Site: CROMARTY NS58, Land South of the Manse	Acting on behalf of the landowner Mr McBeans as his agent agent, we put forward this site for inclusion for housing and allotments/community use under the MIR call for sites procedure where it was a larger site referred to as site H4.We welcome its inclusion albeit on a smaller scale than originally proposed.Please refer to our attached list of points. Cromarty Site NS58 Land south of the manse.
Mr Peter Tilbrook	Cromarty	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.8 Site: CROMARTY NS58, Land South of the Manse	Cromarty is almost entirely contained within the lower level raised beach area and this natural boundary gives it much of its character. It would be a pity to breach this by identifying further development land on the top of the brae. This site is also prime agricultural land.There are also several areas within the current settlement boundary which are available for housing.For the above reasons we feel that this option should be removed from the Development Plan.If there is a statutory requirement to identify further development land and it is felt there is no alternative to it being at the higher level, a more logical site in terms of access to the town centre would be the land just south of the cemetery.
EVAN MCBEAN	Cromarty	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.8 Site: CROMARTY NS58, Land South of the Manse >> 6.8.1	ALTERNATIVE HOUSINGLand South Of the Manse: Site CROMARTY NS59 1. This land is ideal for housing which is much needed in the Black Isle with around 100 people on the housing list. Although originally suggested for mixed Housing/Community use as part of H4 in the 2012 Main Issues report, I am more than willing to use this for housing only.2. Further consultation may be necessary to ensure that any proposed development would not have any impact on the houses at Urquhart Court. These are already separated by trees and could be supplemented by further planting to provide a natural outlook for the existing houses and access point. 3. Although this land is out with the settlement boundary it would merely move the boundary to the west and round off the boundary line nicely.4. In answer to some people's comments in the 2012 Main Issues Report that the land at MU1 (next to the football park) will meet housing demands for the next 15 years. This was true in 2003, over 10 years ago but may not be the case now. This can be confirmed by reading the link to Sandilands Cromarty Development Brief. It clearly states that over the next 15 years, 30 to 40 dwellings are needed and this site has the potential to accommodate up to 30 dwellings. Additionally, a further 23 of the 123 respondents, with no particular housing needs, indicated that they would be interested in buying or building a new house without the use of a Grant. Further information can be found at http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/14391186-64AD-4ED2-A12F-000000000000
Colin Dickie	Cromarty	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.8 Site: CROMARTY NS58, Land South of the Manse >> 6.8.1	Council have been too quick in dismissing other more viable areas. Consideration should be given to infill sites and then those convenient to services and amenities within Cromarty. The likely economic output should be one of the primary considerations as should be wider environmental footprint. NS58 scores poorly on both fronts. I would actively encourage The Council to reconsider previously identified sites within the town – the reasons for their de-registering is not immediately obvious or valid to me. Consideration should also be given to potential sea level sites to east and west of Cromarty.Specifically on NS58, I am not persuaded that this should be a preferred site due to:• The proposed site remains out of town and will lead to increased road usage. It is unlikely that a pavement to town would be used; it is just too far out, with a substantial hill to climb and is actually quite dangerous for pedestrians. Considerable road and access improvements would be necessary.• As mentioned above a primary objective should be to encourage economic activity in the town. Any notion that the local bus service would serve the site into Cromarty is just not plausible as it would cost and not be a frequent or convenient service. The car would be the default mode of transport leading to an increase environmental footprint and health impact. Also I am not persuaded that the local shops and hospitality outlets will actually benefit from the site as potential customers are more likely to stay at home than drive down the hill and therefore - due to the need to drive - add little to the revenue potential of the local bars and restaurants. This challenges the view expressed on Site Assessment 26 in relation to 9.15.1 NS58.• The site would need to cater for social housing and not sure that given the work required to prepare such a site if this would be viable, especially when coupled with the relative remoteness from local services.• Families coming into the site would be deni

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr John Keast	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	I am writing to object to this site being re-designated for use as a 'food store'. My reasons are:* This shop will take trade away from the other shops on Fortrose and Rosemarkie High Streets. Inevitably a larger store such as this will sell goods which are already sold by existing shops. The present smaller shops can co-exist with the present Co-op but it should be noted that we lost a green grocers and a newsagent after the opening of the present Co-op.* We were led to believe, after a lot of controversy over the housing development on H1, that this part of H1 was for a primary school. I have a document dated January 2009 which clearly labels this as a primary school site. I know there is no money at present for a school but a school will be needed in the future and this site should be kept for that.
M.G. Phillips	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	I wish to object to the Highland Council preferring a commercial/retail use for this site on the following grounds:1. As part of the overall package for giving planning permission on the Ness Gap site, this area was to be reserved for community use. A commercial development is not community use.2. It goes against policy 40 in that it is not in the centre or at the edge of the centre of Fortrose. It is at the very edge of Fortrose. It will detract from the existing High Street and will jeopardise the existence of shops there.3. Shoppers will not walk from the area of the proposed site to Fortrose High Street. The same argument was used when Tesco was given permission to build in Dingwall and this did not happen, as evidenced, for a shorter walk, by the very sorry state of the High Street in Dingwall.4. The suggestion does not give any flexibility as there has been only one option presented.5. It is not close enough to public transport so that people would walk there.6. The site should be retained as an option for a primary school and if not required at some future date then it should be allocated as an area where a daycare facility for the elderly can be built.7. If such a development improves parking, it will only be because people are not shopping on the High Street.8. There is almost universal opposition in Fortrose and Rosemarkie to this development and if democracy still exists, it should be shown to be working in this case.
Mr James Grant	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	Primary school site NS129 (wrongly described in para 6.9.1 as currently zoned for housing): Proposal for commercial/ community developmentThe site should be retained for a future primary school, it would be short sited to lose this last remaining suitable space in the area until no long term need for such a facility can be clearly demonstrated. If it assessed that no such requirement exists, the site should revert to agricultural land – either to be farmed or used for allotments. Alternatively the landscape area for the Ness Gap Development should be extended to include this area.Scottish government and Highland Council policy is that agricultural land should not be build upon unless there is an overwhelming need and no alternative exists. The site should revert to agricultural land, either for farming or for use as allotments. Note that the housing density on the Ness Gap development is such that space for growing vegetables is very limited on these properties. Commercial development should not be approved for this site. Such development would:Increase traffic flows in the already congested town,Risk closure of other retailers that are situated in the town centres of both Fortrose and RosemarkieReduce trade in village shops in other adjacent communities and increase traffic flows from these villages.Would be to close to and out of keeping with adjacent domestic propertiesNote that the increasing use of internet grocery shopping is reducing any need for such supermarkets, and age demographics are likely to increase this trend.Approval for Community Development should not be given unless and until any proposed development is clearly defined, a pressing need shown for it, it is demonstrated that no other better site is available for it, and funds allocated for the development to be carried out. Day care facilities have been mentioned as a possible use of this site. On the Ness gap site facilities for the elderly was proposed, but nothing came of it. If su
Mr Gordon Grant	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	NS129: Proposal for commercial/ community development. This area should remain as agricultural land, if it is not to be used for a primary school. Commercial development in the form of a supermarket would detract from the village centre and increase traffic flows from adjacent villages. If Community development is required it should have been recognised at the time of Ness Gap masterplan and incorporated into it. As detailed planning has not been completed for Ness Gap, any community development should be incorporated there.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Gordon Grant	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	Proposal for commercial/ community development – previously zoned for a primary school. This land should be kept for a primary school. Projections of school populations is very difficult. The current primary school building in Avoch is getting old and may need replaced. Use of the site for a commercial development would take business away from the village centre and that of other nearby villages. It would increase vehicle movements to the development. Agricultural land should not be built on unless there is no alternative.
Mr Fraser Hutcheson	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	6.9 FORTROSE NS 129 NESS GAP We refer to the above and the Council's invitation for representations by 30th June 2013. We respond on behalf of our client Mr F Hutcheson, landowner. We reiterate that our representations strongly support and promote a mixed use commercial/community development on the first field east of Ness Road; and that the Council has received a representation from the Co-op, the only food store operator in Fortrose, which has sought allocation of the same land (MU3) for a new expanded food store. We take issue with the planning authority's presentation of NS129 and the assessment on which it finds this to be a "preferred alternative". It is not stated what the site is "alternative" to. When the stated "pros" and "cons" are examined in fact and detail (even examined superficially) the presentation of NS129 appears seriously flawed; it is not balanced or reasonable. We wish to respond to the stated "pros" and "cons" (6.9.1) with the following points. (1) Any "change of use" (as alleged by the planning authority) would not as a matter of fact be from housing. The land is identified in the development plan for "expansion"; and that would include uses other than housing. Further scrutiny of the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan would indicate the land to which NS129 relates is to be reserved for a primary school and open space ie. specifically not housing. The land does not have planning permission for any other purpose and as part of the planning permission (09/00471/OUTRC) ie. the masterplan approval within which the "preferred alternative" sits, it is identified for primary school and open space and by condition (8) of that consent it is specifically excluded from "any residential development". In presenting this site as a preferred alternative, what that does is indicate the planning authority's acceptance of the principle of development other than a school and open space (which is what the land is presently reserved for). In an area that is 6.9 FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap Site
Ms Leslie Grant	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	Primary school site NS129 (wrongly described in para 6.9.1 as currently zoned for housing): Proposal for commercial/ community development. The site should be retained for a future primary school. It takes 10 years usually from the need for a new school or extension being recognised to come to fruition. To remove the school at this stage is premature, especially with the amount of housing already underway in the area. If it assessed that no such requirement exists, the site should revert to agricultural land – to be used for allotments. Alternatively the landscape area for the Ness Gap Development should be extended to include this area. Allotments could in any case be provided at present with a time limit as exits at the Rosemarkie allotments. Both Scottish Government and Highland Council policy is that agricultural land should not be build upon unless there is an overwhelming need and no alternative exists. The housing density on the Ness Gap development is such that space for growing vegetables is very limited on these properties. There is also a need for play facilities. In spite of these being in the masterplan for the Tulloch housing site in the Ness no such provision has been provided and children are having to play on such open ground as at present exits. If, in the future, provision for a primary school is not needed it could be retained for community use, ie day care facilities, but only if such need is properly researched and no other site is available. Please note in the original masterplan, community use, ie day care facility for the elderly, was supposed to be part of the Ness site, but was dropped. Commercial development should not be approved for this site. Such development would: Increase traffic flows in the already congested town. Risk closure of other retailers that are situated in the town centres of both Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Reduce trade in village shops in other adjacent communities and increase traffic flows from these villages. Would be t

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Sally Lloyd (Doyle)	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	Dear Sir/Madam With regard to the preferred alternative for site 6.9 at the Fortrose NS129 Ness Gap site, I feel strongly that there should be no change from the greenfield/primary school zoning to mixed commerce/community. My comments are: This site should be retained as a potential primary school site indefinitely. It is the most suitable site for a primary school because: (1) It is close to village and housing to enable walking to school (government health policy) and close to village and housing to enable after school and other community use. (2) It is also adjacent to secondary school and facilities such as library, swimming pool, leisure centre. If the sustainable school estates review decides that a school is not required in the short term, the site should still be retained indefinitely because the long term (30 – 50 years plus), needs cannot be foreseen with accuracy. 1. While the site is not being used for a primary school it can revert to agricultural land as Scottish government and Highland Council policy dictates. This could be for community use in the form of allotments. 2. Commercial development such as more housing and retail development should not be allowed on this site because of traffic constraints. The access road is not suitable for increased volumes of traffic and heavy goods traffic. There would also be an unavoidable increase in traffic congestion primarily in Fortrose High Street and feeder roads. 3. Retail development should not be permitted as it would be detrimental to High Street businesses in Fortrose, Rosemarkie and surrounding villages. 4. In fact the need for retail floor space is decreasing due to increasing use of internet grocery shopping and home delivery. 5. At the Community Council Open Meeting on Tuesday the 25th of June, people mentioned the possibility of day care and social housing for this site. However there is no need to do this on the proposed primary school site. Other sites have been proposed such as the Abbeyfield Ness Gap Fortrose
Ronan Lloyd	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	I live in Rosemarkie and have 2 young children and do not think that there should be any changes to the preferred alternative for site 6.9 at the Fortrose NS129 Ness Gap. There should be no change from the greenfield/primary school zoning to mixed commerce/community because this site should be retained as a potential primary school site because: (1) It is close to the village and housing to enable walking to school (government health policy) (2) It is also adjacent to secondary school and facilities such as library, swimming pool, leisure centre. If the sustainable school estates review decides that a school is not required in the short term, the site should still be retained indefinitely because the long term
Gloria Quelin	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site	I live in Rosemarkie and have 2 young children and do not think that there should be any changes to the preferred alternative for site 6.9 at the Fortrose NS129 Ness Gap. There should be no change from the greenfield/primary school zoning to mixed commerce/community because this site should be retained as a potential primary school site. In the future my children or even their children might require a new primary school and it is important that a long term view is taken on planning issues. The local government should not be persuaded by commercial interests such as housing and retail developers to change the current plans. Thank you, regards Gloria Quelin, Rosemarkie, 30th of June 2013
Mrs Janis Keast	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	I am writing to object to this site being re-designated for use as a 'food store'. My reasons are: * This shop will take trade away from the other shops on Fortrose and Rosemarkie High Streets. Inevitably a larger store such as this will sell goods which are already sold by existing shops. The present smaller shops can co-exist with the present Co-op but it should be noted that we lost a green grocers and a newsagent after the opening of the present Co-op. * We were led to believe, after a lot of controversy over the housing development on H1, that this part of H1 was for a primary school. There is a document dated January 2009 which clearly labels this as a primary school site. Funding may not be available immediately for a school but with the rising population a school will be needed and this land should be kept for that.
Mr James Sinclair	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	larger supermarket = detriment to existing shops in high street who will be undercut by the larger business. Tesco and Asda both deliver locally Building likely to be of similar style to other supermarkets and therefore not in keeping with the village on such a visual site.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr John Fair	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	I would like to make two main points. Firstly I cannot understand the justification for an extended food store; what form does this justification take and how was this need assessed? This must surely be challenged. My family and I have lived in Fortrose for twenty years and nobody I have spoken to sees any need for additional supermarket facilities if this is what 'extended food store' means. Most other forward thinking Councils in Scotland and indeed Britain are trying to reverse this trend and encourage smaller business back into towns and villages. This is how they will thrive and any extended food store will only have a negative impact on the existing facilities; this is already well understood. The area is well served by several major supermarkets in Inverness with more than one providing competitive delivery services. Secondly as a resident on the corner of Deans Road and Ness Road I have already witnessed the significant increase in traffic in light of the developments on the Ness Gap site and the popularity of Chanonry Point. No improvements or additional traffic controls have been put in place despite this and I would suggest the suitability of this area for this purpose needs to be reviewed.
Miss Janet Syer	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	With all the housing development proposed in the near future in Fortrose, Rosemarkie and Avoch it is obvious Avoch Primary School will shortly be over capacity and the removal of the primary school would be very shortsighted. I appreciate some residents would use a locally based supermarket but the increase in on-line shopping and home delivery from supermarkets is the way forward and the local community certainly already uses home delivery every day.
Ms Brenda Steele	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	There are a large number of elderly living in the town of Fortrose. They currently walk to the Co-op. Moving the store to the edge of town will put it out of reach for many who live on the other side of town - unlike the present store. It may be more convenient for those who have cars, but they generally prefer to shop at larger supermarkets in Inverness. Pandering to car-owners in this fashion is exactly the process which has led the centre of Inverness to a commercial desert.
Ms Naomi Lloyd	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	Dear Sir/Madam With regard to the preferred alternative for site 6.9 at the Fortrose NS129 Ness Gap site, I feel strongly that there should be no change from the greenfield/primary school zoning to mixed commerce/community. My comments are: This site should be retained as a potential primary school site indefinitely. It is the most suitable site for a primary school because: (1) It is close to village and housing to enable walking to school (government health policy) and close to village and housing to enable after school and other community use. (2) It is also adjacent to secondary school and facilities such as library, swimming pool, leisure centre. If the sustainable school estates review decides that a school is not required in the short term, the site should still be retained indefinitely because the long term (30 – 50 years plus), needs cannot be foreseen with accuracy. (3) While the site is not being used for a primary school it can revert to agricultural land as Scottish government and Highland Council policy dictates. This could be for community use in the form of allotments. (4) Commercial development such as more housing and retail development should not be allowed on this site because of traffic constraints. The access road is not suitable for increased volumes of traffic and heavy goods traffic. There would also be an unavoidable increase in traffic congestion primarily in Fortrose High Street and feeder roads. (5) Retail development should not be permitted as it would be detrimental to High Street businesses in Fortrose, Rosemarkie and surrounding villages. (6) In fact the need for retail floor space is decreasing due to increasing use of internet grocery shopping and home delivery. (7) At the Community Council Open Meeting on Tuesday the 25th of June, people mentioned the possibility of day care and social housing for this site. However there is no need to do this on the proposed primary school site. Other sites have been proposed such as the Abbeyfield

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Ian Carus	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	When the Ness Gap Development in Fortrose was first mooted in 2009/2010 , 09/00471/OUTRC, there were 327 timeous representations with none being in favour of the plan. Later, the original number of houses was surreptitiously increased, again with local opposition. The one consolation for residents of Fortrose & Rosemarkie was that, at least, a Primary School was included in the site. Surprise, surprise. In the latest version of the plan, the school has been abandoned for commercial development. Public consultation is derisory and objectionable. The planning department asks for consultation and then totally and utterly ignores the views of the great majority in favour of the developers. The only purpose that the process has, seems to be to allow the general public to vent their anger and then do what the planning department/developers wanted in the first place.
Mark	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 6.9 Site: FORTROSE NS129, Ness Gap site >> 6.9.1	Dear Sir/MadamWith regard to the preferred alternative for site 6.9 at the Fortrose NS129 Ness Gap site, I feel strongly that there should be no change from the greenfield/primary school zoning to mixed commerce/community. My comments are:This site should be retained as a potential primary school site indefinitely. It is the most suitable site for a primary school because:(1) It is close to village and housing to enable walking to school (government health policy) and close to village and housing to enable after school and other community use. T(2) It is also adjacent to secondary school and facilities such as library, swimming pool, leisure centre.If the sustainable school estates review decides that a school is not required in the short term, the site should still be retained indefinitely because the long term (30 – 50 years plus), needs cannot be foreseen with accuracy.1. While the site is not being used for a primary school it can revert to agricultural land as Scottish government and Highland Council policy dictates. This could be for community use in the form of allotments.2. Commercial development such as more housing and retail development should not be allowed on this site because of traffic constraints. The access road is not suitable for increased volumes of traffic and heavy goods traffic. There would also be an unavoidable increase in traffic congestion primarily in Fortrose High Street and feeder roads.3. Retail development should not be permitted as it would be detrimental to High Street businesses in Fortrose, Rosemarkie and surrounding villages. 4. In fact the need for retail floor space is decreasing due to increasing use of internet grocery shopping and home delivery.5. At the Community Council Open Meeting on Tuesday the 25th of June, people mentioned the possibility of day care and social housing for this site. However there is no need to do this on the proposed primary school site. Other sites have been proposed such as the Abbeyfield
Dietrich Pannwitz	North Kessock	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> North Kessock	The land between the A9 and B9161, along the old A9 is suitable for a private dwelling.This in time would provide accomendation for the adjacent agricultural business and reduce traveling mileage for the landowner.The site could also act as a model or showcase for combining sustainable building with sustainable land use. Field No. 4 at Artafallie Farm
Balnagown Estate	Tain	6 Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> Tain NS28	We object to the "preferred" status given to the change to residential from the previously "preferred" Community use in the Main Issues Report.Whilst we acknowledge the sites proximity to the train station, we do not believe that the access issues (on site, or off site) identified in the Ross & Cromarty East Local Plan, or the Main Issues Report, have been satisfactorily resolved. In addition we understand that issues relating to contaminated land and ecology have been asessed to allow this to be considered an effective site.The site borders the Outstanding Conservation Area (however, we have been unable to find the Character Appraisal to understand how development here might affect the character and setting of it) and is close to a number of Listed Buildings and any development will need to respect these features.
Fraser Mackenzie	Drumnadrochit	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.10 Site: DRUMNADROCHIT NS14, Blairbeg, South of Kilmore Road	This area contains a long established rookery which has always been a feature of the village. Any building would destroy this natural feature of the village and I do not see that this can in any way be mitigated.
Mr Andrew Brown	Drumnadrochit	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.10 Site: DRUMNADROCHIT NS14, Blairbeg, South of Kilmore Road >> 7.10.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to consider impact on woodland; would need a species survey and protection plan if necessary; would need retention of as much woodland as possible; would need requirement for compensatory tree planting.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Neil Angus Martin Mackay	Drumnadrochit	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.10 Site: DRUMNADROCHIT NS14, Blairbeg, South of Kilmore Road >> 7.10.1	7.10.1 NON PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SITES AND USESDRUMNADROCHIT NS14 BLAIRBEG The following responses are offered to the comments in the assessment document.(a) The number of Plots has been reduced from six to three to minimise loss of woodland and habitat. The area is 0.41 ha approx. Leaving approx. 1.75 ha untouched and available for good management and regeneration. To this end I have been in touch with Glenurquhart Community Council and Glen Urquhart Greenspace Group. I would draw the Council's attention to the Tree Survey submitted in June 2012 and make the following observations. Of the trees surveyed on the Plots and outwith there are no high value trees, 4 medium value, 4 medium/low, 36 recommended for removal, leaving 68 low value. Plot 1 has the fewest trees. The Plots form a group with the existing properties. The old walls create a barrier to convenient access resulting in that area being the least visited by the public.(b) The width of the carriageway on the road on the south of the wood is about the same as that of Kilmore Road on the north. Agreed there is no footpath, but compared with Kilmore Road the road on the south, by which access and egress will of nature be taken, is considerably less used than Kilmore Road. The majority of vehicles use Kilmore Road to and fro Kilmore housing estate, the Benleva Hotel, etc.. Vehicles associated with the Plots will of nature use the south road to the A82,not Kilmore Road. The capacity of Kilmore Road will not be affected to any noticeable degree, if at all. Given the existing low usage of the road on the south, the additional traffic generated by the Plots will not strain its capacity.(c) Visibility at the junction with the A82, whilst not ideal, is considerably better than that at the Kilmore Road junction. The latter is on the apex of a bend whereas the former is on a straight. Sight lines are much better on the south road.See Appendix 1 para 9.8.1 for additional comment.Accordingly I request that my ea Drumnadrochit NS14 Blairbeg
Mr Andrew Brown	Evanton	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.11 Site: EVANTON NS113, Land east of MU2 >> 7.11.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to screen as part of the HRA for connectivity to Cromarty Firth SPA.
Mr James Grant	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.12 Site: FORTROSE NS47, Land north of Caravan Park	Tourist development land north of caravan site NS47:No development in this area should be permitted because:Separation of the adjacent villages should be maintained.No suitable road access existsThe wildlife corridor from the beach to the hinterland will be further compromised.This area is or should be zoned as a special area for conservation.Its current use as a golf practice green meets a social need in this and the surrounding community.Such development would detract from the existing caravan site.
Ms Leslie Grant	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.12 Site: FORTROSE NS47, Land north of Caravan Park	Tourist development land north of caravan site NS47:No development in this area should be permitted because:Separation of the Fortrose and Rosemarkie MUST be maintained.No suitable road access existsThe wildlife corridor from the beach to the hinterland will be further compromised.This area is or should be zoned as a special area for conservation. It provides a habitat for amongst others, the skylark and the oyster catcher. Number of skylarks have reduced in the Ness area due to the Tulloch housing site. The skylark is on the Red status as being a species under threat. Oystercatchers are on the amber list. Further degradation of their habitat must be avoided.Its current use as a golf practice green meets a social need in this and the surrounding community. Again if the golf course no longer wish to use this site as a practice green, it should revert to agricultural use. Grant monies were obtained by the golf club to enhance facilities on the practice green, with special regard to provision for young players. Tourism development on this site would detract from the existing caravan site.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Douglas Barker	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.12 Site: FORTROSE NS47, Land north of Caravan Park	1. If permitted this would amount to the irreversible loss of prime grade 1 agricultural land, which is particularly short sighted when a global food crisis looms and this is not just loss of agricultural land but some of the best agricultural land in Scotland. This action would amount to a severe lack of foresight which will only benefit a few parties. 2. This area is part of the long standing land buffer between Fortrose and Rosemarkie, in which both communities have placed great importance for the past 30 years. If permitted this would be the start of the erosion of the age old land barrier than ensures the distinct identities between Fortrose and Rosemarkie. Any reduction in this buffer will have a serious impact on the amenity of the area and the character of the locality. 3. I agree emphatically with the Council identified 'cons' of this site, namely: Access issues; sensitive site for landscape impact, outwith settlement boundary, not within easy walkable distance of village facilities and possible odour nuisance.
Mr Douglas Barker	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.12 Site: FORTROSE NS47, Land north of Caravan Park	Please find attached a letter of objection to site NS47 from Morton Fraser Solicitors on behalf of Mr Barker, Fortrose. NS47
Mr James Sinclair	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.12 Site: FORTROSE NS47, Land north of Caravan Park >> 7.12.1	The existing landscape is already providing tourism to the area. Certainly a hotel is an unlikely result. A cynic may suspect that a further change of use would soon be on the agenda for more housing and a few "affordable homes" thrown in to add colour to the proposal. Let's retain what we have: a beautiful place to live, visit and walk around.
Ms Naomi Lloyd	Fortrose and Rosemarkie	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.12 Site: FORTROSE NS47, Land north of Caravan Park >> 7.12.1	should not be used as housing site or hotel or holiday accommodation because: Visually intrusive against sea. Detrimental to local bed and breakfast businesses and campsites. Inadequate local road system to support more traffic. Part of Special Landscape Area which is sensitive to 'infill development which could result in the coalescence of the distinct settlements of Fortrose and Rosemarkie compromising their historical and cultural integrity' Would create 'developments which would compromise the physical integrity of views of key landforms eg Chanonry spit and lighthouse, Fort George, and stretches of natural shoreline by introducing manmade elements of a scale or nature which would detract from the appreciation of these features'. Agricultural land.
Messrs R & C MacKenzie	Invergordon	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.13 Site: INVERGORDON NS18, House of Rosskeen	We write on behalf of the MacKenzie family, the owners of The House of Rosskeen and its associated grounds. Despite our previous discussions with and submissions to the Council on the IMFLDP for this property our clients' are concerned that this land is not viewed in a positive light with its listing as a "Non Preferred Alternative Site" in the current consultation documentation. We outlined the attributes of the land in our submission on the Main Issues Report. This was accompanied by a plan, which we now attach. We note that our submission is listed in the Summarised Comments received from the consultation stage of the Main Issues Report, available to view on the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan webpage. As such, we do not list these in full at this stage. The "Description" and "Existing Use" bullet points refer to a 'Greenfield site with woodland at House of Rosskeen'. However, the potential for redevelopment or extension of the existing house and the area including the Castle Cottages and Honeymoon Cottages are not 'Greenfield'. With regard to the Pros listed - limited visual impact, no flood risk issues and re-use of vacant buildings - these say much to support inclusion of the land within the SDA but seem to be given little weight. If you consider the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the site, the impacts listed are few and where negative these are not insurmountable. There is also no reference to the ability of the housing potential to contribute to the local housing land supply. As such, we feel that there are more Pros than Cons. With regard to the Cons, we are aware of the potential archaeological interest but whether this is "significant" in relation to the land indicated for housing development is questionable. The site of the former Invergordon Castle lies to the north of the open land, but it is in the woodland and therefore would be unaffected by any potential development within the areas of open land. We would expect that any pro The House of Rosskeen, Invergordon

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Andrew Brown	Invergordon	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.13 Site: INVERGORDON NS18, House of Rosskeen >> 7.13.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred from desk appraisal would seem to affect Ancient Woodland (Type 1b – long established of plantation origin)
Mr Andrew Brown	Inverness Mixed Use	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.14 Site: INVERNESS NS19B, Land adjacent to Drummosie Hotel (West) >> 7.14.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need badger survey and protection plan if necessary (including also consideration of cumulative effect).
Simpson's Garden Centre	Inverness Mixed Use	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.15 Site: INVERNESS NS37, Simpsons Garden Centre	Simpsons Garden Centre objects to the Council's non-preference of the proposal NS37. At the time of the Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation, a full representation was submitted on behalf of Simpsons Garden Centre promoting the future allocation of land at the Garden Centre for business/retail/tourism (ref 00780 dated May 2012) – re-attached to this comment for reference. The representation promoting change of policy for the Garden Centre land, is because the business has continued to grow successfully, and within the current development planning policy framework, any future growth (be that expansion or re-organisation of land uses within the ownership of the Garden Centre) will become increasingly difficult or potentially prohibitive. The Council's assessment of the proposal states how the proposals' pros include the fact the land is not useable public open space and the site itself commands a visible presence. This suggests the proposal is both logical and feasible from an operational perspective. Equally, it is argued how further development of the land, in a planned way, would assure best possible sustainable use of land for economic development. Whilst it is noted the land development could threaten a loss of badger foraging and affect visual amenity, it is argued in the representations and in the extensive planning history associated with the site (see for example most recent planning permission reference 11/04500/FUL for the erection of polytunnels associated with the garden centre business) that appropriate planning conditions (such as the requirement to provide additional screen bunding) can effectively mitigate these concerns. This objection also refers to the Council's assessment under the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) regulations. In the accompanying Environmental Report (Appendix 9 of the Additional Sites Consultation) the SEA assessment portrays positively significant environmental benefits with only 3 out of 36 issues assessed as ne Land at Simpsons Garden Centre NS37 (MIR ref 00780)
Simpsons Garden Centre	Inverness Mixed Use	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.15 Site: INVERNESS NS37, Simpsons Garden Centre	Simpsons Garden Centre objects to the Council's non-preference of the proposal NS37. At the time of the Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation, a full representation was submitted on behalf of Simpsons Garden Centre promoting the future allocation of land at the Garden Centre for business/retail/tourism (ref 00780 dated May 2012) – re-attached to this comment for reference. The representation promoting change of policy for the Garden Centre land, is because the business has continued to grow successfully, and within the current development planning policy framework, any future growth (be that expansion or re-organisation of land uses within the ownership of the Garden Centre) will become increasingly difficult or potentially prohibitive. The Council's assessment of the proposal states how the proposals' pros include the fact the land is not useable public open space and the site itself commands a visible presence. This suggests the proposal is both logical and feasible from an operational perspective. Equally, it is argued how further development of the land, in a planned way, would assure best possible sustainable use of land for economic development. Whilst it is noted the land development could threaten a loss of badger foraging and affect visual amenity, it is argued in the representations and in the extensive planning history associated with the site (see for example most recent planning permission reference 11/04500/FUL for the erection of polytunnels associated with the garden centre business) that appropriate planning conditions (such as the requirement to provide additional screen bunding) can effectively mitigate these concerns. This objection also refers to the Council's assessment under the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) regulations. In the accompanying Environmental Report (Appendix 9 of the Additional Sites Consultation) the SEA assessment portrays positively significant environmental benefits with only 3 out of 36 issues assessed as ne Land at Simpsons Garden Centre NS37 (MIR ref 00780)

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Andrew Brown	Inverness Mixed Use	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.15 Site: INVERNESS NS37, Simpsons Garden Centre >> 7.15.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need badger survey and protection plan if necessary (including also consideration of cumulative effect).
Mr Andrew Brown	Inverness Housing	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.16 Site: INVERNESS NS41, Birchwood, Inshes >> 7.16.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to consider impact on woodland and green network; would need a species survey and protection plan if necessary; would need retention of as much woodland as possible; would need requirement for compensatory tree planting to contribute to green network.
Mr John Glendinning	Inverness Housing	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.16 Site: INVERNESS NS41, Birchwood, Inshes >> 7.16.1	7.16 Site: INVERNESS NS41, Birchwood, Inshes - Paragraph 7.16.1As stated in the comments the site has no agricultural use due to the proximity of the nearby housing estate. The site no longer allows any private use by us the owners for the same reason - the nearby housing estate at Birchwood. Although the area is a long established woodland the trees are mainly small and of poor quality. The mature trees within the site are mainly round the perimeter of the site and any development could retain the majority of the larger trees and thus retain the screen from all sides. The site in my view is ideal for a small extension to the existing Birchwood housing estate, all services are available, no new access is required to any main road and any development would be totally screened from view on all sides, unlike one of the preferred sites nearby which is completely open and can even be seen from the A9 nearby and is also right at the roadside and there would be considerable light pollution from this site. The report also suggests that no houses are needed. My understanding is that the Highland Council area is desperately short of low cost affordable housing so I am most surprised at this statement. Why are no houses needed at this site but are perhaps needed on an open site a few hundred metres away. Also, I believe that THC have a considerable budget over the coming years for new housing, particularly low cost affordable housing. The report under section 9.9.4 seems to have no reason for not including the area for inclusion in the local plan. 9.9.4 also makes reference to mature woodland. The trees may be mature but as stated above are mainly small scrubland type trees. I remain of the view that this site or part of the site would be an ideal extension to the Birchwood estate with its nearby availability of all services, road networks and public services.
Mr Malcolm Smith	Muir of Ord	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.17 Site: MUIR OF ORD NS46, Tomich House	The identified site at Tomich House lies immediately to the south of Muir of Ord (opposite Windhill) and directly adjacent to and accessed from the A862, allocated for the development of 3/4 live-work residential units. The site is accessible (to the A862 and to local services in Muir of Ord), is fully contained within a long established landscape framework (which would be retained and enhanced as part of any development), and would represent an attractive and deliverable development that would contribute positively to increasing sustainable economic growth within the area and meeting a form of housing provision not provided for elsewhere in the plan area. The development would comprise low density bespoke units containing residential and related business space designed to facilitate home working. They would meet a particular market niche for this type of development within the area, provision for which is not presently available. Development of the site in the manner proposed would have no negative impacts on local services or on local landscape quality, the stated rationale for resisting development in such areas set out within Highland Council's present policy. Rather, the development would be high quality development fully integrated within a landscape framework and making a positive contribution to meeting housing/employment needs in a sustainable manner while responding positively to the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy. In recognition of the guidance in Scottish Planning Policy that most new development in rural areas should be within/adjacent to existing settlements, geographically the site is outwith but well related/accessible to Muir of Ord and would provide a bespoke form of development not readily deliverable within the identified settlement boundary. There is an accepted requirement at national level for live-work style residential units in rural areas as a positive response to sustainable development. There is however no such provision for d Tomich House
Mr Andrew Brown	Muir of Ord	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.17 Site: MUIR OF ORD NS46, Tomich House >> 7.17.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to consider potential impact on woodland on outer parts of site; would need a species survey and protection plan if necessary; would need retention of as much woodland as possible; would need requirement for compensatory tree planting for any woodland felled.

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Messrs R & C MacKenzie	Munloch	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.18 Site: MUNLOCHY NS121, Land north east of B1	We are disappointed that the additional area put forward as an extension to the existing Local Plan Business allocation is now indicated as a "non-preferred" site. Our client was encouraged to make this submission to the MIR following discussions with Knockbain Community Council and other local representations about the road junction. We note from the list of comments made on the MIR that Knockbain CC (00303) and Mr Anthony Neil Morey (00774) that they support the extension of site B1 to the east for craft workshops and the road safety improvements that could result. We also note that the listed "Pros" are opportunity for tourism related development, possible economic benefit and the provision of a staggered road junction. The "Cons" are: sensitive site for landscape impact, outwith settlement boundary, possibly does not fully address junction issue, sufficient business opportunity within B1 and prime agricultural land. Many of the Cons listed are questionable, notably in respect of the junction issue. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (also enclosed) suggests that whilst there may be scope for some improvement to the junction between the B9161 and the A832 it does not address "the important leg from the village on to the A832". This assertion seems to have been made without approaching us or our client to discuss the availability of adjacent land on the south east side of the junction or accounting for the suggestion by Steven Grant from TECS Roads about moving the northern leg of the junction to the eastern edge of the requested additional business/tourism land. Indeed Steven Grant was the only Council official to approach us to discuss this matter. There is clearly concern locally and within the Council about the current alignment of the road junction but the Council does not have the resources to effect the preferred solution, which could be undertaken as part of developing an expanded business site. As advised previously our client is not in a position
Neil Gray	Beaully	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.2 Site: BEAULY NS25, Wellhouse (north of Beaully)	Simpson Builders Ltd object to the Council's non-preference of site reference NS25 at Wellhouse, north of Beaully. The attached representation was lodged on 28th May 2012, during the valid consultation period for the Main Issues Report for the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. It supports the allocation of land at Wellhouse for mixed uses of business/industry and residential institution. Simpson Builders Ltd is concerned that despite the proposals for NS25 demonstrating an ability to meet a number of Beaully's Key Development Issues as identified in the MIR, this site has been overlooked. In particular, the proposal for Wellhouse would and should, provide a significant new investment that will meet the lack of employment land opportunities in Beaully. This oversight by the Council is now further exacerbated by the Council's indication preference for allocating land at the former House of Beaully (proposed site NS133) for business/tourism. Should the current planning application reference 13/002240/FUL for sub division to create a convenience retail store and 2 office units be successful and be implemented, then there would be a further shortage of available, effective land suitable to address the identified lack of employment land in Beaully. It is respectfully suggested that, for the reasons set out in the initial representation of 28th May 2012, promoting the allocation of land at Wellhouse for future commercial employment-generating uses, the Council reconsider the stated non-preference of site NS25 at Wellhouse to be a preference that can offer much needed employment land for Beaully. In the MIR, the Key Issues facing Beaully include "lack of employment land" –the only way to meet the real lack of employment land is to allocate further land specifically identified to meet the employment land requirement. Land at Wellhouse, on the north boundary of Beaully, promoted to Highland Council (Local Development Plan ref MIR 00661) site Ref NS25, at Wellhouse, would app NS25 Wellhouse, Beaully
Kit Bowen	Strathpeffer	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.20 Site: STRATHPEFFER NS16, North of former railway station	The Strathpeffer Community Council (SCC) have already spent some considerable time in giving their views which were detailed in a full response to you dated July 2012. Para 6 refers. Further to their meeting on 10 June the SCC continue to believe that opportunities for employment in the village are important and feel that the concerns raised can be overcome, albeit with tight planning conditions. As such they do not agree with the recommendation to not favour this proposal.
Mr Andrew Brown	Tain	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.21 Site: TAIN NS71, Land to south of A9 >> 7.21.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to screen as part of the HRA for relative proximity to Morangie Forest SPA (capercaillie).

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Mr Andrew Brown	Conon Bridge	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.3 Site: CONON BRIDGE NS11, NW Conon Bridge >> 7.3.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to screen as part of the HRA for relative proximity to Conon Islands SAC.
Mr And Mrs G Nixon	Conon Bridge	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.5 Site: CONON BRIDGE NS56, Land comprising Drouthy Duck and surrounding land to west	Objection is taken to the continued failure to identify this site for development. Whilst the Council acknowledge that it is a brownfield infill site, its development is opposed due to its perceived flood risk. However, as highlighted in the submission to the Main Issues Report, the adjoining site MU2 on the opposite side of the High Street and nearby site MU1 both sit at a similar elevation and are at no less a risk of flooding. Their development is subject to a "flood defences review" and a similar requirement could be applied to this site. In any event the continued imposition of a flood risk constraints must be questioned; SEPA, in responding to a consultation (attached) to proposals for the 'Drouthy Duck' to provide 12 flats, did not object to the development. It was their understanding that Highland Council TEC Services had gone out to tender for works to remediate the Conon Bridge Flood Prevention Scheme (FPS). They suggested the imposition of a suspensive condition that no development takes place until the planning authority receive written confirmation that the Conon Bridge Village FPS is fully remediated. That was the position adopted by SEPA in 2009 and, it is understood, that those works have now been concluded. As such, there should be no impediment, in terms of flood risk, to identifying this site for development. Regarding concerns over potential impact on listed buildings; this can be managed through careful and sympathetic development of the site. If appropriate, the 'Drouthy Duck' can be retained with new development sensitively sited on the land to the rear. Any impacts can be minimised and such a justification should not be used to exclude the site from the proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). It is contended that this site is capable of beneficial development and should be allocated for residential or mixed use development in the proposed LDP. Conon Bridge NS56 (Drouthy Duck)
Mr Andrew Brown	Contin	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.6 Site: CONTIN NS111, Land north of Contin >> 7.6.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred from desk appraisal would seem to affect Ancient Woodland (Type 2a – ancient of semi-natural origin).
Mr Fraser Stewart	Cromarty	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.7 Site: CROMARTY NS59, Land south of Manse	The land immediately adjacent to the North/East of this site referred to as Site H4 in the MIR, or NS58 in the current consultation is a more obvious and natural choice for an extension to the existing settlement boundary. At present site NS59 is isolated, and only makes sense for inclusion if the land H4/NS58 is included in any settlement extension. Cromarty Site NS59
Mr Andrew Brown	Dingwall	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.8 Site: DINGWALL NS15, SE of Craig Road >> 7.8.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to screen as part of the HRA for proximity to Cromarty Firth SPA.
Mr Andrew Brown	Dingwall	7 Non Preferred Alternative Sites and Uses >> 7.9 Site: DINGWALL NS20, East of Dingwall >> 7.9.1	Noted non-preferred. If preferred would need to screen as part of the HRA for relative proximity to Cromarty Firth SPA.
Mr Fraser Stewart	SEA	9 Appendix 1 - Strategic Environmental Assessment - Site Assessments >> 9.15 Cromarty	As the agent for Mr McBean the landowner of site NS 58, we attach comments on inconsistencies between the SEA's which have been prepared for Mr McBeans (a preferred site NS58), and an adjacent site NS59 (non preferred) site. Cromarty Sites NS58 & NS59

Customer Name	Issue	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Andrew Murchison	SEA	9 Appendix 1 - Strategic Environmental Assessment - Site Assessments >> 9.15 Cromarty >> 9.15.1	We refer to the above matter in which we are instructed by Mr MacBean. He has asked us to make representations on his behalf in regard to the current proposals for the above plan. Our client's proposal is that the sites at H1-4 would be suitable sites for housing. He had also initially suggested that the site at H7 would be suitable for housing but he accepts that this is not a suitable site. With regard to the Land South of the Manse, which is listed as preferred for inclusion as a site for housing, our client confirms that he would be prepared to have this included for housing, and indeed this was an initial suggestion put forward by him. Our client has advised that there is a need for affordable housing, particularly for young people, in the village. There have been a number of young people who have recently moved out of the town to take advantage of affordable housing opportunities in Fortrose. There are not any similar opportunities within Cromarty. It has been suggested that the failure of plots at Cromarty Mains to sell is indicative of the fact there is no such demand. These plots have had considerable cost involved with the connection to the sewerage treatment plant. These costs almost of necessity will deter young entrants looking for affordable housing. The planning restrictions on the plots require that the houses be built to the same specifications. This does not lend itself to purchasers who wish to self-build. Mr MacBean has also commented that he is prepared to enter into such binding agreements as the Council may reasonably require in order to secure the provision of affordable housing. Our client wishes to make clear that he is suggesting four possible sites, of which he would only be wishing one to be used for development. He has no strong preference as to which site would be best, but following the recent meeting, suspects that site H4 would have the most support amongst, councillors, officials and the local community. All the sites under c
Simon Barry	SEA	9 Appendix 1 - Strategic Environmental Assessment - Site Assessments >> 9.26 Tore >> 9.26.2	Highland Grain Ltd, as owner of the site adjoining the area proposed for development by its owner, does have long term plans for growth of its business, which already makes a significant contribution to the local economy. Whilst there is still some limited space available on site, it would be very helpful to have the opportunity to develop a further area for grain storage either to the North or South of the site. The area to the North would be Highland Grain's preferred option but we are aware of the interests of the owner of the house at that end of the site, which may result in difficulties for both parties. Highland Grain would therefore like to see the area proposed for development, i.e. to the south of the site, as being zoned for development in the event that any application for development at the North end runs into difficulty and restricts opportunities for the business. Highland Grain
Neil Angus Martin Mackay	SEA	9 Appendix 1 - Strategic Environmental Assessment - Site Assessments >> 9.8 Drumnadrochit >> 9.8.1	9.8.1 SITE ASSESSMENT DRUMNADROCHIT NS14 BLAIRBEG The following responses are offered to the comments in the assessment document. 1 – 3. Some loss will occur but the No. of Plots has been reduced. Plot 1 has the fewest trees. Medium value trees (4 in all) are located on the boundary edges of Plots 1 and 3. Apart from 2 medium/low value trees on the roadside boundary of Plot 3 all the rest are low value or recommended for removal. Refer to Tree Survey. 5 See 7.10.1 for comments on roads. 9 Little used by public owing to existing old walls impeding access. Most activity is on the north and west side of the wood. There is one informal route crossing SW corner of Plot 3. See 10 below and last year's submission. 10 Little used informal route can easily be moved 3-4 meters and a proper safe gap in the boundary wall rather than the existing access created by the simple expedient of knocking the top of the wall down. 32 Majority of wood will be retained and kept as such with, hopefully, management and regeneration if all or most comes to pass. The area of potential low density private development is on the far, south, side of the village away from it. The visual aspect from the village will not be altered. The landscape will remain the same. The above relates to para 7.10.1. Drumnadrochit NS14 Blairbeg