

Customer Name	Organisation	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
The Co-operative Group per Graeme Laing			<p>We refer to the above consultation exercise being undertaken by The Highland Council in respect of the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan and hereby submit the following response on behalf of our client The Co-operative Group. This submission is made further to our recent correspondence of 25th February 2013 regarding the Co-operative Group's desire to invest in Fortrose, specifically on land on the eastern side of Ness Road at its junction with the A862. Having reviewed the published consultation papers, we note that the Council are establishing the Ness Gap site in Fortrose as a preferred alternative site with a suggested change of use from housing to mixed use/community/commerce. We also note that in proposing the change of use, the consultation papers establish that the Ness Gap site offers the following benefits: • Opportunity for relocated expanded food store (subject to proving no detrimental impact on town centre) • edge of centre location • provides flexibility for future • could improve parking situation in town centre • within easy walking distance of much of Fortrose • close to public transport connections The papers also note that the proposed change of use on the Ness Gap site could result in the loss of a potential primary school site. Our client is concerned at the suggested change of use in respect of the Ness Gap site and do not consider that this site represents an appropriate location for a relocated foodstore in Fortrose. Indeed, our clients wish to take this opportunity to reaffirm the terms of their previous correspondence which confirms the Co-op's intention to expand its store in Fortrose, their interest in land east of Ness Road at its junction with the A832 (identified MU3 in the Local Development Plan Main Issues Report.) and their view that this site represents the most suitable location for a relocated foodstore in Fortrose. Our clients wish to make it clear that the Ness Gap site would not meet their requirements for a relocated foodstore for a number of reasons. Firstly, the Co-op require to maintain a high profile trading position in the town, something which the land east of Ness Road would provide, allowing the Co-op to develop a new store that would have strong linkages with established commercial activities and local businesses. Secondly, the Ness Gap site is further away from the town centre and a new store would have to be developed amongst residential development, creating the potential conflict with issues relating to restricted opening hours, servicing vehicles, customer traffic and related public activity. Indeed, it is our client's experience that introducing a foodstore onto the ness Gap site would compromise the ability of that site to deliver a high standard of residential amenity for the housing that is proposed. These are important commercial and operating factors and the Co-operative Group would have no interest in the Ness Gap site. Our client also wishes to reaffirm that they are in active discussions with the owner of the land east of Ness Road with a view to submitting an early planning application. Indeed matters have progressed significantly in that regard since the Main Issues Report consultation in June 2012. Whilst it is regrettable that the time-table and progress with the Local Development Plan has slipped, we trust the Council will respond positively to the Co-op's requirements. We therefore look forward to discussions with you as to how a planning application should proceed, as soon as possible after the Proposed Plan is considered by the Committee which we understand will take place on 14th August 2013.</p>
Liz MacKay Secretary	GL Hearn Ltd	NS129 Fortrose Gap Site	
Liz MacKay Secretary	Tain Community Council	TAIN NS23, Glenmorangie	The Community Council has no objection in principle to the development of this area but, given the sensitive landscape setting, it should not include the erection of warehousing and any new building should be designed to an aesthetically high level with appropriate landscaping incorporated as an inherent part of the proposal.
Liz MacKay Secretary	Tain Community Council	TAIN NS28, Kirksheaf	The Community Council is happy to support housing over the previously identified area plus the site of the former sawmills. However, an important proviso ought to be that any development proposal makes allowance for safe and proper vehicular access, and one which does nothing to prejudice the setting of the property Croft Roy. Care ought to be taken to define properly the detailed boundary of the new zoning for, as currently represented, it appears to include the Tain Bowling Club. Due cognisance ought also to be had for the land currently set aside for cemetery expansion, and possibly even appropriate allowance made for a future extension, to avoid land-locking.
Liz MacKay Secretary	Tain Community Council	TAIN NS71, Land to south of A9	The Community Council wishes to reiterate the need to have land identified in this Local Plan for Business use. The site B1 owned by Glenmorangie Distillery and Mrs Stone is most likely to be compromised by the distillery's own development aspirations, as evidenced by a recent application for a warehouse access, submitted and subsequently withdrawn. The field owned by Mrs Stone is not large enough on its own to opportunities. As commented upon previously, the sites MU2 and MU3 identified for a mix of residential and business are wholly inappropriate for the latter use, given lack of visibility and poor access. Despite your reasoning as to the 'Cons' affecting the site we have put forward, the fact it is outwith the A9 by-pass is not applicable as a consideration since the precedent for development beyond it's line is well established. Distance from the centre of the settlement is completely irrelevant. With regard to access, the Community Council has long insisted upon improvements to the Morangie Road/A9 junction and such a business development as proposed would provide a perfect opportunity to tackle this important safety issue once and for all. Accordingly, the Community Council insists you review your position with regard to this site and its proposed use.
Mr A McArthur, Drummond Farm, Evanton per Steven Cooper	Bidwells	Evanton NS113	<p>This letter is submitted on behalf of Mr A McArthur, Drummond Farm, Evanton in respect of the above. The consultation states that NS113 is a non-preferred site and lists the cons to the development of this site as: • Loss of prime farmland • Negative landscape and visual impact • Drainage network improvements required In support of the site, the assessment states • No flood risk • Close to village centre and primary school It is submitted that each of the development options promoted for Evanton will result in the loss of prime agricultural land. With limited opportunity for growth supported by brownfield land only, this is unavoidable. Accordingly potential housing land must be considered on merit. Furthermore, each development site proposed will have to resolve its own site specific drainage issues and network improvements. Compared to the significant infrastructure constraint at Teandallon, this is a minor issue, and not one that would prevent the development on site NS113. The key issue raised is the perceived negative landscape designation. The site is not readily visible in wider public areas. Indeed, it is only readily visible from Balcomie Street from the west and the Kiltearn Rd to the south. The site is not prominent in view from the A9 to the south, and is completely obstructed from the A9 to the east and north. An escarpment runs across the adjoining land to the north. There is already a house built on the upper level. Further to the north west there is also housing at the upper level, close to the railway. It is our opinion that the development of Site NS113 would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area. However, as a compromise, a revised site plan is attached which illustrates potential development land restricted in order to accommodate landscaping measures around the site. The revised plan allows for around two hectares of NS113 to be retained in agricultural use with structural landscaping around the boundaries. An additional access point could also be located as shown on the attached plan. This would maximise the connectivity of the site in accordance with the best practice advice set out in "Designing Streets". This revised proposal will address any concerns in respect of the landscape impact of development, whilst allowing additional housing land to come forward. As noted in the consultation documents there are clear advantages to the development of this site. It is close to the village centre and within walking distance of the school. Again this clearly complies with National Policy set out in 'Designing Streets' and meets the key aims of the Sustainability agenda in respect of 'walkable communities'. This part of the site does not lie within an area of flood risk and is easily accessible from the public road network. The site is within the ownership of a party that is able to release the land for development, and critically the site is free from significant infrastructure complaint and its development would have little impact on the public purse. The site is effective and deliverable within the plan period. There is a clear focus at National Level on the requirement for development plans to allocate a generous supply of effective housing land. Furthermore, the Highland Wide Local Development Plan embodies these principles and seeks to direct development to the right places, creating better places. Policy 28 sets out the requirement for all development to be designed in the context of sustainable development and states: "The Council will support developments which promote and enhance the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the people of Highland. Proposed developments will be assessed on the extent to which they: are compatible with public service provision (water and sewerage, drainage, roads, schools, electricity);" Unfortunately, Highland Council continues to allocate land at Teandallon which faces significant infrastructure hurdles that have limited its ability to make nay land of meaningful contribution to the supply of houses in Evanton, since its initial allocation some 30 years ago. Its continued allocation, despite it clearly being a non-effective site, at the expense of other effective sites, such as NS113, is strangling Evanton of much needed growth and investment, to the detriment of the local economy. I would therefore take this opportunity to request that Highland Council embraces this revised plan for NS113 and include it within the Proposed Plan for Evanton as a viable, deliverable housing site.</p>
Glenmorangie Company Ltd, Steven Cooper	Bidwells	Tain NS23	I attach a response to the IMFLDP additional sites consultation on behalf of the Glenmorangie Company Ltd. In our response to the IMFLDP Main Issues Report we suggested an expansion area based on the Company's ambitions at that time. However, since then and indeed since even this recent consultation period began, it has become apparent that Glenmorangie is keen to press ahead with expansion plans in an even shorter timescale than previously envisaged. Plan A attached shows a proposed expansion area for warehousing following the linear pattern of existing warehousing and those recently approved under planning permission 12/00424/FUL. The Company hopes to develop this area in the short term and ideally would like this area of land allocated. As I mentioned previously, since the MIR consultation the Company has reviewed its expansion plans and seeks to develop land on the west side of the A9 in a 5-6 year timescale. This is illustrated on the attached Plan B. I understand that this site was not previously highlighted in the MIR response, but again my client would ideally like to pursue an allocation. I understand that this site will raise many other issues, including access and perhaps a meeting to discuss the way forward would be in order?

Customer Name	Organisation	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
Tain NS23			<p>I write on behalf of The Glenmorangie Company Limited in respect of the above. My clients are fully supportive of the allocation of land at Glenmorangie Distillery, Tain for industrial/employment development. However, after reviewing and revising short term expansion plans, the company is keen to bring forward expansion plans and would like to use this opportunity to outline the revised short term expansion safeguard area. This identified land for additional warehouse development is in line with the existing warehouses and those approved under the grant of planning permission 12/00424/FUL, and further development around the distillery/visitor centre area. My client understands that improvements to the site access may be necessary and is keen to separate distally and visitor traffic on site. The company is currently considering all access options available. The Glenmorangie Distillery is vital to the local economy both as a means of employment provision and also as a tourist attraction. My clients therefore wish to ensure that sufficient land is allocated to meet local needs and to accommodate their own future expansion proposals. Accordingly my clients propose that the site B1 is retained as per the MIR settlement plan, and land surrounding the Glenmorangie Distillery is safeguarded for future expansion proposals. Paragraph 45 of the SPP is unequivocal in its support for economic development: Authorities should respond to the diverse needs and locational requirements of different sectors and sizes of businesses and take a flexible approach to ensure that changing circumstances can be accommodated and new economic opportunities realised. Removing unnecessary planning barriers to business development and providing scope for expansion and growth is essential. The planning system should support economic development in all areas by: • taking account of the economic benefits of proposed development in development plans and development management decisions, • promoting development in sustainable locations, particularly in terms of accessibility, promoting regeneration and the full and appropriate use of land, buildings and infrastructure, • supporting development which will provide new employment opportunities and enhance local competitiveness, and ■ promoting the integration of employment generation opportunities with supporting infrastructure and housing development. The planning system should also be responsive and sufficiently flexible to accommodate the requirements of inward investment and growing indigenous firms. Land surrounding the distillery is presently considered 'countryside', a designation which could pose a potential lanning policy barrier for future expansion plans. Whilst Policy 41 of the Highland Wide Plan sets a broad framework that encourages economic development, the Distillery itself is not specifically safeguarded and the site lie outwith the settlement of Tain. Therefore, the policy context is not clear in respect of my clients' future intentions. In accordance with Scottish Government Policy my clients seek an allocation of land to allow for the future expansion of the site, consolidating Glenmorangie's position in the local economy. I trust that this response is of assistance and interest to you and we look forward to discussing these issues in more detail as the plan emerges in the months ahead.</p>
Mrs. Pat Wells	STRATHDEARN AGAINST WINDFARM DEVELOPMENTS	Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area (SLA)	<p>SAWD members have a particular interest in the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors Special Landscape Area (SLA) and agree with the proposal to extend the boundary northwards (preferred extension) and the suggested extension north and south west of the existing SLA as set out in the Council’s recommendation (Main Issues Report Spring 2012). The extension will serve to better protect the landscape and cultural heritage of an area which is highly valued by local people and the many visitors for whom the Lochindorb, Dava and Drynachan countryside represents something special. We <b>object</b> to the proposed exclusions (shown in red on page 11 map) and the call for the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA designation to be abandoned (Section 3: 3.4.9). We are aware that the Tom nan Clach wind farm has recently been approved by the Scottish Government, despite the site falling within the existing SLA. However, there is a possibility of a Judicial Review. Whatever the final outcome for the Tom nan Clach wind farm, <b>the SLA designation must be retained and the boundary extended</b> in order to strengthen the case against further wind farm development in this special area now under increasing threat of industrialisation from wind turbines. For example, the Pol Lochaig wind farm scoping document states that the Tom nan Clach access will be used for the nine x 126m high turbines proposed for Cnochan Mor hill above the Findhorn gorge (close to the Tom nan Clach development). Scottish Planning Policy bestows some value to local and regional designations and we ask that Highland Council stands by its commitment to protect this highly scenic area and <b>extends</b> the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA.</p>
John Edmondson	Ardross Community Council	Hinterland	<p>We have now had a chance to study some of the proposed extensions to the Hlnterland being proposed. We were surprised not to see the whole area of Stittenham to be included. We have always made representations that the whole of Stittenham be included in the Hinterland area, and should extend further north than indicated on the maps. Indeed the Planning Authority has included a larger area previously. Given the fact that we have requested that the Hinterland area at Stittenham extend further north than indicated, it would be helpful if you could explain your reasons for not including.</p>
John Wright	Strutt & Parker	Muir of Ord	<p>LATE SUBMISSION We have reviewed the consultation document, specifically in respect of sites at Muir of Ord being considered for housing and would wish at this stage to raise our objection to the proposed site “6.13 Muir of Ord NS22, SW Muir of Ord” to the south of Corrie Road. Whilst we acknowledge the stated “pro” of development in this location as being to round off the western expansion of the settlement, we do not believe that this aspiration off sets the significant “con” identified of this site being its distance from the Primary School (and therefore its inherent sustainability). This also raises question marks over the ability to provide “safe routes to school” from the site, given the need to cross busy main roads and the railway. We would be surprised if there were not also access/road capacity issues with a development of this scale in this location. The development of this site could also have a potentially adverse impact on the setting of Castle Hill Scheduled Ancient Monument. We believe that a preferable area for the future (mixed use) expansion of Muir of Ord lies on the eastern side of the settlement, to the north of Black Isle Road (MIR Site MU3). We had sought to clarify the intention here in our MIR Representations, to rationalise the area proposed for development, and to address some of the identified “cons” of the site. We therefore remain of the view that this site is in close proximity to the school, and town centre, and provides an opportunity to enhance public recreational space in the area, and to resolve a currently difficult junction on the public highway. This would similarly provide for the long term growth of the settlement in a planned/phased manner in a sustainable location. Whilst we acknowledge this is a late submission, we do hope that you will take these comments in to account in preparing the Proposed Plan in due course.</p>
Gwyn Phillips		Fortrose Gap Site	<p>EMAIL COMMENT TO SUPPORT ORIGINAL COMMENT IN UNIFORM CONTENT REFERS TO EMAIL FROM LOCAL GP - I had not heard about this meeting, and unfortunately tomorrow is my late evening surgery, so it is unlikely that I will manage to attend. If I am finished before the meeting ends I will pop in. I am sorry to hear that plans for a new primary school are in abeyance. What is now the plan for the future of primary schooling? We feel our current surgery premises remain adequate for our current needs and for the foreseeable future. With our current spare capacity we are still able to host a variety of non-practice personnel including physiotherapists, podiatrists, psychiatrists, psychologists, speech therapists, health visitors, midwives, counsellors etc. In recent years our list size has dropped some 10% due to our new strict policy of adhering to practice boundaries. We therefore feel we will be well able to manage the healthcare of residents of all the planned new housing. It will take about 500 new residents to bring our capitation back to where it was about five years ago A day care facility in the mid Black Isle has been a great lack for many decades. We had hoped that Marine House would open such a facility but this was not to be, and now the provision by Shoremills is no longer available. There is of course some availability in Urray House, the RNI, County Hospital and the Highland Hospice, but all of these are limited and somewhat distant. Such an adequately staffed day care centre would be a great asset in the community and would enhance the lives of the elderly and/or infirm and also of their unpaid carers on whom our society now depends. Billy Barclay's dementia café is proving to be very successful and we must all be grateful for, and impressed by the initiative shown by him and his team.</p>
Mr Douglas Barker per Douglas Milne	Morton Fraser Solicitors	Fortrose North of Caravan Park	<p>1 This would result in 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 the loss of any agricultural land but some of the best agricultural land in Scotland. Our client views this action as a severe lack of foresight which results in the long term loss by many to the short term benefit of only a few. 2 Our client considers 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 that 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. In addition our client emphatically agrees with the further 'cons' identified by the Council, which are: Access issues; sensitive site for landscape impact, outwith settlement boundary, not within easy walkable distance of village facilities and possible odour nuisance. <u>These comments shall be lodged online on the Local Development Plan website.</u></p>
	Transport Scotland	General	<p>The following comments are provided for sites which Transport Scotland has not previously commented upon in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan and where Transport Scotland considers there could be a potential impact to the trunk road network. These are alternative sites and land uses which the Council consider have potential to be identified in the next stage of the Plan. While preferred access strategies have yet to be identified for these sites, due consideration should be taken of SPP with regard to access to the trunk road network. It states at paragraph 175 that new junctions onto the motorway and trunk road network are not normally acceptable, but the case for such junctions will be considered where significant economic growth or regeneration benefits can be demonstrated. Direct access onto any strategic road should be avoided as far as practicable. Access should be from a secondary road unless there is no alternative. Also, in a general context it is recommended that any infrastructure required to support delivery of these proposed development sites is detailed within the LDP’s Action Programme.</p>

Customer Name	Organisation	New Site ref.	Verbatim Comment
	Transport Scotland	Alness, Dalmore Distillery - Proposed Use: Industry	Site NS107 is located adjacent to the A9(T). The impact of the site on the A9(T)/ B817 junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Alness, Land north of Teaninich Distillery – Proposed Use: expansion of existing distillery	Site NS108 is located north of the A9(T). The cumulative impact of sites NS108 and NS131 on the Teaninich Ave/ A9(T) junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Alness, Averon Way – Proposed Use: Completion of business site	Site NS131 is located north of the A9(T). The cumulative impact of sites NS108 and NS131 on the Teaninich Ave/ A9(T) junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Alness, Alness Point Business Park – Proposed Use: Completion of business site	Site NS132 is located south of the A9(T). The impact of the site on the A9(T)/ Alness Point road (site access) junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Inverness NS19A - Proposed Use: Tourism	Site NS19A is located east of the A9(T), adjacent to the junction with the B9177. The impact of the proposed development on this junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Muir of Ord Glen Ord Distillery – proposed Use: Distillery Expansion	Site NS130 lies to the west of the A9(T). Potential impact on the A832/ A9 junction. The impact of the proposed development on this junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Nairn, Househill – Proposed Use: Extension to SDA boundary for further housing	Site NS4 lies to the south of the A96(T). Potential impact on the A96/ A939 junction. The impact of the proposed development on this junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	North Kessock, Land at Bellfield – Proposed use: Housing, commercial and community	Site NS122 is directly adjacent to the A9 trunk road at its junction with the North Kessock/ Charleston access. There may be a potential impact on the A9/ North Kessock/ Charleston trunk road junction. The impact of the proposed development on this junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Tain, Glenmorangie – Proposed Use: Expansion of Distillery	Site NS23 is located adjacent to the A9. Possible impact on the existing priority access junction with the A9. Supporting information indicates “improved access required”. The impact of the proposed development on this junction should be identified, with any mitigation measures which may be required discussed with Transport Scotland.
	Transport Scotland	Tore, Grain Mill Extension - Proposed Use: Expansion of Existing Grain Mill	Site NS128 is bounded by the A9 trunk road, however, the existing grain mill is accessed via the local road network. Transport Scotland recommends that access to the proposed extension continue to be from the local road network.
Mr and Mrs KA & EJ Urquhart		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 <b>strongly object to those exclusions as illogical as the landscape</b> 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). <b>We support both the preferred and suggested extensions of the SLA set out in the MIR as appropriate and logical.</b> With regard to Section 3 of the IMFLDP Additional Sites Consultation - at 3.4.9 <b>the wording is unclear</b> but there appears to be the suggestion that the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA should be removed. <b>If that is a proposal to remove this whole SLA from its designation we strongly object to that suggestion</b> 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" <b>we take it that the suggestion at 3.4.9 will be firmly resisted, and we support that. With regard to Section 4.5.2 we support the proposed slight amendment</b> of the southern boundary of the Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA to better accord with the line of the hill tops, and <b>also support resisting any more substantial reduction</b> for the reasons given that the landscape characteristics and special qualities of the SLA as mentioned are very much in evidence within this southern area of open uplands.
Peter Christie	Strathnairn Community Wood	5.6 HINT NS4 Non Preferred Suggested further contraction to MIR Suggested Contraction South of Dores to Farr	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. Their 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.
Basil Dunlop	Vice Chair & Planning	Drynachan, Lochindorb and Dava Moors SLA	With reference to the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan Alternative Sites and Uses Consultation, we herewith confirm that we agree with the extended Special Landscape Area for Dava, Lochindorb and Drynachan proposals to give greater protection from the threat of retrograde development.
			Notes the House of Beaully has an extensive planning history, including the refusal of planning permission in principle for housing in 2012 and that an application is currently pending for the subdivision of the building. Does not object to the Council’s preference to allocation the site for housing, however asserts that the current planning application is for a retail convenience store with two office units. Considers that if the current planning application is successful then tis would negate any benefits of allocating the site for future redevelopment. However if the site 32:32does continue to be allocated then it should be allocated for a broader use such as ‘mixed use commercial’.
Simpsons Builders	c/o Colliers	NS133 Beaully - House of Beaully	Considers that the redevelopment of former House of Beaully may provide some of needs to address the lack of employment land in the village, however the only way to meet the real lack of employment land is to allocate further land specifically identified to meet the employment land requirement. States that the land at Wellhouse would appear the most viable option for address the lack of employment land.
Simpsons Builders	c/o Colliers	NS25 Beaully - Wellhouse	Wellhouse – objects to Council’s non-preference for the allocation a 3.9 hectare site for mixed use development of classes 4, 5 and 6 plus close-care housing at Wellhouse. Considers the site should be allocated for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ability to meet key development issues identified for Beaully in the MIR</li><li>• Provision of significant new investment</li><li>• Meet lack of employment land opportunities in Beaully</li><li>• If current planning application for the subdivision of 3 units at the former House of Beaully is permitted there would be a further shortage of effective business land in Beaully</li><li>• Most viable option to address lack of employment in the settlement</li></ul>