

Issue (ref and heading):	ACHARACLE GENERAL	9
Development plan reference:	General Comment Text MB 6 – Map LO2 MB 7	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
HIE (495)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General Comment	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>There should a specific allocation of viable land for business purposes in each of the main settlements, rather than assuming provision will fall within Mixed Use allocations. In particular further consideration should be given to allocating business land in Acharacle and other villages particularly where further housing provision is proposed, promoting sustainable communities.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
A specific business allocation.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN BUSINESS AND OTHER ALLOCATIONS.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The Council has now allocated a specific business site which provides land adjacent to existing businesses, and reserves an opportunity for road frontage. That is not to say that this is the only land that can be developed for business uses as there would still potentially be further opportunity within the mixed use allocation and the wider Settlement Development Area (SDA).</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ACHARACLE H1 - West of Medical Centre	10
Development plan reference:	H1 West of the Medical Centre Text MB6 – Map LO2 MB 7	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
E. Gill (747)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
If this land fitted all the criteria for a burial ground, the local church congregation would prefer to see the land used for this purpose.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Want burial ground safeguard. Objection to competing use (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION. <u>Reasons</u> - The whole housing allocation is not necessary for extension to the graveyard so the reservation of land within it is sufficient. Also it is considered that this is an appropriate site for elderly amenity accommodation given its centrality to a larger community.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ACHARACLE H2 - Ardshellach (Druimbeg)	11
Development plan reference:	H2 Ardshellach Text MB 6 – Map LO2 MB 7	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
P. MacFarlane (786) B. Claussen (144) A. Tilling (721)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>P. MacFarlane</u> - objection to development because of the potential adverse impact on: the adjacent National Nature Reserve of Lelaish Moss; the time honoured Right of Way and access route from Acharacle to Polloch (designated Wider Access Network Path in the draft core paths plan); other environmental sensitivities (specifically the questions covered by questions 11, 12, 13 and particularly 18 and 19 of the site's strategic environmental assessment). Also believes there will be an adverse impact on wild, unique and wonderful area. The site's increased capacity will have an increased adverse impact. Also concern over the junction improvements as this will involve blasting rock that will affect objector's property. • <u>B. Claussen</u> - doubts over the feasibility of the northern portion of the site north of the road (outwith objector's ownership) due to depth and movement of peat. Also believes that level of development would require footpaths into the village and pumping of sewage. • <u>Tilling</u> - Feels central sites within the village should be concentrated on. The impact of the road and the loss of trees are unacceptable. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiling and P. MacFarlane request deletion of site (implied). • Claussen wishes land north of the track to be deleted from the allocation (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION. See commended change below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The Council has already added developer requirements to address objectors' concerns in terms of pedestrian safety, flood risk, the right of way, woodland, amenity and setting. The post Examination SEA matrix will be updated to reflect the concerns expressed in relation to questions 11, 18, and possibly 19 (after consultation with our biodiversity officer). With regards to question 12 there is not any <i>designated wild land</i> nearby which is the interpretation of this question. Question 13 relates to <i>designated conservation areas</i> of which there are none. Connection to the main sewer will be sought in accordance with the Plan's General Policy on waste water treatment. If proposals are not expected to connect after assessment against this policy then they will be required to not result in significant environmental health problems and this may reduce the density of any proposal. The site capacity is erroneous and relates to a planning consent capacity that only covers part of the site.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
The Reporter may wish to consider a higher capacity if the site is confirmed following Examination. THC considers that 25 units would be a more appropriate indicative capacity.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ACHMORE	55
Development plan reference:	Achmore - Settlement Development Area (SDA); Allocations AH (West of Former Council Housing), H (South of Forestry Houses), C2 (North of Hall), Text MB70 – Map SL3 MB 70	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<u>SDA & H:</u> G. L. & E. A. Underhill (403), C. & J. Parsons (929) <u>AH:</u> I. Johnston (897) <u>H & C2:</u> C. & J. Parsons (929)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing, Affordable housing, Community Allocations and SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA:</u> objections to the principle of any development potential on land south of forestry cottages and on H allocation because of: loss of farmland (contrary to planning legislation); inadequate sewerage / septic tank soakaway capacity; no public transport or supporting facilities so increased vehicle movements will lead to increased pollution; poor ground conditions; pluvial and fluvial flood risk; adverse landscape and therefore tourism impact; adverse impact on habitats and species; access being difficult / expensive to construct and will lead to speeding; loss of view will be detrimental to self catering enterprise; there being better allocated land within the rest of the village. The Underhills also dispute the Council's assessment of the environmental effects of the site (SEA) because the site will: not yield any publicly available open space; lead to increased vehicle movements; have an adverse impact on traffic safety; cause light pollution; be a bad neighbour development; be a departure from the Adopted Skye & Lochalsh Local Plan; have an adverse landscape impact; have a protected species impact; result in a need for new culverts; be exposed to the prevailing wind, and; cause air pollution. • <u>H:</u> objections to development because: of the loss of good farmland; it is contrary to the Plan's objectives; it is better to have no specific allocations just an SDA and single house developments; the site is contrary to the community consensus view; the Adopted Plan gave an either or choice of sites. • <u>AH:</u> fear over pluvial flood risk and requests an assurance over existing and future land drainage infrastructure. • <u>C2:</u> objection because of claimed community and landowner opposition and because it is not economic. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Underhill:</u> Deletion of H and exclusion of land south of H from SDA (implied). • <u>Parsons:</u> Deletion of AH, H and C2 and redrawing of SDA boundary to exclude land south of H. • <u>Johnston:</u> Stronger requirements assurance re. pluvial flood risk (implied). 		

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authorityResponse(s) -

- SDA: NO CHANGE.
- H: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- AH: RETAIN ALLOCATION. ADD better drainage requirement as per commended change below.
- C2: RETAIN ALLOCATION.

Reasons:

- SDA & H: Only a small part of the better agricultural land is allocated and this is central to the settlement. The indicative densities proposed are in line with those existing. The Plan supports improved sewerage provision. The Council has a statutory duty to produce a local plan and Achmore is an established settlement with a community facility and a significant grouping of housing and employment buildings. National planning policy supports the principle of directing housing and supporting facilities to such established settlements. The current settlement pattern is clustered and therefore further clustered development would be appropriate. Specifically for site H, the current allocation boundary seeks to achieve a compromise between competing interests. It is appropriate to safeguard land for a village-wide waste water treatment works and a development set-back from it. The ransom issue has not been confirmed to the Council and the agricultural value of the land although an important consideration does not justify an embargo on its development given the lack of suitable alternatives. There is no absolute protection for good agricultural land in planning law. The better farmland carries the more economic ground conditions for development. The river is a natural and defensible village limit boundary and the Council have recognised this by extending the SDA up to it. There is no confirmed flood risk affecting the site. There is no evidence of national or European protected habitats and species within the site. The site is in a flat, valley floor location and is read as part of the village and therefore any landscape impact, with appropriate siting and design will not be significant. No landscape designations affect the site. The village access road has good horizontal alignment and the levels difference is not significant. The potential impact on the adjacent holiday letting business' private view is also not considered significant. Privacy considerations can be addressed via appropriate siting and design at the planning application stage but the loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration. The Plan allocates a balance of employment and housing land, and the Council has evidence of a pressing need for affordable housing. The Council's newest street lighting incorporates a low, downward emission design. The Adopted Local Plan allocates this site so there is no departure.
- AH: A stronger surface water drainage requirement would be appropriate given existing conditions and potential future pluvial flooding.
- C2: The hall has no off street parking at present which can cause traffic visibility and safety issues. The same landowner has allocated land within the village which could be used to cross subsidise a small, informal car park.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THCSDA, H & C2: NoneAH: ADD developer requirement for "net betterment of surface water drainage"

Issue (ref and heading):	ACHNACLOICH	67
Development plan reference:	Achnacloich Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB104 – Map SL40 MB104	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
R. Lintott (991)		
SNH have made a general objection requesting better referencing of SSSI interests which is addressed under the General Issue Schedule 4.		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objection to non-inclusion of land within the SDA on grounds of: the extension of the SDA would enclose existing development; no coastal flood risk; the site being on the landward side of the road and therefore there being no impact on public seaward views; no adverse landscape impact because the land is low lying; the poor agricultural quality of the land because of its rocky nature, and; spare water supply capacity.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA boundary.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - NO CHANGE other than amended heritage objective detailed below.		
<u>Reasons:</u> The suggested extension would enclose too large an area and would support development that would not replicate the existing linear crofting settlement pattern.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
AMEND objective “to protect the geological SSSI at the north end of the settlement”		

Issue (ref and heading):	AIRD BERNISDALE	72
Development plan reference:	Aird Bernisdale Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 122 – Map SL59 MB 122	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
A. Macpherson (909)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Crofter request for SDA extension because of: family need for housing; the suggested area represents the poorer agricultural land on the croft, and; power and water supply are available closeby.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA boundary.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> – The land is prominent in public views across the loch and therefore conflicts with the Council's Highland wide approach of trying to protect public views across open water. Suitably sited and designed proposals outwith the SDA may still be acceptable dependent upon the precise nature of the land between the road and the water but this area's general landscape sensitivity does not justify a more positive presumption.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	AN CLACHAN (STAFFIN)	76
Development plan reference:	An Clachan - AH, H1, H2 & B Text MB146 – Map SL87 147	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
SNH (697)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Allocations AH, H1, H2 & B.	
Summary of representation(s):		
SNH object to all allocations on the grounds of: the cumulative landscape impact on crofting landscape that is integral to Trotternish National Scenic Area (NSA); the consequential adverse impact on general landscape character; other central and better alternatives exist than the allocated sites; the adverse impact on the key view from the A855 to Trotternish Ridge; the sites H2 and B are too peripheral, the sites project into adjacent moorland landscape character type, poorly contained within landform and this isolation is emphasised by the playing field as an open ground land use.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of allocations.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATIONS but see commended design requirement changes below for sites AH1 and H2.		
<u>Reasons</u> – The NSA designation is recognised as a siting and design constraint but not as a justification for an embargo on concentrating development within walking distance of Staffin's community and commercial facilities. This concentration would fit with national sustainability objectives and would make comprehensive servicing more feasible. Other less prominent land is included within the SDA but there are significant doubts about the availability of the suggested alternatives given crofting interests and/or ground conditions. Exceptional design quality is a stated requirement for the allocated sites and they may not deliver their stated capacity given the attitude of the relevant landowners who are likely to pursue a more dispersed pattern of development. Further assurances as to scale and capacity are appropriate on the more prominent allocations H1 and AH1. Allocations H2 and B are: more distant from the A855 tourist route; lower lying; part developed; the most central and available common grazings land available, and; represent poorer croft land.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
<u>H1 & AH1</u> - AMEND developer requirements “building form and layout to comprise two 1.5 storey semi-detached housing blocks fronting the side road”. Rename AH1 as AH.		
<u>H2 & B</u> - None		

Issue (ref and heading):	ANNISHADER	73
Development plan reference:	Annishader Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 126 – Map SL63 MB 126	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Borve and Annishadder Township (512)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Township request extension of SDA because: it would represent natural extension of Annishadder township; they have the support of the local grazings committee, and; it will allow development without compromising better croftland.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA boundary.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> – A development boundary was added to the previous Plan draft to reflect that it was possible to utilise poorer croftland and support a recognised settlement. However, the size of the extension proposed is excessive in terms of: its potential adverse landscape impact in an area of commuter housing pressure; not being related to the existing settlement pattern; creating pressure for new or intensified trunk road junctions, and; the existing boundary already allows for further development on poorer croft land.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR - B1 East of School	6
Development plan reference:	B1 East of School (now deleted site) Text MB 4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Kearney Donald Partnership on behalf of R. MacLean (406)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Business Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objects to non-identification of land for housing. Wishes B1 to be integrated with land to east as a larger housing allocation.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Change use of B1 to housing and re-allocate land to east for housing as an extension of allocation H4.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.		
<u>Reasons</u> - Retention is appropriate to retain choice and flexibility in business land supply. There are adequate, allocated housing sites elsewhere in the village.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR - B2 Woodside	7
Development plan reference:	B2 Woodside Text MB 4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. & C. Carmichael (546) • Kearney Donald Partnership on behalf of Mr R. MacLean (406) (this objection has been resolved for site B1 but is interdependent to the future of site B2 and has therefore been included) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Business Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A. & C. Carmichael</u> - Objections to development on the grounds of: inadequate access; greater traffic flow and the lack of a footpath through the village; the lack of mains drainage currently available in the village and therefore the potential negative environmental effect; adverse impact on biodiversity; any development would be contrary to the linear nature of the village; inadequate provision of affordable housing for local people, and; better alternative site exist where access and services are already available for example at North Corran. • <u>Kearney Donald Partnership</u> - proposes a compensatory increase in this allocation to allow its client to pursue housing on another business allocation in the village. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A. & C. Carmichael</u> - deletion of site (implied). • <u>Kearney Donald Partnership</u> - suggests extension. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - Amendments have already been made to address objectors' concerns and the site extended. Land at North Corran is either already allocated or lies within the Settlement Development Area (SDA).</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR H1 - Lighthouse Field	1
Development plan reference:	Ardgour H1 Text MB 4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
D. & A. MacDonald (175), Kearney Donald Partnership on behalf of Mr R. MacLean (406)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p><u>D. & A. MacDonald</u> - Object to development because the Council owns a better site to the rear of houses 17-22 North Corran, which has all the services. It seems ludicrous to use up green space, when the Council have previously earmarked this area for housing.</p> <p><u>Kearney Donald Partnership</u> - Disputes that the land to the south should be safeguarded from development for a future crossing over the Corran Narrows because this will sterilise it for a considerable time.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<p><u>D. & A. MacDonald</u> - deletion of site.</p> <p><u>Kearney Donald Partnership</u> - seek increase in the capacity from 8 to 16 all of which could be affordable with an extension to the south.</p>		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - It is considered that an adequate housing land supply has been identified overall for Ardgour and Clovullin. An increase in the capacity for this site is resisted as this would require significant investment in access improvements. Several smaller sites are seen as more appropriate to the existing settlement pattern and will offer a greater likelihood of providing an effective housing land supply. At an indicative capacity of 8 the infrastructure improvements required will be more feasible than for a larger development. However, it is still considered that a developer requirement for access improvements is necessary albeit they won't be as significant.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR H2 - Woodend North	2
Development plan reference:	Ardgour H2 Text MB 4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Kearney Donald Partnership on behalf of Mr R. MacLean (406)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Queries size and capacity of allocation.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Believe it should be 1.96 hectares and have an increased capacity of 20 units.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - RETAIN ALLOCATION. <u>Reasons</u> - The Council has now increased the capacity of the site and corrected the site area. At planning application stage a more detailed appraisal will be undertaken of the actual site capacity in the context of assessing whether the developer's proposed scheme is appropriate but a 20 unit development is unlikely to be appropriate to the existing settlement pattern, demand, landscape capacity (including the presence of the designed landscape) and servicing.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR H3 - Woodend (South)	3
Development plan reference:	Ardgour H3 Text MB4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
R. Wright (970), Kearney Donald Partnership on behalf of R. MacLean (406)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation and Settlement Development Area (SDA)	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>R. Wright</u> - Wants SDA extended at south end (on land formerly covered by a larger H3 allocation) for small scale development comprising agricultural buildings and self catering holiday letting accommodation because: it will help cross subsidise one of the few actively worked local crofts; the loss of a small area of croftland is not vital as there is a lack of people to work it and this area is a poorer part of the in-bye, and; it will also round off an existing group of development and was zoned in the previous Plan draft. • <u>Kearney Donald Partnership</u> - seeks exclusion of land here because it is quality croft land and decrofting is unlikely to be successful. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>R. Wright</u> - extension to SDA. • <u>Kearney Donald Partnership</u> - remove any development potential from land south of Woodend croft (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION. Further commended SDA change below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - This croft land is of good quality and of local importance. Therefore it is recommended that given there are suitable alternatives the majority of this land should be protected. However, given the clarification of the crofter's development and agricultural intentions it is appropriate to allow a small extension to the SDA but to retain the bulk of the field. The suggested extension is minor and rounds off an existing housing grouping. The loss of croftland is not significant in relation to the size of the unit which will continue to be worked. Formal consultation with the Crofters Commission at application stage would be appropriate to ensure these interests are given expert consideration.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
ENLARGE SDA at south end to include minor suggested extension.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR - H4 East Parks	4
Development plan reference:	Ardgour H4 Text MB4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Kearney Donald Partnership on behalf of Mr R. MacLean (406)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objects to reduction in area of land allocated for housing because a higher capacity would cross-subsidise sheltered housing and offset high servicing costs.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of H4 allocation or larger site and higher capacity on site H1.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - RETAIN ALLOCATION.		
<u>Reasons</u> - It is considered that an adequate housing land supply has been identified overall for Ardgour and Clovullin. The former allocation on adjoining land was deleted for landscape reasons due of the prominence issue caused by the levels difference from the road, along with the lack of trees to form a backdrop or soften the visual impact.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR H5 - North Corran	5
Development plan reference:	Ardgour - H5 Text MB 4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
W. A. Macaskill (958)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Disputes flood risk. Asserts that the site has never flooded in last 40 years and there are many worse areas in Lochaber.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Removal of flood risk assessment requirement (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response</u> - RETAIN ALLOCATION and flood risk requirement.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The requirement is specified, in consultation with SEPA, for sites within or adjacent to a 1 in 200 year risk area not 1 in 40.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARDGOUR - MU South West Of School	8
Development plan reference:	Ardgour MU Text MB 4 – Map LO1 MB 5	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
S. Deans (886), J. Motley (931)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S. Deans - objects to development because of: a fear of increased crime; the lack of pavements; worsening traffic safety; insufficient school capacity, and; insufficient elderly housing provision. Believes the allocation goes beyond meeting local need for additional houses. J. Motley - would support a specific health centre proposal because the land is serviceable, there could be shared use of the car park, and there is a need for closer health care provision than Strontian or Fort William. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S. Deans - deletion of site (implied). J. Motley - more explicit support for health care use (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - This small mixed use site will not breach capacity limits and is allocated subject to appropriate requirements. A new health centre would be an acceptable use on this site but it has not been reserved exclusively for this purpose because there is no certainty over its provision.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ARISAIG	47
Development plan reference:	Arisaig – H2 (Station Road (West)), Settlement Development Area (SDA) at Station Road East, C (Centre Parks), H1 (North Parks), Waste Water & Flood Risk Text MB 46 – Map LO31 MB 47	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H2</u>: A. Westwood (419) • <u>SDA at Station Road East</u>: A. Westwood (419) • <u>C</u>: K. Stevenson (387), S. E. Moon (614), Mrs Rollison (910), M. Wayeneur & R. Dyer (977) • <u>H1</u>: Bidwells on behalf of Mr and Mrs E. D. MacMillan (landowners) (972) • <u>Waste Water & Flood Risk</u>: SEPA (446) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Allocations H2, SDA & Former H3, C and H1, and Waste Water & Flood Risk.	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H2</u>: neighbour objection in principle to any development because of the inadequate access, inadequate water pressure, loss of residential amenity and site has too steep a gradient. • <u>SDA at Station Road East</u>: neighbour objection in principle to any development on this land because of the inadequacy of Station Road as an access, inadequate water pressure, the loss of fruit trees, the loss of residential amenity and the steepness of the land. Although the previous housing allocation on this land has been deleted the area concerned has been retained within the SDA which carries a presumption in favour of development. The Council believes that the objector is unlikely to accept this policy presumption and has therefore treated the confirmed objection as unresolved. • <u>C</u>: resident objections to development because of: loss of rural character; the lack of any indigenous demand for housing; the fact that the site should be open space to retain the rural nature of the village enjoyed by residents and visitors alike; adverse impact on tourism; loss of grazing; loss of open space; the site being unsuitable for a school because the local roads cannot cope with extra traffic and the danger to children; the fear of increased crime; a better school site being available along the road to the cemetery or on the Rhu Road; there being no need for a school, and; there being a perfect and safe footpath to the existing school next to the church. Housing development interest in south west part of site because: it would meet a local need; there is no need for community uses; it would assist with population retention; the principle of development is already established; of the lack of a capital programme commitment to the new school; of a willing landowner; only part of the allocation is required for housing, and; the offer of high quality design. • <u>H1</u>: landowner requests extension of existing housing site because it would round off existing development. • <u>Waste Water & Flood Risk</u>: objection to unacceptable coastal & fluvial flood risk and the need for public sewer connections to minimise the pollution risk to the water environment. 		

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- H2: deletion of any development potential on site (implied).
- SDA at Station Road East: deletion of any development potential on site (implied).
- C: majority seek no development potential on site and reservation as croft land (implied). Pro-development party seeks housing allocation on land at south west corner of site (implied).
- H1: extension of allocation to north.
- Waste Water & Flood Risk: public sewer connection requirement for all allocations, deletion of allocation areas that fall within the 1 in 200 year flood risk areas or a statement that only water related uses will be supported within such areas.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authorityResponse(s) -

- H2: RETAIN ALLOCATION. See sewerage requirement commended change below.
- SDA at Station Road East: NO CHANGE.
- C: RETAIN ALLOCATION. See sewerage and pedestrian connection requirements commended changes below.
- H1: EXTEND SDA. See detail of commended change below.
- Waste Water & Flood Risk: AMEND AS REQUESTED. See detail of commended changes below.

Reasons -

- H2: The site has already been reduced in capacity and had its developer requirements strengthened. The site already has one single house planning consent granted and 5 others recommended for approval pending a section 75 (or other) agreement for most of its land which require suitable road improvements. The reduction of the site's capacity will also minimise local traffic impact. Residential amenity issues can be addressed by the appropriate layout of future development. Scottish Water has confirmed that there is adequate water and sewerage capacity for the Plan's allocations.
- SDA at Station Road East: The site may still come forward for development but suffers from ownership constraints that at present constrain the design and formation of a feasible access to the local road network and then to the trunk road. The Council has therefore removed the benefit of a specific housing allocation but has left the land within the SDA because it believes that it is still suitable, in principle, for development. This is an appropriate infill area within Arisaig and subject to appropriate access, layout and density should still carry a presumption in favour of development.
- C: The site is safeguarded as greenspace. If and when the funding can be identified for a primary school in a more sustainable and safer village centre location it would then be acquired for that purpose. There is adequate housing development potential on the allocated sites and elsewhere within the unconstrained parts of the SDA. Piecemeal development of the community site for housing would be detrimental to its greenspace function and potential community hub role. The site's location is the optimum for sustainable active travel to and from the school. Development of the site would not compromise significant public views. The location of the site also caters for surveillance from adjacent properties thus making it a safer place for a primary school. The land will be retained in agricultural use in the interim.
- H1: This minor extension to the SDA would round-off approved development which is presently under construction. However, extension of the housing allocation is not appropriate in that it may prompt a higher density proposal.
- Waste Water & Flood Risk: amendments are required to address flood and pollution risk concerns. Extension of public sewerage shouldn't cause economic or technical feasibility issues for potential developers.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- SDA at Station Road East: None.
- C: ADD developer requirement for “footpath connections to surrounding residential areas”.
- H1: EXTEND SDA to include suggested plot.
- Waste Water & Flood Risk: ADD developer requirement for public sewer connection to all allocations. ADD developer requirement to MU allocation “flood risk assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area. Only water-related or harbour uses would be acceptable within flood risk areas”. REDUCE B allocation to exclude land within the 1 to 200 flood risk boundary.

Issue (ref and heading):	ARMADALE	63
Development plan reference:	Armadale – MU1 (Between the potteries), MU2 (Armadale Bay), Settlement Development Area (SDA) (Land at Armadale Pier) Text MB96 – Map SL51 MB 97	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MU1</u>: P. Chaplin (223) • <u>MU2</u>: SEPA (446) • <u>SDA (Land at Armadale Pier)</u>: A. M. Masson (445) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA (Former MU3 Armadale Pier), MU1 allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MU1</u>: objection to excessive density of proposal and the site's exposure to the northerly wind. • <u>MU2</u>: concern re. flood risk. • <u>SDA (Land at Armadale Pier)</u>: - seeks re-allocation of former site because: of Slea Community Trust support; of the previous allocation of the land for tourist / community / commercial uses; she is the part owner of the site and wishes to pursue a horticultural development; development will result in a net environmental improvement from the site's present condition; this is an important visual gateway location; of her good past track record of development of low key tourist facilities; the community could finance redevelopment of the site; there are no maintained objections; of the lack of similar tourist site alternatives, and; although car parking and access are poor this could be improved by redevelopment. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MU1</u>: reduction in density • <u>MU2</u>: strengthen flood risk requirement • <u>SDA (Land at Armadale Pier)</u>: reintroduction of previous allocation. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s) & Reasons -</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MU1</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. There is a planning consent for 14 residential units and 2 shops / workshops on site MU1 which has already confirmed the principle of a current development proposal. • <u>MU2</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. A strengthened flood risk requirement is appropriate - see commended change below. • <u>SDA (Land at Armadale Pier)</u>: NO CHANGE. The Council previously recognised the potential of the land with an allocation but removed it in the light of neighbour objections which highlighted the constraints of parking, congestion, access, ground conditions, cost of coastal protection, and marshalling yard safety issues. Moreover the previous proposal for the area is now very unlikely to obtain the same degree of public funding. Therefore the suggested proposal has merit but is very unlikely to be feasible. 		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- MU1: None.
- MU2: AMEND developer flood risk requirement to read, "Flood risk assessment will be required; built development to avoid flood risk area; water related uses only, within flood risk area."
- SDA (Land at Armadale Pier): None.

Issue (ref and heading):	AUCHTERTYRE	57
Development plan reference:	Auchtertyre – B (Business Park), MU1 (East of Business Park), MU2 (North and West of Primary School), LT (North-east of Primary School) Text MB 74 – Map SL7 MB 74	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>B & MU1</u>: M. Butler (308) • <u>MU2 & LT</u>: R. Ross (4), J. Ullman (230), M. Butler (308), I. A. Carr (310), A. Porch (313), M. Lee (936) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	MU1, MU2, B and LT Allocations / Designations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>B</u>: - objection to allocation because: there is a lack of business demand; a waste facility would not be compatible with business uses; a waste facility would attract vermin and be a health hazard, and; the site would better be re-allocated for housing use. • <u>MU1</u>: - objection because of the commercial use restriction on the land's title. • <u>MU2 & LT</u>: - objections to development because of: lack of detail; potential loss of school playing field; severance of link from playing field to school and disruption to school access and parking; loss of greenspace behind property; less safe routes to school for many existing village residents; a better suggestion for no connection between the new A87 access and the village road network; potential loss of play area; the excessive scale and density of housing development; lack of private housing demand; concern that more development will put more pressure on already deficient trunk road junctions; pluvial flood risk; inadequate SUDS infrastructure; loss of private views and privacy; inadequate local road and parking capacity; loss of woodland with amenity and nature conservation value as owl habitat; adverse impact on otters present in the village burns, and; inadequate school capacity. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Majority request or imply deletion of allocations or greatly reduced scale of development.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - RETAIN ALL ALLOCATIONS AND LT DESIGNATION.		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>B</u>: - It is the Council's policy to search for waste management facilities on industrial or business land. The site is central to Lochalsh's population and would greatly assist in meeting the Council's recycling targets. It is only envisaged that a managed recycling centre would be required. This is a clean, good neighbour use which can be accommodated on a small site and would not discourage business uses adjacent. • <u>MU1</u>: - This site suffers from ground conditions, winter daylighting and access constraints. It is also severed from the rest of the community and the school by the A87. However, it has community support and may deliver access arrangements that have a traffic calming effect on village junctions. The Council has no evidence of any such title restriction and the landowner has indicated that its is available for housing or other non-commercial development. • <u>MU2/LT</u>: - Discussions with the landowner's agent and feasibility work by the Highland Housing Alliance (the Council's affordable housing landbanking organisation) have 		

revealed that an amended layout of this wider area north west the village may deliver housing and community land and address many of the concerns of local residents. Using the old road for a new trunk road access and the closure of at least one village junction would deliver net benefits to road safety. It would also remove the direct impacts on neighbours' amenity and help overcome ransom issues within the village's confined central area. There is some spare sewerage capacity within the village and significant water capacity. The development would be phased. The allocation policies of the affordable housing agencies are constrained by housing law and it is not possible to favour certain groups unless that priority relates to housing need. The interest of landowners and developers demonstrates a response to market demand. Improved access arrangements would ensure that a shop or other community use would not overburden the constrained village road network. Achieving satisfactory and even improved run-off is a legitimate requirement. Construction disturbance will be temporary, can be minimised by planning consent conditions and will be lessened by taking access from a new junction. The primary school has spare capacity. The Plan allocates a balance of employment and housing land, and the Council has evidence of a pressing need for affordable housing. Auchtertyre is at a principal road junction and on strategic public transport routes. The Council's newest street lighting incorporates a low, downward emission design. The MU designation and the Council's Affordable Housing Policy promote the dispersal and integration of H and AH. The land merits re-allocation given the lack of effective alternatives within and closer to Kyle. The present village accesses present a trunk road safety issue and to not close off the accesses would represent a missed opportunity. Severance, turning and safety issues will need to be resolved within the expanded village by careful layout planning but these routes will be lightly trafficked in comparison and traffic speeds will be low. Preserving greenspace to the rear of particular properties is not a proper planning purpose or consideration.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

None.

Issue (ref and heading):	AVERNISH-NOSTIE	60
Development plan reference:	Avernish-Nostie Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 85 – Map SL20 MB 85	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
A. G. Mackay (112), G.E. Martin (233), M. Mackay (980)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objections to development on grounds of: the current boundary is a departure from the Adopted Skye and Lochalsh Local Plan; the abandonment of the previous 2 dwellings per croft limit; a breach of the previous restriction on holiday accommodation; the scale of development since 1999 and its adverse impact; inadequate single track spine road; the costs of road improvements; inadequate water supply, and; the breach of the seaward side of road development restraint policy.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of Avernish-Nostie SDA (implied)		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> The settlement objectives seek to ensure that all new development proposals are dependent upon proportionate network improvements. Average speed is a criterion for crash barrier provision and paradoxically the route's poor alignment has a traffic calming effect. The SDA boundary reflects consents granted on the seaward side of the road. Water and electricity network improvements will also be a developer cost. The scale of expansion is significant but has been achieved largely via dispersed development and without undue landscape impact.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	BALLACHULISH SOUTH - General Comment	12
Development plan reference:	Ballachulish General Text MB 8 – Map LO3 MB 9	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Ballachulish Community Council (43)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General Comment	
Summary of representation(s):		
The Adopted Lochaber Local Plan included land allocated for housing at West Laroch in the vicinity of MacColl Terrace.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Housing allocation at West Laroch (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> – This land was not allocated due to land slip issues however it lies within the Settlement Development Area (SDA) so the principle of development is supported should these issues be overcome.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	BALLACHULISH SOUTH - MU Former Station Yard	13
Development plan reference:	Ballachulish South - MU Text MB 8 – Map LO3 MB 9	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
GL Hearn on behalf of Co-op (515), P. Connoly (883), Bruce & Neil on behalf of Mr Chisholm (51), M Sayers (890), K. Jones (899), Ballachulish Community Council (43)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GL Hearn - Wants a specific retail use recognition because of the extant consent and to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the centre and its role in the surrounding area. • Bruce & Neil - Objects to the allocation of this land for housing development and refer to the consent granted for retail. Their client wishes to retain the commercial use on this part of the site and he or others will apply for renewal on expiry of the current consent. • Ballachulish Community Council - request that the new draft is amended to show the retail consent. • P. Connoly - objects to access from Elizabeth Place because it is inadequate for increased traffic. • M Sayers - would like an existing informal pathway to the medical centre to be kept accessible. • K. Jones - believes access to the mixed use site should be via the existing Tourist Information Centre car park and not via the road from the goods yard to the rear of Elizabeth Place properties. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific retail allocation for consented Co-op development. (GL Hearn, Bruce & Neil and Ballachulish Community Council) • Others want pedestrian connection to health centre retained and no vehicular connection from Elizabeth Place. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION. See commended changes below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The allocation has already been amended to reflect the retail consent which shows the access from the public road just north of the car park. Re-allocation for retail only is not appropriate in that the consent may lapse and other mixed use village centre opportunities should not be precluded. Similarly, although access to the retail consent will be from the north east, improvement to the western access is feasible and should not be ruled out. A general requirement to retain / improve pedestrian connections would be appropriate in active travel and sustainability terms.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Committed by THC		
ADD developer requirement for “pedestrian connection safeguards and improvement”		

Issue (ref and heading):	BALLACHULISH SOUTH - Settlement Development Area (SDA) - Rectory	15
Development plan reference:	Ballachulish South SDA Text MB 8 – Map LO3 MB 9	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
C. Roberts (772), Ballachulish Community Council (43)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Roberts - wants land at Rectory to be endorsed for housing development because: it will promote good siting and design; there would be no adverse impact on the setting of the Rectory; it will have the advantage of better overlooking security for the church and the possibility of an increased congregation; it could meet local need for plots; the area is too large to maintain as a private garden, and; there is claimed support from community and servicing organisations. • Ballachulish Community Council - support for housing development here as meeting local need. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA, new SDA or isolated housing allocation (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - Outline planning applications for 5 houses were submitted on this land and then subsequently withdrawn by C. Roberts in September 2007. The land is distant from any recognised settlement and any housing proposal should therefore be assessed against the Plan's Housing in the Countryside and other General Policies. The need for new or intensified trunk road access also militates against a more positive identification of development potential.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	BALLACHULISH SOUTH - Settlement Development Area (SDA) - West Harbour	16
Development plan reference:	Ballachulish South SDA Text MB 8 – Map LO3 MB 9	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Ballachulish Community Council (43)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Ballachulish Community Council - understands that there is potential for housing development around the west harbour (at Lochside Cottages) and request that this is included in the new draft plan.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Inclusion of more land within SDA or a specific housing allocation (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The Council has already enlarged the SDA west of Lochside Cottages but restricted the area to that outwith the flood risk area and has made this subject to: avoiding the creation of new A82 accesses; to secure community access to boat launching and jetty facilities, and; to require an otter survey. Any further extension to the SDA or a specific allocation in this constrained location would not be appropriate.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	BALLACHULISH SOUTH - Settlement Development Area (SDA) - Land North of A82	14
Development plan reference:	Ballachulish South SDA Text MB 8 – Map LO3 MB 9	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
L. Young (117), HIE (495)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Young - Requests inclusion of land on north side of the A82 near hotel for low scale, quality housing along with tourism-related development because this would be a logical extension of the settlement development area and claims that the local community council would support it. • HIE - Suggests that subject to a flood risk assessment, consideration should be given to the scope for appropriate development on the headland to the north of the hotel, pier and car park. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Proposed extension to the settlement development area or mixed use allocation on land to north of A82.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN SDA BOUNDARY for this part of settlement.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - This land has been rejected for inclusion within the SDA because of the potential for adverse impact upon: the landscape quality and character of the Ben Nevis and Glen Coe National Scenic Area; existing semi-natural woodland cover; public views from the A82 and the local footpath network, and; the setting of the scheduled monument Fort Cnocan Dubh.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	BRAESIDE (BY KINLOCHEIL)	100
Development plan reference:	Request for new Settlement Development Area (SDA) Map PM B	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Bidwells on behalf of Locheil and Achnacarry Estate (731)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	New SDA request	
Summary of representation(s):		
Landowner objection to non-identification of Braeside as an SDA because: it is an existing housing grouping; development there would represent an acceptable rounding-off, and; it is similar in pattern to Kinlocheil which has been assigned an SDA.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
New SDA enclosing existing and potential development land.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> Braeside has no community facilities, falls within the commuter hinterland area and suffers from trunk road proximity, access, woodland and flood risk constraints. There are house plot planning applications pending for the lower (southern) part of the site which have attracted negative representations.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	BROADFORD	96
Development plan reference:	Broadford Commerce Boundary, Glen Road Developments (AH (Blackpark), C1 (West of school), H1 (Glen Road), MU3 (Glen Road (North))), H3 (East of Caberfeidh), MU5 (Airstrip) Text WS 71-73 – Map LFM SL 138 (a) and (b)	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Commerce boundary</u>: G. L. Hearn on behalf of the Co-op (515) • <u>Glen Road Developments</u> AH, C1, H1 & MU3: D. & C. Gould (520) • <u>H3</u>: A. MacLeod (453) • <u>MU5</u> - SNH (697) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Commerce Boundary, AH, C1, H1, H3, MU3, MU5 Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Commerce boundary</u>: Objection to inconsistent references to Broadford as “Area” and “Sub Area Centre”. Disputes whether there is any spare retail expenditure given recent planning consents on Skye and suggests there should be no food retail allocations or mixed use sites that allow food retail in Broadford. • <u>Glen Road Developments</u> (AH, C1, H1 & MU3): Objection to any further development because: the related planning consent transport assessment was flawed; development will lead to increased traffic on Bayview Crescent which will compromise safety; infill plots should be developed first before the rest of H1 is developed; of inadequate capacity in supporting infrastructure; of the inadequate capacity of Glen Road; of the “rat run” problem on Bayview Crescent which compromises safety, and; of inadequate water and sewerage capacity. • <u>H3</u>: landowner seeks extension of housing allocation to southern limit of Settlement Development Area (SDA) as this is suitable ground for development because: it is of poor agricultural quality; access is feasible; it is within the SDA; service networks are available closeby; it is linked to a good junction with the A87 trunk road, and; it is central to the village and is therefore sustainable. • <u>MU5</u> - SNH request that for sites where particular development proposals could have a significant adverse impact on Natura sites, that such developments be precluded by the terms of the policy. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Commerce boundary</u>: clarification that no further food retail developments will be supported within Broadford. • <u>Glen Road Developments</u> (AH, C1, H1 & MU3): stipulation that no more development will be consented, accessed off Glen Road, until Bayview Crescent has been completed (implied that this means development of remaining infill plots and associated improvement and adoption of road). • <u>H3</u>: specific allocation for land to south of H3. • <u>MU5</u> - request suitable reference to make development dependent upon effect on nearby Natura site and its seal interest. 		

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authorityResponse(s) -

- Commerce boundary: RETAIN. See below re detail of commended changes to related general policy and retail allocation.
- Glen Road Developments (AH, C1, H1 & MU3): RETAIN ALLOCATIONS.
- H3: RETAIN ALLOCATION and reject suggested extension.
- MU5 - RETAIN ALLOCATION but add stronger appropriate assessment dependency as detailed in commended changes below.

Reasons:

- Commerce boundary: The Plan should not be used to prevent commercial competition between retail sites within Broadford's central core. However, given recent food retail consents in Broadford and Portree it is appropriate to allow more market and use flexibility for the site south of the library.
- Glen Road Developments (AH, C1, H1 & MU3): In terms of Bayview Crescent, the Council has offered a reasonable compromise to the affected parties to close off the junction at the Elgol Road, to design and progress the road adoption, and to fund a third of the construction costs. Lochalsh and Skye Housing Association have also funded the tie-in to Glen Road. The lack of water supply will control the rate of expansion of the site. The alleged misuse of the roundabout is a police not a planning matter. The A87 junction capacity constraint is recognised and therefore a secondary access to the Elgol Road is a requirement. A large part of the site benefits from an extant planning permission. The improvement of Bayview Crescent is desirable but is not an essential pre-requisite for the development of the remainder of the Glen Road sites.
- H3: A further extension of the site is not required given the availability of adequate and more central alternatives. The suggested land falls within the SDA and is therefore well placed for crofting pattern development in this Plan period or for consideration as an allocation in the next period.
- MU5: Plan amendments have already been made to address heritage factors such as the exclusion of the shoreline SSSI from the site boundary but a further appropriate assessment dependency should be added to address the potential effect on the nearby seal interest.

Any Further Plan Changes Committed by THC

- Commerce boundary: DELETE "Sub" from "Sub Area" in GP17. AMEND allocation "R" to be mixed use with acceptable uses "retail, business, housing, community."
- Glen Road Developments (AH, C1, H1 & MU3): None.
- H3: None
- MU5 - ADD sentence to developer requirements box "proposals will only be supported if developers can demonstrate no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjoining Natura site."

Issue (ref and heading):	CAMAS LUINIE	61
Development plan reference:	Camas Luinie Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 86 – Map SL22 MB 86	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
D. Matheson (384)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Request for extended SDA on grounds of: insufficient developable land within SDA and within representor's control; it being needed for returning family members; no undue landscape impact; the land being serviceable; the land being poor croft land, and; evidence of ruins.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA to north.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> – Minor extensions have already been made to the SDA on all sides to allow a suitable extension of the existing clustered settlement pattern. The larger extension to the north would not be in keeping with this pattern. The suggested change may compromise landscape and road capacities. The Plan's countryside policies don't place an embargo on development outwith the SDA and therefore single, well separated houses may still be suitable in this area subject to adequate siting, design and other site-specifics.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	DORNIE	58
Development plan reference:	Dornie – Settlement Development Area (SDA), AH (Carr Brae), MU (Graham House) Text MB 76 – Map SL9 MB 77	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: D. MacRae (692) • <u>AH</u>: Mr & Mrs Falconer (92) • <u>MU</u>: Dornie Community Projects Group (710) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA, AH and MU Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u> - objection to boundary enclosing good croft land because of: loss of good croft land; this being contrary to the Plan's aims of protecting good croft land; all the best in-bye land being enclosed within the SDA, and; Dornie still being an active crofting community. • <u>AH</u> - objection to development because of: inadequate water and sewerage; lack of close primary school; no employment; inadequate local road capacity; unmet indigenous local housing need, and; the inaccurate Ordnance Survey base map. • <u>MU</u> - objection because the care home is still in use. There is a community aspiration for elderly care use, the lack of knowledge / support from the Council's Social Work Service and unclear ownership. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u> - exclusion of better croft land from SDA (implied). • <u>AH</u> - deletion of allocation (implied). • <u>MU</u> - deletion of housing as an acceptable use - should be retained for care of the elderly. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s):</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u> - NO CHANGE. • <u>AH</u> - RETAIN ALLOCATION. • <u>MU</u> - RETAIN ALLOCATION. 		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u> - The SDA although widely drawn does not grant an automatic consent on good croftland. The Plan highlights croftland quality as a key criterion for decision making on individual applications. Development management officers will by negotiation seek to persuade applicants to site any single houses on the poorest part of individual croft units and in a position where it will no block agricultural access to the rest of the unit and any grazings. • <u>AH</u> - Site AH benefits from a recent planning consent for 38 residential units. Water supply constraints have been overcome, a sewerage solution is being negotiated and the relatively close Auchtertyre school has spare capacity. The site benefits from an extant planning consent for the allocated uses. Balancing employment land is allocated and part developed at Auchtertyre. The development will have an improved access. Lochalsh's larger settlements have similar allocations. The allocation policies of the 		

affordable housing agencies are constrained by housing law and it is not possible to favour certain groups unless that priority relates to housing need.

- MU: – The community's desire to investigate an alternative use for Graham House and the Title uncertainty merits keeping options open as to the future use but a proportion of housing may be an enabling development for community aspirations. Further reassurances for neighbours and to protect public views have already been added.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

None.

Issue (ref and heading):	DRIMNIN/BUNAVULIN Settlement Development Area (SDA)	41
Development plan reference:	Drimnin/Bunavulin SDA Text MB 30 – Map LO16 MB 30	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
D. Lewis (882)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Requests changes to SDA to exclude land west of the pier because it is prominent and development there would intrude into public views from the sea and adopted road. Requests inclusion of land which has a house, a partially constructed house and a potential plot on which an outline planning application has been submitted. This land is within the centre of the township is serviceable and would not adversely impact on its appearance / heritage.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension and reduction of SDA.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – AMEND SDA as requested. See commended changes below. <u>Reasons</u> - The additional area is relatively unconstrained in a settlement that offers limited development opportunities. The pier land is visible rather than prominent but merits the more cautious policy presumption that the Plan's countryside policies provide.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
Exclude land west of pier from SDA and include suggested development area within SDA.		

Issue (ref and heading):	DUNVEGAN	97
Development plan reference:	Dunvegan – H2 (North west of primary school) and associated “link road”, MU3 (Adjoining Dunvegan Pier) Text WS 74-76 – Map LFM SL137	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
H2: P. Atherton (652), G. Cooper (706) - MU3: SNH (697)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	H2 Housing Allocation and associated “link road”, MU3 Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H2: resident objections because: of loss of rural character; they fear that any link road will become a “rat-run”; there is already a pedestrian link between the two roads; better land exists to the north of the allocation; of loss of croft land; the allocation is contrary to the Plan objectives in terms of croftland; of the construction and maintenance costs associated with any link road when the Council can’t even maintain the existing road network; the link road will by-pass the village centre to the detriment of traders there; of interference with the neighbour’s septic tank / soakaway; of the need for a water main safeguard; of an inadequate water supply, and; of poor surface water drainage. • MU3: - SNH request that for sites where particular development proposals could have a significant adverse impact on Natura sites, that such developments be precluded by the terms of the policy. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H2: Implied deletion of allocation and link road suggestion. • MU3: Stronger reference to and safeguard for SAC 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s):</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H2: RETAIN ALLOCATION. • MU3: RETAIN ALLOCATION but add appropriate assessment dependency as detailed in commended change below. 		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H2: The site area has already been reduced with a consequent reduction in impact on local croft land and rural character. The suggested road connection will far less likely given this reduction but is still desirable given the local pressure for development on the Kilmuir road and the consequent impact this will have on that road and its limited capacity due to the poor junction visibility with the A850 and the road’s other width, alignment and condition issues. Other servicing issues, notably water supply are recognised and may delay the site’s development. Any other site-specific safeguards can be accommodated and addressed at the planning application stage. • MU3: Further safeguards are appropriate given the adjacent international heritage interests. 		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- H2: None.
- MU3: ADD sentence to developer requirements box “proposals will only be supported if developers can demonstrate no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjoining Natura site”

Issue (ref and heading):	DUROR - General & MU Adjacent to Former Hotel	31
Development plan reference:	Duror General and MU Text MB 21 – Map LO10 MB 21	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
HIE (495), E. Connolly (200), J. Connolly (477), M. Reynolds (930)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General & Mixed Use Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIE - request for specific employment land allocation via a mixed use or business allocation to allow for provision of local work places. Local employment promotes the concept of sustainability. • Others object to development because of: adverse impact on character of the village; inadequate current facilities and road, and; inadequate local employment base which would result in increased commuting. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIE - a mixed use or business allocation within Duror. • Others - deletion or reduction of site (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The allocation has been changed to mixed use with a lower housing capacity to meet concerns raised and as it is in an appropriate village centre location. It offers a business land opportunity within Duror to balance with the housing land identified. This change allows the prospect of local employment. There are no known infrastructure capacity issues beyond the developer requirements listed.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	DUROR H1 - North of Achindarroch Road	29
Development plan reference:	Duror H1 Text MB 21 – Map LO10 MB 21	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
E. Connolly (200), J. Connolly (477) and C. Pearman (493)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objections to development because of: adverse impact on character of the village; inadequate current facilities and road, and; inadequate local employment base which would result in increased commuting.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of site (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION. <u>Reasons</u> - There are two full planning applications pending on H1. The size of the allocation is partly dependent upon financing a viable reconfiguration of the trunk road junction to the benefit of existing and new residents. Explicit phasing has been added by the use of an LT allocation. 35 houses are allocated with further land identified for the longer term in order to give some developer certainty whilst ensuring an appropriate pace of development. A developer requirement is necessary to secure and recoup developer contributions for the reconfiguration of the junction which the first developer will have to pay upfront.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
There is a factual change necessary to the Mapping booklet to reflect the Committee decision to amend developer requirements for LT (long term) site in regard to improvements to the shared junction.		

Issue (ref and heading):	DUROR - H2 South of Achindarroch	30
Development plan reference:	Duror H2 Text MB 21 – Map LO10 MB 21	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
E. Connolly (200), J. Connolly (477), C. Anderson (478), C. Pearman (493), D. Chrystal (550)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General objections to development because of the adverse impact on the character of the village and the inadequacy of current facilities and the road to cope with the scale of building proposed. Also that an inadequate local employment base would result in increased commuting. • D. Chrystal offers site specific grounds of objection because: the land has been actively grazed; that development would detract from two Telford designed listed buildings, and; overhead electricity lines impinge on the site. Habitat issues for deer, otter, woodcock are alluded to. Also mention of a previous objection to development on part of site H2 where the Reporter found in their favour. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Anderson - request for privacy/ daylighting set-back from property at north-east end of site. • C. Anderson, J. Connolly, E. Connolly, C. Pearman - reduced scale, density or deletion (implied). • D. Chrystal - deletion (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The reduced site capacity and boundary will have less impact and objectors' other pertinent concerns are reflected in the site's developer requirements. The shape of the site may cause privacy / daylighting issues and therefore a further requirement is appropriate.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
ADD developer requirement for "privacy / daylighting set-back from adjacent properties"		

Issue (ref and heading):	DUROR - Settlement Development Area (SDA)	28
Development plan reference:	Duror SDA Text MB 21 – Map LO10 MB 21	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Bidwells on behalf of Carita Investments Ltd (736), J McIntyre (952)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidwells - suggestion for 4 houses on A828 via SDA extension and long term (LT) site north of hotel for housing and tourism to help diversify the economic base of the village. Justifies enclosure within SDA because of location close to services, single new access, part adopted plan allocation, part consented, close to facilities and could accommodate sites outwith flood plain. • J McIntyre - objection to any extension to SDA south of Old Mill cottages because of flood risk, ground conditions, overhead electricity lines and unsafe access off A828. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidwells - SDA extension and LT allocation • J McIntyre - unclear but may support Council's position. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - Two outline applications are currently being considered to the south of Old Mill Cottages. The proposed extension is considered unsuitable because of access constraints due to inadequate visibility at the A828 junction and the unadopted status of the road. The land north of the hotel also suffers from access constraints caused by visibility at the junctions, the unadopted status of the road and bridge and there is a need to protect the national cycle way. For clarification if either development proposal was to be accessed from the north, the access issues are the unadopted bridge and junction difficulties, and protection of the cycleway. If accessed from the south there is also an unadopted bridge here and a junction problem with the A828. There is no evidence presented of agreement with Transport Scotland or of the results of a flood risk assessment and adequate alternatives have been allocated. If constraints can be overcome then applications could still be pursued and tested against the Plan's general countryside policies.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	EDINBANE	71
Development plan reference:	Edinbane – Coishletter - H2, H3 & LT Text MB116 – Map SL52 MB 117	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
H2/H3/LT: I. Brown (9), SEPA (446), R. Morriss (588), J. Howarth (589), White Young Green on behalf of Ewen Gillies Builders (630)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	H2, H3, LT Allocations.	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>Objections to development are made on the grounds of: the land's poor microclimate (lack of shelter, north easterly aspect), particularly of the upper slopes which will lead to poor energy efficiency; increased commuting because of few local jobs; excessive scale and density which is contrary to the established settlement pattern; loss of riverside amenity space; loss of views; previous Plan's safeguarding of the upper slopes; inadequate local road capacity; loss of rural character; possible adverse impact on surface water drainage and water supply; lack of housing demand, and; the need for adequate foul drainage.</p> <p>The Landowner's agent supports the allocations and will consider appropriate and proportionate planning gain that is directly related to development but disputes the feasibility of the affordable housing element feasibility and believes an interim private sewerage arrangement is acceptable.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Objectors seek a lower density of housing development on lower ground and no development on upper slopes. SEPA seek a stronger public foul drainage developer requirement. The landowner seeks a lower level of planning gain.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATIONS / DESIGNATION.		
<u>Reasons</u> – The lower slopes are zoned in the Adopted Skye & Lochalsh Local Plan and are subject to a current planning application which may be consented before or during the Examination process. Existing requirements including a good neighbour set-back to reduce the issue of overlooking / privacy, will provide an adequate policy context. The croft land is not actively worked and the sites lie close to the core of the settlement. The long term allocation is not scheduled for development within the Plan period and is shown merely to allow non-prejudicial layout and servicing choices to be made for the allocated land. The low demand for aggregated housing developments in this part of Skye and the current financial climate are both likely to limit the scale, pace and density of development.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
THC's position is that the Plan content should be updated to reflect the outcome of the related planning application decision including the decision on the type of foul drainage provision.		

Issue (ref and heading):	EILEAN IARMAIN & CAMASCROSS	68
Development plan reference:	Eilean Iarmain & Camascross – Settlement Development Area (SDA), MU (North-east of Park Cottage) Text MB107 – Map SL42 MB 106	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: SNH (697) • <u>MU</u>: P. Christie (718) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA and MU Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: objection to undeveloped Duisdalebeg section of SDA on grounds of: the potentially adverse landscape impact of developing it because it is part of an undeveloped open vista when travelling south on the A851; the river represents a better natural settlement dividing line, and; development here would be unplanned and ad hoc. • <u>MU</u>: objection to development because of loss of public view from road and because this open land has been used historically for the village games/festival. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: - SNH seek developer requirement for “production of a master or design plan for the expansion area to be submitted at the same time as the first planning application”. • <u>MU</u>: - deletion of site (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: NO CHANGE to boundary but see commended change below re. additional objective to secure appropriate expansion • <u>MU</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION but reduce as commended change below. 		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: The land was included within the extended SDA because of the lack of suitable, serviceable alternatives and knowledge of the aspirations of the local crofting community. The commended further change will make the need to replicate a traditional crofting settlement pattern more explicit. SNH’s suggested wording is not proportionate to the scale of development and the resources of a grazings committee. • <u>MU</u>: The land is constrained in terms of potential impact on public seaward views but the unavailability and difficulties in servicing alternatives together with apparent community consensus support, support the allocation of the land subject to the stated safeguards. Subsequent discussions between the landowner and community interests have revealed that a smaller site would be adequate and feasible. 		
Any Further Plan Changes Committed by THC		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: ADD OBJECTIVE to secure a collective, crofting community development of the township expansion area. • <u>MU</u>: REDUCE site BOUNDARY to that in the immediate vicinity of hall with shared access and parking. 		

Issue (ref and heading):	ERRACHT	52
Development plan reference:	Erracht – Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 60 – Map LO40 MB 60	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
C. MacKay (284), C. MacKay (Petition) (284) (802-808, 810, 821, 824-827, 829, 831, 832, 834-838, 844-851, 853-855, 918-925), T. MacKay (415), C. MacKay (473), A. Howie (526), J. Garlick (527), A. MacBride (536).		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>Objection to development because of: adverse impact on exceptional views and landscape; adverse economic impact if past TV/film set affected; adverse impact on habitats and species; adverse impact on tourism if landscape affected; adverse impact on historical associations; adverse impact on the recreational significance of the area (i.e. greenspace is scarce within the urban area of Fort William and this provides a green lung for the area); the loss of an actively and traditionally worked smallholding which has a low environmental impact; the loss of the educational value of the environment; the loss of the mental health benefits of a quiet greenspace; adverse impact on the setting of the scheduled monument the Caledonian Canal; a lack of housing demand; the B8004 having inadequate capacity; no public transport; the incorrect Ordnance Survey base map giving a misleading impression of the amount of development in the area, adverse impact on the geological value of the area; adverse green tourism impact; adverse impact on Great Glen Way; adverse impact on view from Nevis Range; building being contrary to the Plan's promotion of Fort William as the Outdoor Capital brand; the same owner owning more suitable land elsewhere, and; the development creating a ribbon of building within the Glen.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of Erracht SDA (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> - RETAIN SDA. See commended change re. protected species below.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> There are 7 outline planning applications pending consideration in Erracht. Objectives have been listed to address some of the concerns of objectors including: to support development which is appropriate to the existing dispersed settlement pattern; to safeguard the existing natural and built environment; to protect features of historical value and important recognised views, and; to protect any recreation areas and footpaths within the settlement. The scale of the SDA, its location and the level of development supported within it, are all unlikely to result in significant adverse impact to the constraints listed. A further protected species survey requirement is appropriate. The Plan allocates land for accessible greenspace within Fort William. The Convener of The Queen's Own Cameron Highlanders Regimental Association has confirmed that although they do not wish to object to the SDA they would like any development to respect the structure and setting of the regiment's cairn which is sited just below Erracht House. The Reporter may wish to consider a specific reference to the cairn within the Plan's third settlement objective although this change has not been ratified by the Council's relevant Committee.</p>		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC
ADD objective “to secure developer funded protected species surveys and any necessary mitigation.”

Issue (ref and heading):	FERRINDONALD & TEANGUE	65
Development plan reference:	Ferrindonald & Teangue – Settlement Development Area (SDA), H1 (Manse Field), H2 (Teangue) Text MB 98 – Map SL36 MB99	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: U. Macleod (709) • <u>H1 & H2</u>: W. & A. Richmond (598) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA and Housing Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: objection to any additional development that will add vehicle trips to the lower section of the Teangue / Saasaig road because of: traffic impact on residential property adjacent to lower Teangue road; evidence of damage to house especially by construction vehicles, and; the better suggestion for a new road on a different alignment to serve upper Teangue. • <u>H1 & H2</u>: objection to development because of: light pollution; loss of farmland (H1 only); impact on farm unit viability (H1 only), and; the reduced ability to provide locally grown food (H1 only). 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: new road on different alignment to serve Saasaig / upper Teangue or no further development that would add vehicle trips to the lower section of the Teangue / Saasaig road. • <u>H1 & H2</u>: deletion of sites and exclusion of land from SDA (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: NO CHANGE. • <u>H1</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. • <u>H2</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. 		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<p><u>SDA</u>: The Council are in discussions with the owner of the property adjacent to the lower Teangue road and have offered to undertake some improvements provided a prior engineering assessment is made.</p> <p><u>H1</u>: Although good agricultural land, the site is not in crofting tenure and is not essential to the viability of the wider unit. The land can be developed without compromising adjoining residential amenity. There are few alternative, non-crofting housing sites in the settlement. The Council's newest street lighting incorporates a low, downward emission design.</p> <p><u>H2</u>: The land can be developed to mirror the adjoining settlement pattern and to safeguard adjoining residential amenity. There are few alternative, non-crofting housing sites in the settlement. The Council's newest street lighting incorporates a low, downward emission design.</p>		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC
--

None.

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM EXPANSION SITES	84
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocation MU1 – Corpach Text WS 58-59 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
J. Biggin (174), I. & M. MacIntyre (197), R. Campbell (244), Kilmallie Community Company (248), A. & C. MacKenzie (257), B. & A. Dennison (289), I. & M. Aitchison (388), J. Clark (417), C. Abernethy & S. Kennedy (439), SEPA (446), L. Taylor (447), M. Smith (492), R. & B. Grieve (509), M. MacColl (582), R. Boswell (889), J. Ball (898), S. Abbott (902), J. Walker (911), E. Walker (912), A.K. Rowan (916), G. Anderson (917), P. Jenkins (935), Fort William & District Chamber of Commerce (937), Mr & Mrs Sutton (939), S. & V. Llewellyn (957), S. Sellers (960), HIE (495), BSW Timber (500)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Expansion Area	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p><u>Wider MU1 Site</u> Neighbours and residents object on the grounds of: the lack of layout detail for access roads areas of open space and housing etc.; a previous planning application was refused in this general area; inadequate local road capacity; the allocation is contrary to the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan; loss of public views; adverse impact on the amenity of the footpath network that has been put in at public expense; excessive walking distance to the local primary school; loss of actively used croftland; loss of access to common grazings; poor ground conditions; pluvial and fluvial flood risk; construction / blasting damage to existing houses; lack of sewerage capacity; excessive scale / density; loss of greenspace; adverse habitats and species impacts; loss of public open space and mature native woodland; the need for set-back from adjacent uses; the steep gradients are not suitable for elderly accommodation and access; inadequate water supply, and; adverse landscape impact.</p> <p><u>The Existing Sawmill Component of the MU1 Site</u> Residents' objections to the perceived Plan proposal for an energy from waste plant because of: health risks; amenity risks; toxic ash; few jobs created; unhealthy emissions; concern it would provide less incentive to recycle; additional road traffic; landfill text shown on Plan inset map; loss of recreational facilities allocation from previous Plan draft; fear of "bad neighbour" development; and, adverse tourism impact. HIE request that the sawmill operational area be zoned for Use Classes 4, 5 and 6 because it is flat and serviced, will be available within 3-5 years and is zoned in the Adopted Local Plan. HIE highlights the general deficiency of employment land within Lochaber and Fort William in particular. The sawmill owner requests a business and/or retail zoning because housing and community uses would be incompatible with the continuing sawmill operation in the short term.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Majority request deletion of site by implication but others seek site and/or density reduction. Specific request for Allt Dogha to be a green corridor for recreation, tourism and wildlife. Specific neighbour request for extreme western boundary to be reduced to exclude woodland and maintain set-back from residential properties. Local group request for 2 significant areas of woodland to be designated and safeguarded as open space. Request for business, industrial and/or retail zoning on sawmill.		

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) – RETAIN ALLOCATION subject to amendments detailed in commended changes below.

Reasons - The better croftland has already been removed from the allocation. The precise alignment of the distributor connection will depend upon a detailed feasibility assessment which would be undertaken as part of any future planning application process. Site-specific issues such as surface water drainage and servicing are not insurmountable and will be addressed at the planning application stage. Similarly concerns about scale, gradient and landscape impact can be overcome by careful phasing, siting and design. There are other flatter more central sites allocated by the Plan that would better accommodate accommodation suitable for the elderly. The western shift of the allocation from the previous draft will have less landscape impact when viewed from the centre of Fort William and principal hill paths. The Council has no household waste incinerator facility proposed for Fort William. It is investigating provision of an energy from waste facility at Portree to serve Lochaber. The Ordnance Survey map base reference to landfill site refers to a former landfill site and is not a Council proposal. Additional greenspace safeguards are appropriate but it is not known whether these suggested further amendments will meet objectors' concerns. In light of the evidence presented by HIE it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

DELETE last sentence of Lochaber Vision para 5.18 which implies Corpach in general could accommodate an energy from waste facility.

ADD open space notation to larger areas of woodland. ADD developer requirement for "green corridor along Allt Dogha", "semi-natural woodland safeguard" and AMEND to include "Flood risk assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area."

AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM EXPANSION SITES	91
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocation MU10 – Waterfront Text WS 62 – Map – LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
C. MacDonald (71), C. J. MacKenzie (202), SEPA (446), HIE (495) and Muir Smith Evans on behalf of Fort William Waterfront Ltd (941)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Expansion Area	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to the development on the grounds of: coastal flood risk; the marina proposal not being feasible; adverse visual impact; adverse impact on the scheduled monument Fort, and; it would be better to refurbish retail units on the High Street and subsidise lower rentals as a method of promoting economic development. • The preferred joint venture bidder of the Waterfront site advises that it intends to submit a planning application in spring 2010 and objects unless the site is enclosed within the town centre commerce boundary and the boundary is extended to the south west to include enhanced marine access and potential related uses. • HIE want a more comprehensive design framework for the wider waterfront, an employment land/uses safeguard to meet unmet demand in Fort William because it is a sub-regional centre and enhanced marine access facilities. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those opposed to development seek the deletion of the site (implied). • SEPA seek a flood risk assessment prior to the allocation being confirmed within the local plan. • Muir Smith Evans - extension of the town centre commerce boundary to enclose the site and its extension to the south west. • HIE seek a more comprehensive design framework, an employment uses safeguard and more enhanced marine access facilities. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION. AMEND commerce boundary and ADD employment land safeguard as detailed in commended changes below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The feasibility of the scheme will be for the market to decide in conjunction with public funding bodies but is not an overriding planning consideration. The Plan allocates land within the existing town centre for refurbishment and redevelopment but setting rental levels is outwith its scope. The site is allocated for mixed town centre uses so extension of the commerce boundary would be appropriate. Extension of the site is not appropriate given the uncertainty over the optimum location for enhanced marine access. The Council, HIE and the Crown Estate have commissioned further work to provide a wider waterfront design framework. Integration with the existing town centre is the principal design parameter for the allocation. Development of the site will attract an increased footfall to a wider town centre to the benefit of existing and new operators. The site's feasibility will ultimately be a decision for the market but its location is the optimum in national retail planning policy terms. The previous exclusion of the Cromwell Fort from the allocation boundary and the textual reference to setting has addressed this heritage issue. The loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration.</p>		

In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

AMEND commerce boundary to include this site. AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM EXPANSION SITES	93
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocation MU16 - Claggan/Achintee Text WS 63 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<u>Objections</u> - B. Bellwood (172), I. Jackson (190), Nevis Partnership (260), R. I. Spence (294), Fort William Community Council (317), S. MacLennan (423), Brodies on behalf of Inverlochry Castle Ltd (748), Alcan Highland Estates (732)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Expansion Area	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to development on the grounds of: adverse impact on natural heritage designations; the proposal is contrary to the Nevis Strategy; the site being rejected at the previous local plan inquiry; fluvial and pluvial flood risk; inadequate single track access capacity; poor ground conditions; inadequate A82 trunk road junction capacity; the proposal being contrary to the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan; loss of a (potential) parkland corridor; an inadequate area for holding surface water; light pollution in the "dark glen", and; impact on future of the Nevis Partnership as an organisation if one of its partners is prepared to promote such a harmful development. The reduction in the site's capacity is not sufficient to overcome concerns because the allocation will still: have serious impacts on heritage; be contrary to the Plan's objectives especially in terms of the setting of Fort William, Glen Nevis and Ben Nevis, and; the site is worse than other allocated alternatives. • The landowner seeks a larger site because: there are no crofting tenure restrictions; the site has easy land assembly; the owner has a good track record in terms of native woodland regeneration; the site was in site options draft of the Plan (Lochaber Futures), and; the landowner is prepared to accept phasing subject to traffic assessment. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Objectors seek deletion of site. Landowner seeks extension.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The setting of the iconic Glen Nevis is recognized as a key development constraint. However, this entrance to the Glen is characterized by intensive, haphazard and urban development above the banks of the Nevis. Rounding the edge of existing development, on a smaller site than previously allocated, will provide a more certain and defensible boundary between Glen and urban area and will penetrate no further into the Glen than adjoining development. Surface water and ground conditions problems are not insurmountable and common to all alternative housing areas. The proposed landowner extended area is excessive in terms of road and landscape capacity.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None		

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM EXPANSION SITES	94
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocation MU17 - Upper Achintore Text WS 63-64 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
A. Cumming (68), R. Burgess (70), A. Kirk (148), M. McCann (203), V. & J. Rose (700), Brodies on behalf of Inverlochy Castle Ltd (748), HIE (495)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Expansion Area	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to development on grounds of: loss of rural character; loss of rural footpath to phone mast; loss of woodland and habitat; noise pollution; need for traffic management close to primary school; fear of local roads being used at “rat-runs”; shop proposal not being viable; inadequate water and sewerage capacity; inadequate supporting community / commercial facilities; traffic congestion on Lochaber Road and at West End roundabout; difficult land assembly; contamination; poor ground conditions; the need to safeguard or divert underground services; climatic exposure and elevation; better lower lying alternatives; high development costs, pluvial flooding, the map doesn’t show connecting footpaths and is therefore misleading about the impact of neighbouring access, and, loss of privacy and daylight. • HIE want a specific employment land allocation on this site because the lack of sites is constraining the area's economic growth. There is little spare capacity in allocated business sites - i.e. site B1 has a single operator, site B2 is earmarked for a specific tourism use, B3 is for tourism, B4 more likely for tourism and B5 for retail - so only 11.4 ha of allocated land is genuinely available for business use which is insufficient for a sub-regional centre such as Fort William. Government guidance requires a 5 year supply of marketable employment land. The Council has given no justification for changes from previous plans. HIE has a proven track record of acquiring and servicing sites. HIE provides evidence of recent and existing unmet demand. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority request deletion of site (implied). • HIE wants a specific business allocation within initial phases of 0.5-1 ha close to other community facilities. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION but see commended employment land safeguard change below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> -</p> <p>A planning consent has been granted for the first phase of the site. There is neither an intention to close any strategic footpaths nor to promote a net loss in tree / woodland cover. The allocation is an extension of a densely developed urban area and therefore the land does not have a rural character at present. Traffic management issues will arise and a transport assessment is suggested to better define developer requirements. Net betterment should be the aim for surface water drainage given the gradient issues, size of the allocation and existing problems. The Council will not support an adopted connection to Heathercroft and this connection is already gated. The viability of a local shop is a commercial decision but the Council can play a justifiable role in safeguarding land for this purpose and for other employment uses. In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential</p>		

deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing. Land close to the Angus Centre may be suitable for a new primary school but this will be dependent upon future decisions of the Council's Education Culture and Sport Committee. Land assembly, servicing and other constraints will all ensure a phased development of the wider allocation. There are no known contamination issues affecting the site but any concerns with this or underground services will be revealed by detailed feasibility work associated with the planning application process. The other concerns of neighbours are addressed by existing developer requirements.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM EXPANSION SITES	88
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocations MU5 & MU7 - Blar Mor and Caol/Lochyside Text WS 59-61 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<p><u>Objections</u> - R. & B. Grieve (MU5, MU7) (509), M. Elliott (MU5) (517), I. M. Strachan (MU5) (694), M. Morrison (MU5) (741), Brodies on behalf of Inverloch Castle Ltd (MU5, MU7) (748), L. Wade (MU5) (937), S. Bracken (MU5) (987), C. MacInnes (MU7) (205), J. Murdoch (MU7) (258), C. Morrison (MU7) (334), L. Livingston (MU7) (558), I. Hamilton (MU7) (561), D. Ferguson (MU7) (799), D. & C. MacInnes (MU7) (800), HIE (MU5, MU7) (495), Oatridge Ltd / Locheil Estates (MU5) (947)</p>		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Expansion Area	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MU5</u> - Residents' objections to development on the grounds of: loss of common grazings which the smaller crofts depend upon; pluvial and fluvial flood risk; excessive scale and density of housing development; loss of European protected habitat (blanket bog) which is also an educational resource; loss of structural and central urban greenspace; adverse impact on views from A830 and surrounding hill paths; adverse impact on the cultural significance of the potential site of Loch Abar freshwater loch; poor ground conditions (high water table), and; the land would better be allocated as a local nature reserve. • <u>MU7</u> - Residents' objections to development on the grounds of: pluvial flood risk; poor ground conditions; the A830 junctions are already at capacity at peak times; the need for a development set-back from the railway; adverse traffic impact on the local road network; detrimental impact on traffic safety close to local play areas; adverse impact on habitats and species; excessive scale and density of housing development; insufficient supporting community facilities; loss of privacy and private views; the costs of peat extraction will make development uneconomic, and; the Caol Link Road should be built prior to development. • HIE assert that the lack of specifically safeguarded employment land within Fort William is leading to unmet demand damaging the economic growth prospects of the area. Also specifically for MU5, HIE want land to the west of A830 to be re-allocated for business and industrial development because: it is listed in the Council's Structure Plan and Adopted Local Plan as a key employment site; it is separated from other incompatible uses and is therefore ideal for bad neighbour uses, and; the site benefits from a previous albeit now lapsed planning consent. HIE dispute the need for the Caol Link Road safeguard that crosses the site. • Oatridge Ltd. / Locheil Estates as the developer and landowner of site MU5 query the scale of retail provision appropriate to a district centre. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectors seek deletion of allocation (implied). • HIE seek specific employment land safeguard and removal of link road safeguard. • Landowner / developer seeks a larger retail component on MU5. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATIONS but see commended employment land safeguard changes below.</p>		

Reasons:

MU5: The majority of the land has been allocated for a considerable period and benefits from allocation within the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan. Moreover, Fort William's rate of growth has been artificially low in recent years due to the significant development cost constraints facing most sites. Although the importance of the European protected habitat is recognized it is not rare in a Highland context and this example is central to an urban area and therefore subject to the encroachment and pressure associated with such a location. However, retention of a significant area of greenspace would be appropriate. This may take the form of retained crofting, a riverside corridor and/or an area required for tackling surface water problems and could interpret the potential cultural and natural significance of the location. Visually, the land is flat, low lying and central to an urban area and therefore entirely appropriate in landscape terms. The high site preparation costs are recognized but are not regarded as an insurmountable constraint. Most of the allocated land is blanket bog and of very poor grazing quality. The developer's commitment to pursue an inclusive master planning process for a mixed use proposal, which will deliver economic benefits, a reservation for a relocated hospital, sports pitches, a Police HQ if needed and business land is welcomed. The Caol Link Road safeguard is appropriate given the Council's commitment to what is a strategic route. Bad neighbour uses may be appropriate within the wider site but the commercial advantage of a prominent trunk roadside location should not be wasted for a use that would not benefit from it. The master planning process will reveal and test an optimum layout and mix of uses.

MU7: There is a 301 house planning application pending on allocation MU7 which is likely to be determined prior to Examination. The majority of the land area has been allocated for a considerable period and benefits from allocation within the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan. Moreover Fort William's rate of growth has been artificially low in recent years due to the significant development cost constraints facing most sites. Although the importance of the European protected habitat is recognized it is not rare in a Highland context and this example is central to an urban area and therefore subject to the encroachment and pressure associated with such a location. However, retention of a significant area of greenspace would be appropriate. This may take the form of an area required for tackling surface water problems. The high site preparation costs and servicing issues are recognized but are not regarded as an insurmountable constraint. Noise pollution, property depreciation and loss of private views are not relevant considerations for this allocation. The Caol Link Road safeguard is appropriate given the Council's commitment to what is a strategic route.

Employment Land - In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM EXPANSION SITES	89
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocation MU8 – Lundavra Text WS 61 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
M.G. & A.G. Halligan (22), E. Griffiths (46), B. MacPherson (89), M. MacPherson (90), J. Douglas (160), R. & A. Algar (178), M. McCann (203), L. Merry (232), M. Jones (235), B. J. & E. Walzak (356), S. Bain (367), , Mr & Mrs Matheson (369), , R. Bruce (392), I. McCulloch (396), S. Sutherland (402), , Mr. & Mrs. M. Warburton (458), K. & F. Robertson (491), B. & P. Paterson (514), Mr & Mrs O'Neil (552), Mr. & Mrs. A. Lindsay (571), D. & S. Robertson (602), A. Whiteford & N. MacDonald (616), I. M. Strachan (694), N. Johnson (714), C. M. Whiteford (730), Mrs O'Neil (894), A. Whiteford (901), J. Macrae (905), E. M'Kenzie (934), A. Henderson (963), A. Cameron (964), J. Thomson (975), Kearney Donald Partnership on behalf of part owner Malcolm Cameron (456), HIE (495).		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Expansion Area	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents' objections on the grounds of: pluvial flood risk, which has no practicable solution because of a lack of additional surface water storage areas; existing slope stability issues which will be worsened by further development; poor ground conditions; adverse species and habitats impacts; loss of essential surface water storage areas; excessive size/density; concern that the stated density can only be achieved by high rise development; light pollution caused to lower properties because of the site's steep gradient; the steepness of the site being unsuitable for elderly accommodation and access; the site's development would create unsafe routes to school; increased pedestrian movements along existing paths which will increase nuisance problems; loss of informal play space; lack of layout detail; better alternative housing land north of the Dalvenie smelter and elsewhere within Fort William that is allocated within the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan and lower lying; the 1985 planning application refusal on part of the site; litter pollution; insufficient room for set-back from existing development; loss of scarce greenspace; loss of actively used croft land; loss of public views across Loch Linnhe; impact on proposed Tree Preservation Order (TPO); lack of supporting employment; overlooking leading to loss of privacy; fear that Seafield Gardens and Grange Terrace will be used for access to the site as a loop road; the altitude and exposure of the location; unclear satellite reception; existing water pressure problems being worsened by development; overhead lines inhibiting development; the compensation costs that would need to be paid by the Council if slope stability / flooding problems occur; trunk road queuing at the West End roundabout; increased traffic on Lundavra Road and Sutherland Avenue, and; the greater proximity to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which will result in a greater impact. The landowner requests an extension to the allocation because of the lack of constraints and because he is prepared to safeguard land for other non-housing uses in principle subject to the costs and density of development. HIE seek a specific employment land safeguard for the site because: there is little spare capacity in allocated business sites which is insufficient for a sub-regional centre; government guidance requires a 5 year supply of marketable employment land; there is no Council justification for changes from previous plans; HIE has a proven track record of acquiring and servicing sites, and; there is evidence of recent and existing unmet employment land demand. 		

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- Majority of neighbours / residents request deletion of site (implied).
- Landowner seeks extension of site to south east.
- HIE seeks specific employment land safeguard.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) – RETAIN ALLOCATION but see commended employment land safeguard change below.

Reasons -

- Representors' concerns over slope stability and existing surface water drainage issues have been recognized and are incorporated within the site's developer requirements. Discussions have taken place with Scottish Natural Heritage as to the SSSI proximity issue and they have advised that the allocation boundary can be contiguous to the designation boundary. Although there are alternative housing areas, this site compares favourably in terms of feasibility and outlook. The majority of the land is green but is fenced, partly in active crofting use and does not function as actively used public open space. Public views across Loch Linnhe can be safeguarded by control at the detailed planning application layout stage and will also be mitigated by the sloping nature of the site. The draft TPO was never confirmed but this is addressed in the current Plan wording. The existing policy wording requires developer contributions to resolve servicing issues. The density figure is indicative but doesn't necessitate high rise development. Light pollution will be an issue in any urban area and dark sky opportunities are available closeby. Similarly, other opportunities for housing for varying needs are allocated within the wider settlement. The decision on school provision has yet to be made but safe routes will be considered and any necessary mitigation provided. Better use of an existing footpath is a positive result for promoting active, healthy travel. The site does not provide public open space at present but could do as part of the development. There is no intention to connect the site through Seafield Gardens and Grange Terrace. The land north of the smelter is dependent upon the realignment of the A82 which is not included in the Government's 20 year trunk road capital programme. There is no significant queuing issue at the West End roundabout outwith peak periods. There may, at the time of the application and dependent upon the results of an engineering assessment, be a need to secure a developer bond or insurance to cover the impact of any potential slope stability issue.
- The suggested extension further to the south west would create layout and adopted road access issues. These suggest that the land may be suitable for development but should not benefit from a specific allocation.
- In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM EXPANSION SITES	90
Development plan reference:	Fort William - New Community MU9 - Torlundy / Fort William - Business Allocation B3 - Leanachan Forest Text WS 61-62, 65 – Map LFM LO46 & LO28 MB 40	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
D. Robertson (32), G. T. Kaye (33), C. Carver (45), S. Carver (48), M. Stevens (124), E. A. D. Kaye (135), J. & N. McCallum (149), M. Dunham (& 3 petitions totalling 550 signatures) (222), J. N. Scott (227), J. Murdoch (258), J. Weir (Inverlochty and Torlundy Community Council) (301), H. MacColl (381), R. Pashley (382), J. Pashley (383), J. Weir (405), A. McKenna (407), L. Macalister (408), R. MacKenzie (413), J. E. Robertson (418), M. & M. Dunham (427), J. & S. Wilson (428), SEPA (446), K. Matheson (455), J. McIntyre (457), A. Campbell (463), C. Dingwall (471), D. N. Williams (494), R. & B. Grieve (509), Lochaber District Salmon Fishery Board (523), J. Bell (529), M. Gillespie (579), M. Mee (580), D. Mee (581), D. & C. MacCallum (615), J. Carver (297 signature petition) (745), Mr & Mrs Kennedy (749), B. Thomas (754), D. Carver (884), J. M. Kennedy (885), D. Mitchell (904), J. Mee (914), C. A. Williams (938), M. Jons (940), L. Williams (942), B. & S. Thomas (944), R. Leaper (948), J. Fairbairn (950), P. Pullar (951), D. Paton (953), P. Pollard (954), M. Ketchin (955), E. Macalister (978), K. Ball (981), K. Scoular (982), E. & B. Kempe (B3 only) (986), Bidwells on behalf of Mr & Mrs Carver (861), Howie Minerals (794) and Brodies on behalf of Inverlochty Castle Hotel (748)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	New Community, Business Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to development on the grounds of: the land was not considered at the site options (Lochaber Futures) Plan draft stage; excessive scale and density; inadequate supporting community facilities; irreversible loss of good agricultural land; adverse impact on the setting of Inverlochty Castle Hotel as a listed building; better, more sustainable brownfield sites being available within Fort William or at Dalvenie Smelter; adverse impact on existing businesses; inadequate infrastructure; the development will be contrary to national planning guidance; inadequate jobs to support new residents; poor ground conditions particularly at Achindaul; adverse impact on historical and environmental features; no demand for housing in the area and forecasts are only aspirations; traffic and light pollution; a departure from the Council's Hinterland policy; adverse impact on the social balance of the existing community; pollution risk to River Lundy; loss of ancient Caledonian forest; loss of residential amenity; impact of any industrial development on local amenity; opposition to any closure of existing junctions; inadequate single track side roads; loss of safety of unfenced children's play area; proposals are unclear; adverse landscape impact and therefore loss of tourism; the proposal being contrary to the established settlement pattern in the area; site B3 promoting ribbon development, and; the environmental effects of the development have been underestimated in the Council's strategic environmental assessment. Other later objections were received on the grounds of: severance of any potential community by the A82 trunk road; dislocation of parts of the settlement; flood risk; noise pollution; new trunk road accesses being contrary to national policy; lack of housing demand in the current recession; feasibility given the high costs of A82 improvements; decreased safety on the A82 due to access proliferation; a genuine mixed use community would have more of a balance of employment and community facilities; the need and cost to relocate A82 roadside telecommunications services; the need for a new primary school or increased school transport costs; adverse protected species impact; the developer master plan layout is not sensible; the A82 improvement is not in Government's capital 		

programme; the rail halt and other improved public transport connections are not feasible; the weight of public feeling as evidenced by petitions, and; some residents concerns about properties being shown within area and therefore assumed for demolition. The one objection specific to B3 is based upon its encouragement of ribbon development and a suggestion that it would have been better to just allocate land both sides of Nevis Range access, forest tracks should just be left for recreation.

- Bidwells on behalf of Mr & Mrs Carver propose a tourism based development on Carver land. They believe this would be of a more appropriate scale and more environmentally friendly than the Council's allocated new community.
- Brodies on behalf of Inverloch Castle Hotel seek an allocation that will provide sufficient development value to retain and enhance the Hotel as an existing high quality tourism asset and employer. They believe the site can: make an effective contribution to the local land supply; provide simpler land assembly on less constrained land than alternatives within and around Fort William. They assert that a higher density will make better use of a scarce land resource. They propose a layout and land use mix that does not fully comply with the Council's concept of a sustainable new community.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- Majority of objectors seek deletion of allocation.
- Bidwells on behalf of Mr & Mrs Carver seek allocation of Carver land for: eco-based holiday village accommodation; expansion of events and bunkhouse accommodation; allotments, and; medium density, private and affordable housing including homeworking units.
- Brodies on behalf of Inverloch Castle Hotel (748) seek 300 dwelling new village proposal and limited associated facilities.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) – RETAIN ALLOCATION but see further flood risk and protected species commended amendments below.

Reasons

Given the constraints with other expansion sites within the wider Fort William area, Torlundy is worthy of support as a growth option. If it is confirmed after the Plan's Examination process then it should proceed as a genuine mixed use new community not as a detached housing expansion area. The confirmed availability of other Forestry Commission Scotland land closeby for employment use at Leanachan supports this concept. The suggested Dalvenie smelter area is closer to Fort William but dependent upon more significant A82 works that does not feature within the Government's 20 year trunk road investment programme. A satellite new community should also have a degree of physical separation from its "parent" settlement. The new settlement's scale also needs to be sufficient to offer a degree of sustainable self containment in terms of a mix of community, commercial and employment uses. The landscape impact of the development will be mitigated by most of the land being lower than and partially screened from the A82. Although the allocation comprises relatively good agricultural land this also means that the site preparation costs are significantly lower than within Fort William. These costs are the principal reason that Fort William's growth has been artificially held back by a lack of economic-to-develop land. National planning policy on housing asserts that planning authorities should identify a sufficient supply of effective housing land that can be delivered within the Plan period. The allocation boundary and intervening land/planting will ensure no significant adverse impact on the Category B listed Inverloch Castle. The Carver family land may have future development potential but the uncertainty over its release suggests it should be excluded at present. Its development would also be likely to have a more direct impact on the residential amenity of existing residents and on flood risk areas. The landowners of the allocated land have had initial but detailed discussions with the Trunk Road Authority and appear to have negotiated an A82

improvement scheme that could satisfy the Authority. The land's distance from Fort William is a genuine sustainability issue and needs to be addressed via a developer requirement for enhanced public transport connectivity plus early delivery of local community and employment facilities. However, the area already benefits from a pedestrian/cycleway connection to Fort William. Phasing agreements will also be required to address the community's concern about rapid expansion upsetting the social balance of the existing housing areas.

The development boundary has been drawn widely to include all land that may be required as part of a viable mixed use new community. The Council has given no endorsement of the developer's master plan and believes it has shortcomings in terms of a lack of community facility and employment provision. It would therefore be appropriate for the developer to be invited to the Examination to offer its own opinion on what uses, layout, trunk road improvements and planning gain it is prepared to commit to. It is also THC's position that the new community concept should be tested against other expansion sites within Fort William given the current oversupply of housing land within the Plan. The severance issue could be addressed by grade separated crossing provision or by concentrating on employment uses south east of the A82. Protection or diversion of roadside services is a common feature of many development sites and not an insurmountable constraint. An active travel connection to Fort William already exists and a larger community would increase the feasibility of improving a public transport that already passes through the area. The public will have an adequate opportunity to express their opinions through the Examination process as will the Carver family in pursuing any alternative tourism development concept. Also, the B3 allocation has been drawn widely at the request of Forestry Commission Scotland given the initial nature of their proposals. However, it is likely that any built development would be grouped close to existing developments and where services exist.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

AMEND boundary to exclude minor area within 1 in 200 flood risk area. For MU9 ADD "protected species survey" to developer requirements and AMEND to state "Flood risk assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area."

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM GENERAL	82
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocations - C1 Kilmallie Hall, B5 North Road, B6 Glen Nevis Business Park, Fassfern New Community, Caol Link Road, B2 Smelter Tailrace, Schools Provision, Housing Land Supply, Fort William Settlement Development Area (SDA), Corpach Woodland Areas, General Comment Text WS 53-65 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Kilmallie Community Company (Corpach Woodland Areas) 248, R. Thomas (SDA - Lochyside) 291, SEPA (B2) 446, HIE (Employment Land) 495, C. Turner (SDA - Lochyside) 577, Bidwells on behalf of Rio Tinto Alcan (SDA - Dalvenie Smelter) 732, J. Clark (Schools Provision) 417, Brodies on behalf of Inverlochy Castle Ltd. (SDA - Carrs Corner, General Comment) 748, D. Donnelly (Caol Link Road) 864, Fort William & District Chamber of Commerce (Employment Land, B6) 937, West Highland Woodlands (Fassfern New Community - Pro Development) 946, Morbaine Ltd (B5) 2, R. Hawkes (B5) 94, Kilmallie Hall Committee (C1) 560, W. Veitch (C1) 600, K. Rice (Fassfern New Community - Anti Development) 272, A. M. Barrie (SDA - Lochyside) 483		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Smaller Allocations, Sites and General Comments	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MU2/C1</u> - Hall Committee desire to safeguard and extend community use of the hall site and adjacent land. • <u>B5</u> - Developer asserts that the site is suitable for any form (comparison or convenience) of large retail unit because the town centre can't accommodate this type of development and there have been delays with the Waterfront (MU10) site. • <u>B6</u> - Chamber of Commerce believe this site is not suitable for industrial uses such as fish processing because it lies at the entrance to Glen Nevis. • <u>Employment Land</u> - HIE believe the Plan's supply of employment land is deficient in terms of quality and quantity which will lead to unmet demand and therefore adverse impact on the economic and housing growth potential of the area. There is little spare capacity in allocated business sites - B1 has a single operator, B2 is allocated for a specific tourism use, B3 is also for tourism, B4 is more likely to be developed for tourism, B5 is for retail - so there is only 11.4 ha of land genuinely available for business use which is insufficient for a sub-regional centre such as Fort William. Government guidance requires a 5 year supply of marketable employment land. The Council gives no justification for changes made from the previous local plans. HIE has a proven track record of acquiring and servicing sites and should be assisted in this process. Provide evidence of recent and existing unmet demand. There is a specific need for land to be safeguarded, in an attractive location, for office uses. • <u>Fassfern New Community</u> - owner disputes Council's previous statement about a lack of owner interest in progressing feasibility work on the site. The land is available and there is no detailed proposal because the previous Plan draft advised that Fassfern should not be pursued in short term. Owner believes there is an unmet housing need and demand in the area and there are many constraints affecting the zoned Fort William urban area sites. Land assembly will be simple, there is an existing planning consent for 12 houses which establishes the principle of development at this location and the owner is willing to include affordable provision. The owner would consider a tourism complex rather than mainstream housing as a first phase. The objector is concerned because of: the lack of detail; adverse impact on a historical site, adverse impact on landscape and recreation; 		

foul water pollution to the sensitive Loch Eil which has low dispersal of foul water discharges at this point.

- Caol Link Road - crofter believes the link road safeguard will cause unreasonable blight in preventing croft diversification to provide holiday letting accommodation. Any road would also cause severance and reduction in useability of the croft.
- B2 - SEPA concern over flood risk.
- Schools Provision - resident objections to a lack of a decision and/or misleading references on schools provision within Fort William. This decision is crucial in shaping where the housing allocations should best be located, safer routes to school and minimisation of school transport costs.
- Housing Land Supply - resident objections to too much housing land being identified because: the demand / need is not proven; there is inadequate matching employment; of inadequate transport networks; there is no diverse retailing base, and; there are insufficient visitor attractions.
- Fort William SDA
- (Dalvenie Smelter) owner suggests new allocation because: the site will not lead to coalescence with Torlundy; there will be no adverse impact on the setting of Inverlochy Castle Hotel; land assembly will be simple; there are no crofting tenure restrictions affecting the land, and; development of the site would provide an opportunity to improve the northern gateway entrance to Fort William.
- (Lochyside) crofter concerned about the Plan's contradiction between not allowing housing on crofts at Lochyside but zoning much larger areas on the Bla Mhor common grazings for intensive development. The future of crofts depends upon access to grazings. Housing development should be allowed on the open space designation at Lochyside because this croftland is no longer suitable due to its proximity to busy roads.
- (Carrs Corner) owner suggests an arts and crafts centre allocation north of Carrs Corner because: it was mentioned in a previous site options (Lochaber Futures) Plan draft ; this is an important and commercially advantageous gateway location; it would be complementary to Inverlochy Castle role as a key tourism facility, and; the proposal would be compatible with national planning policy as a commercial leisure development.
- Corpach Woodland Areas - local desire for Corpach's existing woodland areas to be safeguarded and managed as woodland greenspace. A local body intends to purchase one area.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- MU2/C1 - eastward expansion of community uses allocation.
- B5 - change to unrestricted retail use.
- B6 - HIE want Class 4 only business uses and no incompatible waste facility, Chamber of Commerce want this land for business uses only.
- Employment Land - HIE and Chamber of Commerce want more, specifically allocated and safeguarded employment sites including an attractive office park location.
- Fassfern New Community - owner wants a return to the wording for Fassfern given in 2007 Deposit Draft. Objector requests deletion of new community proposal (implied).
- Caol Link Road - deletion of link road safeguard from Plan text and mapping.
- B2 - SEPA seek strengthening of flood risk developer requirements.
- Schools Provision - deletion of references to possible school closures and/or more certainty and match up between housing allocations / expansion areas and new school provision structure.
- Housing Land Supply - deletion or reduction in scale of housing allocations / expansion areas.
- Fort William SDA
- (Lochyside) implied removal of open space designation /safeguard.
- (Carrs Corner) new arts and crafts centre allocation on Inverlochy Castle ground.
- (Dalvenie Smelter) new long term development allocation.

- Corpach Woodland Areas - public open space designation on all remaining woodland areas in Corpach.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) -

- MU2/C1 - RETAIN & EXTEND ALLOCATION. See commended change below for detail.
- B5 - RETAIN ALLOCATION. See commended change below for detail.
- B6: NO CHANGE.
- Employment Land - ADD textual reference to safeguard employment land for all principal Fort William mixed use sites. See commended change below for detail.
- Fassfern New Community -. NO CHANGE.
- Caol Link Road - NO CHANGE.
- B2 - RETAIN ALLOCATION but add strengthened flood risk developer requirement as detailed in commended change below.
- Schools Provision - NO CHANGE.
- Housing Land Supply - NO CHANGE.
- Fort William SDA - (Dalvenie). NO CHANGE.
- (Lochyside) - NO CHANGE.
- (Carrs Corner) - NO CHANGE.
- Corpach Woodland Areas - ADD open space notation to larger areas of woodland.

Reasons:

- MU2/C1 - Uses ancillary to a refurbished hall would be appropriate across a wider site.
- B5 - A recent inquiry appeal decision has prescribed a specific mix and type of uses for the site which should be carried forward into the Plan.
- B6 - Well managed waste facilities are an entirely appropriate use for such an area. The Plan's suggested uses are compatible with existing and likely future employment uses. High profile office uses would best be accommodated on a site such as MU10 Waterfront which has the commercial advantages of town centre location, better outlook and better accessibility.
- Employment Land - In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing.
- Fassfern New Community - The Fassfern proposal was downgraded in importance as a development option given: the lack of further feasibility work produced by the landowner (albeit the Council accepts that the previous Plan draft wording may have misled the landowner in this regard); its relative distance from Fort William compared to Torlundy and existing urban expansion sites, and; the lack of supporting service, employment and community networks. Fassfern offers a poorer balance of planning pros and cons than other allocated alternatives and therefore does not merit endorsement in the short term. However, the Examination process will allow for an impartial testing of its relative merits. A hotel / timeshare development would have more planning policy merit but not as a pre-cursor to mainstream housing.
- Caol Link Road - Any positive funding decision necessitating a Council promoted scheme would require environmental assessment. Although the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) does not include an A82/A830 link it remains a Council priority and is key to the activation of several allocated sites. This strategic significance justifies the continued safeguarding of a route. Compensation for any severance and loss of croft

land would be considered during the detailed procedures prior to the road's construction.

- B2 - The use is largely water based and any buildings and essential access routes should fall outwith the 1 in 200 year risk area.
 - Schools Provision - This matter will be for future decision making by the Council's education Committee and possibly full Council. The importance of the issue and its influence on housing location is recognised but school provision has separate statutory consultation procedures. Any timely decisions will be made available to the Examination for information and will also inform future planning application assessment.
 - Housing Land Supply - It is recognised that the housing capacity of the presently allocated sites is in excess of that required for an effective housing land supply. The examination process will test the relative planning merits of these sites and may discard less favoured options.
- Fort William SDA
- (Dalvenie) - The suggested Dalvenie smelter area is closer to Fort William than some of the allocated expansion areas such as Torlundy but is dependent upon significant A82 realignment works that are not programmed within the STPR or Council's roads budget.
 - (Lochyside) - Although not strictly a "cherished" greenspace within the Fort William area, relaxation of a hitherto restrictive policy in this area would set a precedent for erosion of the wider crofts. This is also a poorly serviced area and its lower parts are subject to flood risk. The land may be suitable for comprehensive, longer term development but not for the piecemeal extensions proposed at present.
 - (Carrs Corner) - The Plan supports the arts and crafts in principle and this is sufficient and appropriate given the lack of detail as to the proposal. The use may better be included within the new community itself or on allocated land at Carrs Corner.
 - Corpach Woodland Areas - The sites are increasingly valued and used areas of public open space.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- C1 - ENLARGE site on eastern boundary as requested.
- B5 - RETAIN ALLOCATION. The appeal outcome is now known. Amend as per appeal outcome DPEA case P/PPA/270/517.
- B6 - None.
- Employment Land - AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.
- Fassfern New Community - None.
- Caol Link Road - None.
- B2 - AMEND developer flood risk requirement to read, "Flood risk assessment will be required; built development to avoid flood risk area; water related uses only, within flood risk area."
- Schools Provision - None.
- Housing Land Supply - None.
- Fort William SDA - (Dalvenie) None
- (Lochyside) - None
- (Carrs Corner) - None
- Corpach Woodland Areas - ADD open space notation to larger areas of woodland.

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SITE	83
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocation H – Tomonie Text WS 58 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
G. Bruce (88), J. N. Scott (227), Mr & Mrs D. Cameron (394), J. Clark (417), B. Bruce (460), F. McGregor (490), R. & B. Grieve (509), M. Elliott (517), R. & A. Skinner (617), M. Gilmore (668), L. Gilmore (669), J. Quigley (675), G. Bruce (680), B. Bruce (681), Ms Blackhall (682), A. & P. Brown (704), I. C. Smith (775), W. J. Gibbons (876), H. Gibbons (877), M. Small (878), A. Skinner (880)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Neighbours and residents object to development on the grounds of: loss of croftland; less safe and/or longer routes to school for local children; loss of European protected wetland habitat; lack of sewerage capacity; opposition to linking of culs-de-sac that serve the area; inadequate road (including rail bridge) capacity; fluvial flood risk; pluvial flood risk; the need for a pedestrian bridge over the railway prior to any more development; the lack of suitable areas within the site to hold additional surface water run-off as a result of more development; loss of scarce greenspace; the negative impact on European protected species (especially otters and bats); the loss of a Right of Way; loss of views from the area's footpath network; adverse impact on the scheduled monument the Caledonian Canal; the area is more suited to a more dispersed crofting style development; the allocation's excessive capacity and density; development will add to existing pollution of local watercourses; the site is a departure from the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan, and; the recent planning permission for the western section of the site should be overturned.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Majority request deletion of site (implied) others may be satisfied by a lower density more dispersed crofting style pattern.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION. See commended change below regarding drainage.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The land at Tomonie would benefit from comprehensively serviced development. Its haphazard evolution has resulted in a fragmented pattern of land uses served by a similarly ad-hoc set of service networks. Therefore, what croft land and greenspace remains, is also disjointed. The existing policy wording promotes further development but hand-in-hand with planned improvements (developer requirements) which address the issues raised by representors. The linking of the culs-de-sac is a preference not a formal requirement. The primary school closure is an issue for the future decision of the Council's Education Culture and Sport Committee which is subject to separate public consultation and associated objection procedures. A setting set-back from the scheduled monument canal is already incorporated in the Plan wording. A protected species survey requirement has also been added which would also consider related habitat issues. The Plan wording also already requires improvement to foul drainage arrangements and an additional surface water improvement target would be appropriate.		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC
ADD developer requirement for "net betterment of surface water drainage."

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM	92
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocations MU12 (BT depot/Police station and MU13 (High Street "Backlands") Text WS 62-63 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
C. MacDonald (MU12) (71), Telereal (BT Property) (MU12) (142), Scottish Court Service (MU12) (221), Grog & Gruel PH (MU13) (186), Mr & Mrs R. Cameron (MU13) (316)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MU12 - Mr MacDonald disputes the appropriate future use of the site should relocation occur. BT Property say they have no intention to relocate or part relocate because the building and its contents are still operational. The Scottish Court Service (SCS) fear the loss of custody cells within any relocated police station and 2 related parking spaces. • MU13 - The Grog and Gruel are concerned about the possible net detriment to their existing enterprise if redevelopment occurs - including the issues of storage, access, parking, turning and amenity. The Camerons are concerned about an ownership boundary and loss of residential amenity. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MU12 - Mr MacDonald feels the site would better be allocated for a 3 story multi-storey car park and flats for the elderly. BT imply a desire for removal of any BT relocation assumption. SCS seek a guarantee of replacement custody cell and parking provision. • MU13 - The Grog and Gruel seek a net betterment to existing enterprises pre-condition to any redevelopment. The Camerons imply that they want the exclusion of their "Morar Dale" property from the allocation boundary and an advance consultation guarantee. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATIONS.		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MU12 - Subsequent local discussions have suggested that BT may be prepared to relocate their operation. Similarly any relocation would also have to address the needs of the police and courts service and negotiate with affected parties to achieve no net detriment. The existing policy allows for upper floors residential development subject to adequate parking provision. • MU13 - Redevelopment will depend upon successful negotiation with affected parties which would centre around the principle of no net detriment in terms of access, parking and storage. 		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM MIXED USE SITES	85
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocations MU2 - Corpach Locks Text WS 59 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
A. & V. Walker (109), J. & N. McCallum (149), J. Biggin (174), P. Biggin (248), SEPA (446), Historic Scotland (498), R. & B. Grieve (509), Mr & Mrs Payne (891), HIE (495)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>Objections to development on the grounds of: flood risk; potential adverse impact on Caledonian Canal scheduled monument; adverse visual impact on classic view of Ben Nevis; off-site flooding impact of any land raising; insufficient room for parking, turning and yacht trailers; noise pollution from yacht rigging blowing in the wind; the railway level crossing is a constraint to the access road's capacity and safety; adverse wildlife impact; any reclamation would be too expensive because of the steeply sloping loch floor at this location, and; development here may be prejudicial to British Waterways interests. HIE object generally to the lack of specifically safeguarded employment land within Fort William leading to unmet demand. They also want more explicit support for recreational sailing facilities.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectors seek deletion of site (implied). • SEPA seek strengthening of flood risk developer requirements. • HIE seek specific employment land safeguard and a more explicit support for recreational sailing facilities. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION subject to further commended changes detailed below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The Council has already amended the Plan to address the concerns of representors. Positive support for expanded recreational sailing facilities has been included but made subject to access and heritage safeguards and will also be made subject to flood risk. The allocation supports small scale and low-key development proposals plus enhanced marine access most probably via pontoons. The developer requirements text addresses other issues. British Waterways have not objected, will be an essential development partner and have previously been supportive of development connected to their operational interests. In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would unnecessarily curtail layout options.</p>		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.

AMEND developer flood risk requirement to read, "Flood risk assessment will be required; built development to avoid flood risk area; water related uses only, within flood risk area."

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM MIXED USE SITES	86
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocations MU3 - Banavie Car Park Text WS 59 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
W. G. Lees (101), Mr. & Mrs. H. Ryan (612), A. Clark (795), HIE (495), British Waterways Scotland (BWS) (767)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents object on the grounds of: adverse impact on tourism; loss of greenspace; loss of views, and; loss of “public” parking which is important for locals, visitors and is also used for major events. HIE believe the lack of specifically safeguarded employment land within Fort William is leading to unmet demand. BWS clarify that they have no obligation to provide general needs parking. It is prepared to enter dialogue with all affected parties but believe an expanded boundary would better reflect its ownership boundary and associated uses / land. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectors seek deletion of allocation (implied). HIE seek specific employment land safeguard. BWS seek expanded allocation for canal side development, new homes and associated open space. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION but see commended employment land safeguard change below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The role of this area as a vital visitor facility is accepted and therefore its loss or partial loss to a competing use would not be appropriate. The site and its constraints lend themselves to a visitor related development. It should be possible to achieve a compromise use mix that promotes development potential without compromising built heritage, parking and greenspace interests. In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Committed by THC		
AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.		

Issue (ref and heading):	FORT WILLIAM MIXED USE SITES	87
Development plan reference:	Fort William - Allocation MU4 - Mount Alexander Text WS 59 – Map LFM LO46	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
R. & B. Grieve (509), HIE (495)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection on grounds of: loss of greenspace; loss of habitat; lack of housing demand, and; lack of supporting infrastructure and jobs. • HIE - lack of specifically safeguarded employment land within Fort William is leading to unmet demand. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectors seek deletion of allocation (implied). • HIE seek specific employment land safeguard. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION but see commended employment land safeguard change below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - Adjoining site-specific constraints have been referenced within the site's developer requirements. The land lies within the urban area and is a suitable infill site subject to the requirements being met. There is a planning application for 10 holiday accommodation units pending on the site. In light of the evidence presented it is accepted that there is a potential deficiency in allocated employment land in Fort William. A change in the developer requirement wording will strengthen the safeguarding of potential land. However, to specifically delineate certain areas for business only, without the capital programme commitment from HIE to acquire and service these areas, would curtail the layout options of these mixed use expansion areas and may prejudice their development for other needed uses such as affordable housing.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
AMEND Fort William allocations MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, MU5, MU8, MU9, MU10, MU17 to ensure each area safeguards a minimum 15% of site area for employment uses as part of an early phase of development.		

Issue (ref and heading):	GAIRLOCHY	48
Development plan reference:	Gairloch – All Housing Allocations, H2 (Lochside), H3 (North of Mucomir), H4 (South of Mucomir), H5 (Caravan Park (North)), Land at Caravan Site Text MB50 – Map LO34 MB 51	
Body or persons(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All Housing Allocations</u>: P.J. Browne (252), J. Higginbotham & H. Gillanders (541), D. & K. Dewar (570) • <u>H2</u>: D. MacKenzie MacNicol (283) • <u>H3</u>: W. Skene (81), D.F.W. MacDiarmid (281), J. Higginbotham & H. Gillanders (541), H. MacLean (567), D. & K. Dewar (570) • <u>H4</u>: W. Skene (81), H. MacLean (567), D. & K. Dewar (570) • <u>H5</u>: SEPA (446) • <u>Land at Caravan Site</u>: I. Stevenson (11) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	All Housing Allocations (H1-H6) & Land at Caravan Site.	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All Allocations</u>: resident objections to development because of: major visual intrusion; the sites are not in the original 1985 Fort William plan or in the 1992 revision; adverse impact on tourism; inadequate road and school capacity; conflict with proposals to designate part of Lochaber as a National Park; the development being contrary to the settlement pattern; adverse impact on historical sites; no public transport or shops; non-car traffic safety problems; increased light pollution, adverse visual impact on the area's rural setting, and; the need for development to be kept on the north side of the road to preserve views. • <u>H2-specific</u>: resident objections to development because of: adverse impact on the area's rural setting; loss of rural character; adverse impact on protected species and habitats; loss of woodland; increased light pollution; road inadequacy; adverse impact on Great Glen Way, and; loss of the Great Glen Way informal car park. • <u>H3-specific</u>: resident objections to development because of: loss of privacy / overlooking; poor drainage; the high water table; the lack of septic tank / soakaway capacity; increased noise & light pollution; the likely interruption to road access and services; inadequate road capacity and access; the track to Rathtulaich should be adopted by the developer; inadequate water and wastewater provision and the adverse effects on fisheries; development being contrary to the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan; the land being peat bog and rock crossed by watercourses; the rock requiring blasting; the steep gradient of the site; the need for a new sub-station; adverse effects on tourism; adverse impact on wildlife; the loss of farmland; the loss of rural character; adverse landscape impact; better alternative sites between the forest and the road further up the B8004; no infrastructure or community facilities; no street lighting; no pavement; pluvial flood risk; no speed limit; inadequate school capacity; no GP surgery, shop or public hall; depreciation of property, and; the public expense of upgrading service networks. • <u>Common to H3, H4, H5, H6</u>: resident objections to development because of: loss of amenity of adjacent properties; visual blight on northern exit to the Spean Gorge Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and; adverse impact on the tourist appeal of the Commando training area. 		

- H4-specific: resident objections to development because of: the need for the roofline of development to be below that of the hills on the south side of the river Spean, adverse impact on the SSSI; the lack of a justification when readily developable land under the same ownership has not yet been developed; development not being in keeping with established the settlement pattern; loss of riverside woodland, pluvial flood risk; poor ground conditions; development being contrary to the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan; the high water table; the lack of septic tank / soakaway capacity; increased noise & light pollution; adverse landscape impact; inadequate road capacity and access; adverse impact on public views and setting of Great Glen Way; inadequate water and wastewater provision and effects on fisheries; a new sub-station being needed; adverse impact on wildlife; adverse effects on tourism; loss of farmland; loss of rural character; better alternative sites being available between the forest and the road further up the B8004; no infrastructure or community facilities; no street lighting; no pavement; no speed limit; inadequate school capacity; no GP surgery, shop or public hall; depreciation of property, and; the public expense of upgrading service networks.
- H5-specific: SEPA objection because of flood risk.
- Land at Caravan Site: Settlement Development Area (SDA) should enclose latest planning consent boundary.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- All Housing Allocations: deletion of all allocations and removal of undeveloped land from SDA (implied).
- H5-specific: Addition of stronger flood risk developer requirement.
- Land at Caravan Site: SDA should enclose latest planning consent boundary - i.e. include more land east of Business Allocation.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) -

- All Housing Allocations: RETAIN ALL EXISTING ALLOCATIONS.
- H5-specific: ADD flood risk requirements. See detail of commended changes below.
- Land at Caravan Site: AMEND SDA to include area consented at time of post Examination draft of Plan.

Reasons:

- All Housing Allocations: There are extant planning consents as follows: H1 (2 houses), H2 (4 houses) and H4 (4 houses). The objectives for Gairloch recognise the importance of the natural and built environment and ensure the provision of high quality design and careful siting and layout of any new development. Considering the small scale of development proposed, the Council believes there will be no significant road and bridge network capacity issues especially given that the settlement is served by a loop road. The Council accepts there is a potential capacity issue in the Spean Bridge primary school in the future and is considering possible solutions. However, the scale of development proposed for Gairloch will not have a significant impact on the school's future roll. Adequate surface water drainage arrangements are a requirement for all sites via the application of the Plan's general policy on this issue. The objectives for Gairloch address the concerns over insensitive siting and design in respect to the SSSI and candidate AGLV. Privacy and nuisance concerns will be addressed via appropriate layout at the planning application stage. Scottish Water have confirmed that there is no capacity at the septic tank in Gairloch but private systems should be acceptable and SEPA have not maintained objections to the sites on waste water grounds. There are no known water capacity issues. The local plan has to provide sufficient land potentially available for development in order to accommodate for the settlement's growth and for

choice. The objectives cater for the protection of recognised tourist views. The land identified is not essential to the working of a particular agricultural unit. The loss of peat bog is relatively insignificant in comparison to the resource within Highland and there is no SNH objection on any site. The loss of private views and perceived depreciation in property values are not valid material planning considerations.

- H2-specific: The site is cleared of most of its woodland. The additional developer requirements will enhance any existing habitats and safeguard the existing informal car park. Considering the scale of development proposed, the Highland Council does not accept any capacity issues regarding B8005. An outline planning consent has now been granted for 4 houses on the site.
- H3-specific: Potential light pollution will be mitigated by an intervening tree screen. SEPA does not confirm any flooding issue.
- H4-specific: the land is allocated subject to flood risk requirements.
- Land at Caravan Site: There is an extant planning consent and a similar application pending consideration on the land at the caravan site. It would be appropriate for the Plan to reflect the boundary of the latest extant consent.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- Housing Allocations Other than H5: None.
- H5-specific: Add developer requirement "Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area".
- Land at Caravan Site: AMEND SDA to include area consented at time of post Examination draft of Plan.

Issue (ref and heading):	GENERAL	101
Development plan reference:	Strategies & Visions, General Policies (WHILP specific only), Other General Whole Plan	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<u>Strategies & Visions</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewables - Mountaineering Council of Scotland (MCS)(511), SNH (697), A. Williams (740) • In-migration - M. Basil (683) • Balance in Heritage References - SNH (697) 		
<u>General Policies (WHILP specific only, remainder considered under separate issue papers)</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity - Scottish Wildlife Trust (983) • Disabled Access - Voluntary Action Lochaber (992) • Flood Risk - SEPA (includes SEPA's general objection to all allocations within, partly within and bordering the 1 in 200 year flood risk area) (446) • Waste Water (addresses SEPA's objection to all allocations that should in its view connect to a public sewer) - SEPA (446) • Built & Cultural Heritage (paras. 5.17 & 5.28 of the Written Statement) - Historic Scotland (498) • Developer Contributions - Theatres Trust (635) • Commerce - Theatres Trust (635), GL Hearn (515) 		
<u>Other General</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected Species Surveys - R. Cottis (501) • Protection of Croft / Agricultural Land - M. Foxley (701) • Safeguarding of Land for Elderly Person Accommodation - M. Foxley (701) • Trunk Road Capacity - (and all allocations that may have an adverse impact on the trunk road network) Transport Scotland (859) • Adequacy of Allocated Employment Land - HIE (495) • Watercourses - (and all allocations containing significant natural watercourses) SEPA (446) • Other Natural Heritage - SNH (697) • Environmental Report - Historic Scotland (498), SNH (697), SEPA (446) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Various	
Summary of representation(s):		
<u>Strategies & Visions</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewables - MCS object to any phrases of support for renewables unless caveated for no adverse landscape impact. This is justified because of the scenic, recreational and tourism value of that landscape. SNH object to the inclusion of locational guidance on marine energy developments as this is inconsistent with the removal of other locational guidance on renewables and the potential for adverse natural heritage impact. Mr Williams objects to the specific locational support for on shore windfarms because of the adverse natural heritage impact such developments would have. • In-migration - Mr Basil believes the Plan should be realistic and aim to encourage immigration of higher income middle aged professionals not the young who will leave for 		

greater diversity of employment and social opportunities. This will strengthen the skills and tax base of the area but requires attractive living environments with broadband access and accessible greenspace. Attracting this home-working sector will be more successful and reliable than depending upon tourism.

- **Balance in Heritage References** - SNH request more balance in referring to heritage - want more emphasis on safeguarding resources rather exploiting them.

General Policies (WHILP specific only)

- **Biodiversity** - The Scottish Wildlife Trust object to the lack of vision, strategy and general policy coverage on the issue of biodiversity because of: the legal requirement to address the issue; it being contrary to national policy, the importance to climate change and quality of life, and; the potential for detrimental impact if there is no policy coverage.
- **Disabled Access** - voluntary group objection to lack of specific Plan policy support for better disabled access.
- **Flood Risk** - SEPA general objection to unacceptable flood risk on allocations within, partly within and bordering the 1 in 200 year flood risk area.
- **Waste Water** - SEPA objection to: inadequate encouragement of public sewerage solutions and their implied lower risk of pollution, and; the lack of discouragement of sea/loch outfalls and their potentially worse direct impact on pollution.
- **Built & Cultural Heritage** - Historic Scotland objection to: the inadequate reference to the setting of the Fort in Fort William; the inappropriate reference to restoration of Castle Tioram, and; the incorrect reference to Kinloch Castle as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM).
- **Developer Contributions** - Theatres Trust believe that assistance for cultural venues should be sought as a developer contribution because this would assist their self sufficiency, obtain better sites and buildings and meet the cultural needs of the local community.
- **Commerce** - Theatres Trust objects to the lack of specific protection and promotion of existing venues because of their role as tourist attraction(s) and therefore as a contribution to the local economy. GL Hearn objects to the lack of detail on the function of each scale of centre because this is potentially misleading. It believes the policy should set out quantitative and qualitative requirements in more detail in accordance with national planning guidance. Only the mixed use core of each centre should be included within the commerce boundary.

Other General

- **Protected Species Surveys** - Mr Cottis presents a proposal for a planning and wildlife mitigation policy / process on the grounds that: the Council's legal duties in this area are not being met, and; a simple checklist and better development management officer training would better inform the decision on the need for protected species surveys.
- **Protection of Croft / Agricultural Land** - Dr Foxley objects to the Plan's inadequate protection of locally important croft in byre or arable farmland.
- **Safeguarding of Land for Elderly Person Accommodation** - Dr Foxley objects to the Plan's inadequate provision of land for extra care sheltered housing for local elderly in every village.
- **Trunk Road Capacity** - Transport Scotland objection to all allocated sites that take access off the trunk road network and/or that will adversely affect the network because this is contrary to national policy, there is no exceptional appraisal justification given, and it will raise false expectations amongst developers.
- **Adequacy of Allocated Employment Land** - HIE objection to the lack of specifically allocated employment land in all main settlements but in particular in Fort William. It is not content with mixed use allocations because these provide no guarantee of employment land. It points out the qualitative deficiencies in all identified business sites. It claims support from the Council's Structure Plan and national planning guidance. It

points out the contradiction between this lack of employment land and the Plan Vision which sets out the need for 700-800 new jobs. Therefore there needs to be a range of employment sites to maximise opportunities for potential users. It provides evidence of past and current demand. It believes this demonstrates unmet demand in terms of land and premises, which is in part due to lack of suitable sites. The private sector will not acquire and service sites themselves but they will provide units on serviced sites.

- **Watercourses** - SEPA asserts that natural watercourses where they exist within development sites should be safeguarded from development because of their natural heritage value, they are less likely than culverts to get blocked and they therefore have fewer maintenance issues.
- **Other Natural Heritage** - SNH objections to: inadequate cross-referencing of updated Scottish Government guidance; inadequate information of documents' deposit places; "key principles" section is potentially misleading; inconsistent referencing of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) where they overlap with Settlement Development Areas (SDAs); inconsistent referencing of National Scenic Areas (NSAs) close to and within SDAs; potential adverse impact on settlement pattern and landscape character in crofting expansion areas; inadequate protection for Natura water bodies; need for factual updates on new sites and correction of headings in heritage designations and hinterland mapping; inadequate protection of Natura sites from development; inconsistent references to development "objectives" for SDAs and "factors" in General Policy 2, and; lack of reference to landscape character assessments in preamble to General Policy 3.
- **Environmental Report** - consultation authorities comments on the need for more: up to date information; consistency; follow through of mitigation; consideration of cumulative and residual effects, and; cross-referencing of other relevant policies and documents. All these changes would ensure a fuller consideration of environmental effects and appropriate mitigation.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Strategies & Visions

- **Renewables** - MCS - every support in principle phrase to be caveated as subject to no adverse impact on any valued (whether covered by any formal designation or not) landscape. SNH - deletion of marine renewables locational guidance. Williams - deletion of locational guidance for on-shore windfarms (implied).
- **In-migration** - a change in strategic policy direction to encourage in-migration of middle aged homeworkers by creating and safeguarding attractive living environments with good broadband access (implied).
- **Balance in Heritage References** - more balanced references to heritage to emphasise primary purpose of safeguarding not exploitation.

General Policies (WHILP specific only)

- **Biodiversity** - better policy coverage on the issue of biodiversity.
- **Disabled Access** - specific policy support for better disabled access.
- **Flood Risk** - where significant flood risk SEPA want pre-allocation-confirmation flood risk assessment (FRA) - for other part risk sites want FRA and either exclusion of affected area or water related uses only within affected area or built development exclusion from affected area.
- **Waste Water** - addition of: wording to support general principle of discharge to land; developer to pay for any private solution to be "Scottish Water-ready", and; public sewer connection for all allocations where feasible to connect and/or private treatment not appropriate.
- **Built & Cultural Heritage** - additional reference to setting of Fort in Fort William; deletion of reference to restoration of Castle Tioram, and correction of reference to Kinloch Castle as a SAM.

- **Developer Contributions** - Theatres Trust want specific inclusion of contributions towards Fort William's cultural needs
- **Commerce** - Theatres Trust want addition of specific protection and promotion of existing Fort William venues. GL Hearn want fuller detail and justification for scale and function of retail hierarchy.

Other General

- **Protected Species Surveys** - policy to cross reference a development management process that better informs the decision on the need for protected species surveys (implied).
- **Protection of Croft / Agricultural Land** - Plan policy embargo on development proposals on locally important croft in by or arable farmland.
- **Safeguarding of Land for Elderly Person Accommodation** - Specific allocations for sheltered housing only sites in the centre of every Lochaber village.
- **Trunk Road Capacity** - either deletion of all sites taking direct access off the trunk road network or likely to have a detrimental effect upon it or access arrangements amended to only allow direct access from the local road network, or wording added to make all sites dependent upon Transport Scotland approval of developer funded transport appraisals and/or a Scottish Government funding commitment to any consequential trunk road network improvements.
- **Adequacy of Allocated Employment Land** - specifically allocated employment sites in every major Lochaber settlement, general policy support for enhanced marine access, specific allocations for uses proposed for relocation, and a more explicit A82 lobbying policy.
- **Watercourses** - Addition of developer requirement for retention and integration of watercourses as natural features within applicable development sites and commitment to general policy on issue within Highland wide Local Development Plan.
- **Other Natural Heritage** - Need for: better cross-referencing of updated Scottish Government guidance; addition of list of where paper copies can be inspected and deletion of "key principles" section; consistent referencing of SSSIs where they overlap with SDAs; consistent referencing of NSAs close to and within SDAs; addition of objective to avoid possible adverse impact on settlement pattern and landscape character of crofting expansion areas; addition of objective for all SDAs draining to Natura water bodies; update designated sites and correct headings in background maps; addition of wording to preclude developments that could have a significant adverse impact on Natura sites; cut SDAs to exclude SACs wherever potential adverse impact; consistent references to development "objectives" for SDAs and in General Policy 2; reference to landscape character assessments in preamble to General Policy 3.
- **Environmental Report** - Request for factual updates, better baseline data e.g. no. of SAMs, match scoring matrices to changed general policies, all matrix mitigation to be followed through into the allocation developer requirements, more commentary on cumulative and residual effects, better and fuller cross-referencing of other relevant policies and documents.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) -

Strategies & Visions

- **Renewables** - DELETE all remaining locational guidance for renewables and reference to on-going work as detailed in commended changes below
- **In-migration** - NO CHANGE.
- **Balance in Heritage References** - AMEND text to add more balanced references as detailed in commended changes below.

General Policies (WHILP specific only)

- **Biodiversity** - NO CHANGE.
- **Disabled Access** - NO CHANGE.
- **Flood Risk** - Only WHILP site changes as detailed in commended changes below.
- **Waste Water** - Only WHILP site changes as detailed in commended changes below.
- **Built & Cultural Heritage** - NO CHANGE.
- **Developer Contributions** - NO CHANGE other than clarification detailed in commended changes below.
- **Commerce** - NO relevant CHANGE.

Other General

- **Protected Species Surveys** - Only WHILP site-specific changes.
- **Protection of Croft / Agricultural Land** - NO CHANGE.
- **Safeguarding of Land for Elderly Person Accommodation** - NO CHANGE.
- **Trunk Road Capacity** - NO CHANGE.
- **Adequacy of Allocated Employment Land** - Only WHILP site-specific changes.
- **Watercourses** - Only WHILP site-specific changes.
- **Other Natural Heritage** - AMEND as detailed in commended changes below.
- **Environmental Report** - AMEND to update, clarify, augment and to better cross reference related policies and guidance (see commended changes below).

Reasons:Strategies & Visions

- **Renewables** - The previous locational guidance was inappropriate given its brevity, lack of context and partly “under review” status and was therefore removed. For consistency any remaining references should also be removed. However, support in principle for renewables should be retained as this accords with national and Highland policy and is a vital component of tackling climate change. Caveating every support in principle reference would not be in keeping with the Government’s commitment to producing streamlined planning policy and adequate environmental safeguards exist within the existing Plan wording or are commended for addition.
- **In-migration** - It is accepted that homeworking will making an increasing contribution to the Highland economy. However, there are many attractive Highland areas with suitable broadband access that will help foster the home-working sector. Many very rural phone exchanges have now been ADSL enabled and further advances in technology will increase availability even to the most remote areas. This coupled with the Council’s positive housing in the countryside policies allows many suitable locations for potential and existing home-working migrants.
- **Balance in Heritage References** - It is accepted that more balanced references to the purpose of heritage designations as areas for protection and enhancement as well as interpretation opportunities are appropriate. However, the suggested change to para. 6.16 (access and recreation) is not appropriate because the suggested wording is written as a policy and other guidance covers this issue with adequate balance. Similarly, para 7.51 (core path plans) is written as a policy and other Highland policy guidance covers this issue with adequate balance.

General Policies (WHILP specific only)

- **Biodiversity** - The Highland wide Local Development Plan and future supplementary guidance will address the issue of biodiversity in greater detail. Further non-specific guidance is not appropriate to the streamlined content of the new style development plans.

- **Disabled Access** - The disabled access policy issue would best be addressed through the forthcoming Highland wide Local Development Plan given its strategic nature. At the local level, the new design and access statements for larger developments will provide the most appropriate vehicle to test and improve the acceptability of proposals.
- **Flood Risk** - Following negotiation with SEPA further flood risk safeguards are appropriate. However, pre planning application determination flood risk assessments rather than pre local plan confirmation assessments are sufficient given the resource implications and relative certainty of development.
- **Waste Water** - Following negotiation with SEPA further “public sewer connection” developer requirements and “drainage to land” SDA objectives are appropriate. However, within SDA boundaries, where it is not feasible and/or economic to connect to a public sewer then private arrangements should not be ruled out as this would stymie development without proper justification of a proven pollution risk.
- **Built & Cultural Heritage** - Fuller / corrected built heritage references are appropriate.
- **Developer Contributions** - Theatres are semi-commercial operations that do not justify planning gain contributions particularly because there is no direct connection with the physical environment or the impact of a particular development proposal.
- **Commerce** - Theatres and other leisure use sites may be capable of redevelopment or relocation and therefore an absolute safeguard would not be appropriate. The policy offers adequate policy coverage on the retail hierarchy. National planning policies are being streamlined to be less prescriptive. The Council’s policy is in line with this trend. The scale and function of each centre is commensurate with the population served and the aims of minimising travel but maximising accessibility. In a rural area many settlements (in particular those that originated as dispersed crofting townships) do not have a defined core. A wider presumption in favour of small scale retail, leisure and other commercial uses is therefore appropriate. To ensure a consistency of application, all larger, listed centres should be mapped.

Other General

- **Protected Species Surveys** - Particular habitats and species interests, where known, are reflected within the developer requirements for those sites. It is recognised that better development management processes and training for planning officers are required in relation to this evolving issue. However, the Council believes these are matters of day to day practice not of local policy. A brief policy “hook” in the forthcoming Highland-wide Local Development Plan may be appropriate but not a specific policy in the WHILP.
- **Protection of Croft / Agricultural Land** - Many of the changes that affect crofting interests are supportive of the expressed views of local crofters. Many of the SDAs have been drawn widely enough to allow flexibility for the crofter and the planning application officer to look at siting development on the poorer part of any croft or indeed the common grazings. Regulatory definition and control of proper occupiers and continued Crofters Commission comment on planning applications should also provide a degree of protection. The Plan makes several policy references to the importance of croft land quality in planning decision making. It is therefore flagged as an important and material planning consideration. However, an absolute safeguard would not be appropriate or enforceable and would preclude diversification proposals that may sustain existing crofting activities.
- **Safeguarding of Land for Elderly Person Accommodation** - Many central allocations make reference to housing accommodation suitable for the elderly. The Council also has a policy to encourage at least 25% of affordable housing developments as being of accommodation suitable for the elderly. An embargo on other forms of housing development would be difficult to enforce without a change in current national legislation / guidance. The Council cannot at present dictate the tenure, price and type of housing on a particular site but can seek to achieve elderly provision by negotiation and by

- establishing a clear preference within the local plan developer requirement wording.
- **Trunk Road and Rail Capacity** - Transport Scotland's suggested additional developer requirements are so onerous that they would stymie the development potential of most sites. Local road network access is taken wherever possible but many settlements have little option but to take access from the trunk road network. Adequate trunk road access is already given as a developer requirement for many allocations and in the objectives of relevant SDAs. The recent Government's trunk road investment programme (STPR) publication clarifies that most routes will not get a Scottish Government funding commitment within the lifetime of the Plan so agreeing to such a dependency in the wording would effectively embargo development on many sites to the detriment of the area's prospects for sustainable economic growth.
 - **Adequacy of Allocated Employment Land** - Each major village has land allocated that could accommodate business proposals either via the mixed use allocations or more generally within the SDA. Fort William merits more specific textual safeguards for employment land. The Plan's Vision supports enhanced recreational sailing facilities and specific allocations are made for this purpose within Fort William sites MU2 and MU10 and elsewhere. Similarly the expansion options for Fort William provide more than adequate land for relocated facilities. The Scottish Government's decision not to include any significant improvement scheme for the A82 within the STPR makes a lobbying policy less relevant.
 - **Watercourses** - Retention of natural watercourses would achieve sensible environmental and maintenance benefits without imposing undue, additional development costs.
 - **Other Natural Heritage** - Following negotiation with SNH and the appropriate assessment / SEA processes, amended heritage references will offer better, clearer more consistent guidance.
 - **Environmental Report** - The Council accepts that the effects should be followed through to mitigation. Cumulative and residual effects have been mentioned but a more detailed analysis is outwith the scope of current resources. Further cross referencing is not appropriate to a streamlined plan format.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

Strategies & Visions

- **Renewables** - DELETE all remaining site-specific renewables references - e.g. para. 6.64. ADD factual update of THC's further work on this issue in para. 6.41
- **In-migration** - None.
- **Balance in Heritage References** - AMEND to add more balanced references in paragraphs 5.1, 5.11, 5.25, 5.27, 6.18, 6.8.8.

General Policies (WHILP specific only)

- **Biodiversity** - None.
- **Disabled Access** - None.
- **Flood Risk** - ADD "flood risk assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area" for sites adjacent to 1 in 200 year risk area. ADD as above plus "only water-related or harbour uses would be acceptable within flood risk areas" for sites that fall (partly) within the 1 in 200 year risk area. REDUCE site boundaries for non water related use allocations to exclude 1 in 200 year risk area unless flood prevention works are also proposed. AMEND Glencoe sites H1 and B2 to clarify developer requirement for "coastal/road protection works" not for flood prevention scheme.
- **Waste Water** - ADD "public sewer connection" developer requirements for all allocations where it is technically / economically feasible to connect and "drainage to land" SDA objectives where water bodies are likely to be affected. For allocations within SDAs where not feasible, ADD "public sewer connection or interim private arrangement that will be compatible with and make a future public connection/scheme more likely."

- **Built & Cultural Heritage** - ADD reference to setting of Fort in Fort William (para. 5.17); DELETE reference to restoration of Castle Tioram (para. 5.28), and AMEND reference to Kinloch Castle as a SAM (para. 5.28).
- **Developer Contributions** - AMEND policy to allow for reduction if exceptional / abnormal development costs can be demonstrated by open book accounting.
- **Commerce** - None.

Other General

- **Protected Species Surveys** - None.
- **Protection of Croft / Agricultural Land** - None.
- **Safeguarding of Land for Elderly Person Accommodation** - None.
- **Trunk Road and Rail Capacity** - None.
- **Adequacy of Allocated Employment Land** - None beyond Fort William specific changes.
- **Watercourses** - ADD developer requirement for “retention and enhancement of natural watercourses” for requested sites.
- **Other Natural Heritage** - Appendix 1: ADD better cross referencing to whatever Government guidance is relevant at post -Examination draft issue. Appendix 3: ADD list of where paper copies can be inspected and delete “key principles” section. ADD objective to “To protect the integrity of and secure exceptional siting and design within the NSA” to all relevant SDAs. ADD objective for all SDAs to reference any adjacent Natura sites. ADD/AMEND objective “to secure a collective, master planned, crofting community development of the township expansion area” for all settlements where a large area of common grazings has been enclosed within the SDA. ADD new sites including recent Natura sites and correct AGLV map heading. ADD sentence to developer requirements box “proposals will only be supported if developers can demonstrate no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjoining Natura site” to the allocations at Dunvegan pier (MU3), Kyle Harbour (MU4), Broadford airstrip (MU5) and Kyleakin quarry (I). ADD “drainage to land” objective for all SDAs draining to Natura water bodies where no public sewerage solution exists. AMEND SDAs to exclude SACs where potential for adverse impact e.g. Torrin. AMEND references to development "factors" to read "objectives" in General Policy 2. ADD reference to landscape character assessments in preamble to General Policy 3.
- **Environmental Report** - ADD additional developer requirements where SEA matrix has highlighted a mitigation need and ensure consistency between sites for same impacts requiring same mitigation. The policies scoring matrix will require to be updated to reflect the Examination outcome regarding the general policy content.

Issue (ref and heading):	GLEN HINNISDAL	77
Development plan reference:	Glen Hinnisdal Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 148 – Map SL88 MB 148	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
P. T. & B. T. Kinloch (469), G. Fish (743)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Residents object to density of development in upper glen because of the: upper glen having a different landscape character to the lower glen in that it has a distinct and open nature; loss of a special and unspoiled location; irreversible loss of rural character; existence of sufficient and available plots in the lower glen; recognition by a Council development management officer in a Committee document that the upper glen has a more dispersed settlement pattern ; potential loss of woodland which provides habitat for deer and birds; potential adverse impact on river salmon habitat; adverse impact on the Trotternish Site of Special Scientific Interest; loss of good croft land; loss of fields which are a habitat for rare orchids; lack of mains water and sewerage, and; pace and extent of recent development that is not shown on inset base map.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Removal of upper glen from SDA. Reintroduction of spacing criterion from Adopted Skye and Lochalsh Local Plan.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> It was recognised that further development of the upper glen will have access implications and therefore an additional developer objective was added. Croft land quality, privacy, overlooking and landscape impact are still important criteria for the particular siting of house plots within the SDA and the Plan's general policies reflect these concerns. The Council has rejected the re-application of prescriptive policies to control the number of houses per croft and spacing of houses because the previous policy was seen as arbitrary and difficult to enforce. The SDA encloses more undeveloped land in the lower Glen which recognises this relative potential. Upper Glen constraints are addressed in the Plan objectives and enclosure of land within the SDA does not carry an automatic presumption in favour of development. The related general policy (number 1) only supports development in keeping with the existing settlement pattern.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	GLENACHULISH General	17
Development plan reference:	Glenachulish General Text MB 10 – Map LO4 MB 11	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Ballachulish Community Council (43)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General Comment	
Summary of representation(s):		
Notes that there is the possibility of relocating the A82/A828 roundabout further west. Request that the furthest west that would be acceptable would be the western boundary of the area marked as MU1.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Specific mapping notation or text to show location of relocated roundabout (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE. <u>Reasons</u> - The Council accepts that the roundabout position should not be moved further west than the western boundary of MU1. A specific location would be too prescriptive given the uncertainty over site layouts.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	GLENACHULISH - MU1 (West of A828), MU2 (East of A828) & MU3 (South of A82)	18
Development plan reference:	Glenachulish MU1, MU2 & MU3 Text MB 10 – Map LO4 MB 11	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
G H Johnston on behalf of Laurence Young (510) Transport Scotland (859), J. McFatrige (797), P. McFatrige (798) L. Young (117)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Young - requests extension of MU3 to north - no reasons. • G H Johnston - on behalf of Laurence Young - objects to any interdependency requirement between the sites. Requests deletion of development embargo wording that requires sites to be presented in a joint way. Wants higher housing density on MU2 up to 35 from 25 units. • Transport Scotland - objection to safety of connection between local and trunk road network on MU2 due to visibility concerns at the junction with the A82(T). • J. McFatrige & P. McFatrige - objection against development because of: adverse impact on the landscape; adverse tourism impact of poorer landscape, and; adverse consequences of this scale of tourism development would have on other business in this sector. There is also a lack of services and amenities in Glenachulish and a lack of supporting infrastructure. Any infrastructure improvements may also have an adverse impact. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Young - extension of MU3 to north • G H Johnston (510) - request deletion of development embargo wording unless sites presented in joint way. Want higher housing density on MU2 up to 35 from 25. • J. McFatrige & P. McFatrige - deletion of sites (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATIONS. See further commended changes below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - Mixed use is essential to ensure a sustainable balance of employment and housing opportunities and the commercial tourism potential of the sites justified their inclusion as mixed use sites. Any increase in housing capacity is opposed therefore. The Plan's stated developer requirements will minimise any adverse landscape impact. The formal interdependency requirement can be removed but if and when planning application(s) are submitted the accompanying master plan will need to explain how the site / series of sites will be developed, describing and illustrating the proposed urban form in three dimensions. It will also need to explain how that form will achieve the intended vision for the place, describing how the proposal will be implemented, and setting out the costs, phasing and timing of development. This is required because of the scale of these allocations, need for high quality design, and their impact within the Ben Nevis and Glencoe National Scenic Area. It will also serve to help communicate and engage the community on the details proposed. There are no known visibility standard issues with the proposed</p>		

access points shown but further commended changes will highlight the need for adequate trunk road access. The existing allocations are adequate and extension to the north of MU3 would be inappropriate because of the site's prominence, the likely loss of woodland and the very close proximity to the trunk road.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

DELETE paragraphs above and below MU3 allocation table but reject increased density. ADD developer requirements for "adequate trunk road access arrangements" for all sites.

Issue (ref and heading):	GLENBORRODALE H - School / Adjoining land	39
Development plan reference:	Glenborrodale H Text MB 28 – Map LO14 MB 28	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
P. Dawson (57)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objection to any development because the water supply is not adequate, there is a privacy issue as the objector's property will be overlooked and the detrimental impact on the value of the objector's property.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of site (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The allocation is within the SDA and relates to an existing building and its curtilage. It is most likely to be developed as a conversion which is unlikely to have significant amenity and servicing impacts.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	GLENBORRODALE Settlement Development Area (SDA)	38
Development plan reference:	Glenborrodale SDA Text MB 28 – Map LO14 MB 28	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
A. Morrison (644)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Request for extension of SDA to east to support further single house developments. One area had previous planning permission and area removed from SSSI by SNH to allow access to pontoon. Another area is proposed as it contains a croft ruin. The village should continue east to Stron nam Brathan corner before Laga Bay to include all other existing houses in village.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Large eastern extension of SDA.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The SDA has already been extended to include land at the jetty and east of the school but any further extension may compromise the adjacent SAC. It is considered that any proposal extending into the SAC should be assessed when proposals are being developed in order to consider the impacts. Prior to details being submitted which establish details such as the access, the footprint of development, and drainage details it would be inappropriate for the Local Plan to establish the principle of development. These proposals are not of a scale that would require an allocation and so they can be assessed against the general policies of the Local Plan particularly against the wider countryside and the natural, built and cultural heritage policy.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	GLENCOE H3 - South of Filling Station	23
Development plan reference:	H3 South of Filling Station Text MB 14 – Map LO6 MB 15	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
G. and I. McTaggart (620)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objection to loss of actively worked croft land. The land is owned and worked by objectors' family.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Unclear.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The Council believes the H3 allocation is owned by H. MacColl but that the land between the hotel and H3 is crofted and possibly owned by Gwen and Ian McTaggart. Their reasons for objecting are unclear but an access to H3 may not need to cross their land or would not have a significant adverse impact on their crofting operations if it did. The Council has deleted any indicative access crossing their land to allow for negotiation of a mutually acceptable solution between the land interest parties.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	GLENCOE SDA	22
Development plan reference:	Glencoe Settlement Development Area Text MB 14 – Map LO6 MB 15	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
A. MacDonald (19)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>On this piece of land was a ruined Dorran house, which the trust demolished, and reapplied for planning permission for one house site. As the planning application was being processed it became obvious that this piece of land would easily accommodate two houses, and if ever the trust sold it as a one house site the owners could then cash in and sell a plot for a second house. There is development for four houses currently taking place some 50 yds away, which means the road will be upgraded to accommodate this development.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The Council believes the area of land the objector requests to be included is already included within the SDA and benefits from a planning consent. There is a planning consent for 2 houses west of site H4 within the current SDA boundary. Any further extension would not be appropriate given the potential adverse impact on woodland and due to inadequate road access.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	GLENELG / GALLTAIR AND GLEN BERNERA	98
Development plan reference:	Glenelg/Galltair and Glen Bernera – General & Settlement Development Area (SDA), MU1 (South Galltair), B (Bernera Barracks), H2 (Land South of Health Centre), H3 (Land South of Forestry Houses), MU2 (Land East of Health Centre) Text WS77 – 78 – Map LFM SL139	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General & SDA</u>: T. Macpherson (949), D. Whittaker (956), J. & B. Nicholas (959), D. Cannon (962), G. Sutherland (967), SNH (697), N. Campbell (913), G. B. Mitchell (915), J. Watt & M. Baines (969) • <u>MU1</u>: J. N. Adams (201) • <u>H2 & H3</u>: F. MacPherson (479), D. Patterson (655), M. & J. Macmillan (965) • <u>MU2</u>: R. K. Lane (892), Dr R. Rawnsley & Mr J. Hammersley (893) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General Comment, SDA, MU1, B, H2, H3 and MU2 Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General & SDA</u>: objections to development because: there is too much development potential contained within the SDA boundaries; the SDA will promote ribbon development along the road to the ferry point; of loss of semi-natural woodland, the steep contours makes much of the land un-developable or would promote cut and fill that would have a negative effect on the landscape; of adverse bird species impact; of loss of seaward views; of loss of tourism because of adverse visual impact; of loss of croft land and landscape; of flood risk; the land is better assessed against the Plan's housing in the countryside policies or a constraint policy; of the likelihood of poor designs because of past completions; of the loss of land of recreational value; other better, allocated alternative land exists; it would represent the coalescence of separate communities; Bernera is not a recognisable settlement; of the impact on the listed ferry house; of the historical significance of the drove road; it would support development that would be contrary to the existing settlement pattern; it would support development that would be contrary to national planning policy; it is misleading to developers; it is contrary to other Council safeguarding policies, and; it will only be developed for second homes. There is a specific objection to the corner plot within the SDA near the Barracks because of a concern about the loss of village avenue trees. • <u>MU1</u>: objection to development because of fluvial and pluvial flood risk and likely need for land raising plus pollution risk to river based fish and natural heritage. • <u>H2 & H3</u>: neighbour objections to development because of: loss of privacy; loss of private and secure parking; increased quantity, type and speed of traffic that will compromise child road safety; inadequate capacity of infrastructure networks; property depreciation; the inadequacy of the current access and private landownership interests that could inhibit widening; pluvial flood risk; poor ground conditions, and; the need to safeguard septic tanks / soakaways within the site. • <u>MU2</u>: neighbour objections to development because of: the remoteness of the area; the lack of demand; poor ground conditions; the proposed scale and density is excessive and will upset the social balance of the community; adverse visual impact; loss of privacy and amenity; loss of tourism; loss of private views, and; affordable housing could better be provided by buying up surplus existing properties. 		

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General & SDA</u>: deletion or considerable reduction of SDA (implied). • <u>MU1</u>: deletion of allocation (implied). • <u>H2 & H3</u>: deletion of allocations (implied). • <u>MU2</u>: deletion of site (implied).
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority
<p><u>Response(s)</u> -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General & SDA</u>: NO CHANGE. • <u>MU1</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION • <u>H2 & H3</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATIONS. • <u>MU2</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General & SDA</u>: The extension of the SDA towards the ferry point was made at the request of the local community council, which is keen to foster development along the road to the Kylerhea ferry to encourage tourists to take the ferry over the sea to Skye. The SDA encourages economic and tourism development as much as housing proposals and is designed to support tourism developments on the landward side of the ferry road to attract tourists along that route to a ferry service that is very marginal. It is accepted that very few sites are physically capable of development along this route even with cut and fill and this in itself will act as a brake on development and will prevent ribbon development. Glen Bernera is a secluded Highland glen with few constraints and well designed, break of slope sited development would not have an undue impact. The settlement's objectives already list the tree lined avenue as a development constraint for the corner plot. • <u>MU1</u>: A confirmed flood risk affects most of the site and no flood prevention scheme is programmed so the site has already been reduced. The Highland and Islands Fire Brigade may still require a permanent facility within the village and they have recorded a previous interest in this site. • <u>H2 & H3</u>: All three potential access routes to this allocated land are problematic. The cost of an improved access road will provide a significant but not insurmountable constraint. With appropriate siting and design there will not be impacts on the forestry houses in terms of privacy, overlooking, loss of parking, road safety, construction disruption, flood risk or other safeguards. A specific requirement to achieve net betterment in terms of surface water drainage has also been added. • <u>MU2</u>: There is a current combined agency proposal to achieve a mixed day care / affordable housing scheme on the site. The site lies close to the centre of the village where relatively higher density development is appropriate. Many existing properties don't meet the space and accessibility standards required for affordable housing. The ground conditions and other physical constraints are recognised and are being checked at present through a detailed feasibility assessment.
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General and SDA</u>: None. • <u>MU1</u>: None. • <u>H2 & H3</u>: None. • <u>MU2</u>: None.

Issue (ref and heading):	HARLOSH	80
Development plan reference:	Harlosh Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 171 – Map SL120 MB 171	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
R. & G. McCracken (155), K. & A. Smith (194)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>Neighbours object to inclusion of triangle of land within SDA on grounds of: adverse landscape impact; any development on the land would be contrary to the existing settlement pattern and breach physical boundaries such as the access track; loss of views that are essential to tourism businesses; the existence of sufficient alternative development land already available within the same croft boundary; the precedent for further inappropriately sited development; inadequate infrastructure networks (i.e. the unadopted nature of the track and substandard wider network, water, telephone, foul drainage, surface water and electricity); adverse impact on natural heritage in particular protected bird species; the proposal is not sustainable; potentially adverse impact on un-surveyed archaeological resource, and; potentially adverse impact on air quality.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Exclusion of triangle of land at Ardmore from the SDA.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> – The enclosed plot, if developed in the correct manner, would not have an undue impact on any public view or known heritage interest. The loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration. The impact on the adjacent tourism business is also unlikely to be significant. Any future development would also be subject to adequate servicing. This corner plot will not set an inappropriate precedent and will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	INCHREE - MU North of the River Righ and H South of River Righ	27
Development plan reference:	Inchree MU & H Text MB 20 – Map LO9 MB 20	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Objections to previously allocated housing sites:</u> M Mackie (263), I A and A M MacFadyen (422), A.Foster (525), J. Boustead (596), I A MacFadyen (607), Swinger (608), S. MacKintosh (691) • <u>Objections to MU North of River Righ:</u> Nether Lochaber Community Council (753) Haynes (210), S. Duff (296), S. & J. Morrow (554), M. MacNeil (613), S. Green (656), T. & E. Cameron (660), C. Fleming (966), L. Stewart (421), A MacDonald (299), A. and J. Gibb (524) • <u>Specific Objections to H South of River Righ:</u> L. & C. Macinnes (974) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Mixed Use and Housing Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General objections</u> to development because: the proposals are not financially feasible; it will upset the social balance of the community; of a lack of market demand; of insufficient capacity of local infrastructure; of unclear traffic priority; of the need for an unprogrammed upgrade of the A82; it will cause increased commuting on the 'dangerous' A82; of the lack of public transport; of adverse impact on access / right of way; of adverse impact on pedestrian safety; of loss of views and habitat; of adverse impact on rare species; the development will be contrary to the established settlement pattern; of the loss of a peaceful rural character; the proposals are of an excessive scale and density; of a loss of tourism due to other adverse impacts; of pluvial and fluvial flood risk; the proposals are contrary to other Plan objectives; of the lack of community facility capacity (e.g. no local school), and; of loss of daylight and privacy. Community really needs a playing field, hall and changing facilities. • <u>Specific objections to MU:</u> because of: a concern that the open space shown is too formal; the single track road through the village being unsuitable without substantial widening, and; concern that the widening of the village road would result in a loss of roadside trees and parking. Also concern over the adverse impact of light industrial units. • <u>Specific objections to H:</u> because of loss of natural woodland, rare orchids and sphagnum moss plus intrusion into the SAC heritage designation. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority object to scale and density rather than opposing principle of some development. • L. and C. MacInnes seek the deletion of the southern part of H South of River Righ allocation to west of existing houses. 		

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) – RETAIN ALLOCATIONS.

MU

Reasons - The Council has already reduced and re-phased the capacity of allocated land. Additional developer requirements have also been added to address local concerns in terms of master planning, phasing and community use. In terms of access, the Council's position is that a new trunk road access should be created to serve H and MU rather than increasing the traffic using the existing junction. The scale of the development proposed has been a feature in a lot of comments in combination with the effect this increase may have on existing infrastructure and the community itself. In addressing these issues it has to be recognised that the costs involved in creating a new trunk road access and to cross the River Righ are significant.

The Council has had to combine the need for phasing with a realistic approach to assessing the effectiveness of these sites for housing bearing in mind the significant upfront infrastructure costs. With this in mind, 55 houses have been allocated in Inchree to limit development within this Local Plan period. It is recognised that the developer will need some certainty but this needs to be phased for the longer term to control development to a suitable pace. Although the financial cost of a safer junction onto the A82 is not a justification for a larger scale of development within the village, a 16 house development would not lever the finance necessary to construct such a junction and connecting road.

In the absence of Scottish Government funding to resolve what is an existing deficiency then the choices are no development or a level of development that finances a solution to the village's access needs. The intended developer has advised the Council of their discussions with the Trunk Roads Authority over the new access. The outcome being the access position reflected in the Local Plan where the necessary sight lines and a right hand turning lane can be achieved. Some design work has also been undertaken to consider the road construction on the more sensitive sections of the road to ensure the hydrological integrity of adjacent ground and the flow of ground water to and from the SAC site. Additionally discussions with Scottish Water are beginning and where the developer can meet certain criteria Scottish Water intend to assist development by increasing capacity where feasible. One of the key criteria is allocation within the development plan.

The Council believes that such a significant established village should be allowed to grow in a planned way rather than allow development pressure to be dispersed in an ad-hoc manner to the surrounding countryside. There needs to be additional developer requirements to stipulate phasing within the Local Plan period, along with the safeguarding of land for community and business use within a mixed use allocation. These adjustments have been made to make explicit what will be expected of the developer.

The developer will also need to produce a masterplan to submit with planning application/s for the development of MU and H. The master plan will need to explain how a site or series of sites will be developed, describing and illustrating the proposed urban form in three dimensions. It will explain how that form will achieve the intended vision for the place, describing how the proposal will be implemented, and setting out the costs, phasing and timing of development. This has been added as a requirement because of the level of development allocated on MU and H and will also help communicate and engage the community on the details.

The mixed use nature of the allocation allows the prospect of local employment and therefore commuting may not necessarily increase. Many housing allocations are made in Fort William. It is most likely that business uses will be tourist related and would require to be compatible with adjacent uses. Further and more explicit developer requirements are suggested to pick up outstanding objectors' concerns.

H

Reasons - This site will also need to be part of the master planning exercise. This allocation was amended to take account of the impact on the SAC and to ensure that this is an acceptable impact on the oak woodland interest. Further and more explicit developer requirements are suggested to pick up outstanding objectors' concerns.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

MU - ADD developer requirements for "otter and other protected species survey", "net betterment of surface water drainage" and "upgrade of waste water treatment capacity".

H - ADD developer requirements for "otter and other protected species survey", "net betterment of surface water drainage" and "upgrade of waste water treatment capacity".

Issue (ref and heading):	INVERARISH	74
Development plan reference:	Inverarish – Foul Drainage, Settlement Development Area (SDA), H4 (Henderson Bridge) Text MB 138 – Map SL78 MB 139	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Foul Drainage</u>: SEPA (446) • <u>SDA</u>: A. & A. Gillies (293) • <u>H4</u>: M. Ferguson (401) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General, SDA, H4 allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Foul Drainage</u>: SEPA concerned about pollution risk to the water environment in particular the need ideally for public sewerage for all allocations. • <u>SDA</u>: Gillies' seek holiday accommodation development potential on land in their ownership because; the land is suitable ground for septic tank soakaways; the adopted road should not have to be improved by a developer but instead by the Council, particularly where the road already serves forestry operations and the cemetery; they dispute that the boundary of the designed landscape encloses the site, and; the lower fields more prominent in landscape terms than the land they are suggesting. • <u>H4</u>: Neighbour concerned about: the septic tank soakaway foul water impact on downhill properties including her own; existing surface water drainage problems being made worse by up-slope development; the risk to foundations from increased pluvial flooding, and; the need for a comprehensive sewerage solution. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Foul Drainage</u>: SEPA seek a stronger foul drainage developer requirement for sites H4 and H5 - specifically a requirement for a "public sewer connection or interim private arrangement that will be compatible with and make a future public connection/scheme more likely." • <u>SDA</u>: Gillies' seek positive allocation of land for development at the top of Borrodale Parks and removal of any developer requirements to improve road access and to respect the Raasay House designed landscape. • <u>H4</u>: deletion of H4 site or a requirement for adequate public sewerage (implied). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Foul Drainage</u>: ADD stronger foul drainage requirement for site's H4 and H5 as detailed in commended changes below • <u>SDA</u>: NO CHANGE. • <u>H4</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION but see foul drainage above. 		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Foul Drainage</u>: A stronger foul drainage safeguard is appropriate given the densities of existing and proposed developments and the need to lobby and encourage Scottish Water to provide for a longer term village-wide public sewerage solution. • <u>SDA</u>: The land to the north east of the hotel requires significant road improvements to open up its development potential. It is accepted that the land is framed by commercial 		

forestry and is less prejudicial to agricultural operations. However, the road has carriageway width, alignment, visibility and limited number of passing places constraints. Further development will worsen this existing deficiency and therefore the developer should contribute in proportion to that net detriment. The designed landscape boundary reference is factual and is a development factor.

- H4: Part of the site benefits from a planning application that was backed in principle by a minded to grant Committee decision. This sheep stock club proposal is intended to deliver a 10 serviced plot development for local need. The constraints raised by the objector are addressed by the developer requirements or will be matters to be addressed in connection with the planning application(s).

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- Foul Drainage: AMEND foul drainage DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS for H4 and H5 allocations to “public sewer connection or interim private arrangement that will be compatible with and make a future public connection/scheme more likely.”
- SDA: None
- H4: None except foul drainage change above.

Issue (ref and heading):	INVERGARRY	51
Development plan reference:	Invergarry – H2 (West of Mill), MU1 (Easter Mandally), MU2 (Opposite hydro station), B2 (Forestry Commission Depot) Waste Water & Flood Risk Text MB 56 – Map LO37 MB 57	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H2</u>: J. Prior (565) • <u>MU1 & MU2</u>: P. Mantell-Sayer on behalf of P. Williamson (688) • <u>B2</u>: Transport Scotland (859) • <u>Waste Water and Flood Risk</u>: SEPA (446) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Allocations H2, MU1, MU2, B2 and Waste Water & Flood Risk	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H2</u>: neighbour objection because the site boundary does not follow the ownership boundary, the density is excessive, there will be an adverse impact on the regenerating forest, there will be an adverse impact on the habitat for flora and fauna and a better (unclear) alternative site exists. • <u>MU1 & MU2</u>: landowner desire for higher density of housing development because this will: bring in new people which will assist with retention and enlivenment of local businesses; increase local employment; deliver affordable housing provision; retain the young population, and; be in accordance with the Plan's objectives. • <u>B2</u>: specific Transport Scotland objection to allocation because of lack of adequate footpath connection to village and contrary to national guidance. • <u>Waste Water and Flood Risk</u>: SEPA want public sewer connection requirement for allocations H1, B1 and MU1 because of potential pollution risk from private arrangements. If not feasible for MU1 then site should be deleted as unsustainable. That part of H1 that falls within the 1 in 200 year flood risk area should be excluded. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H2</u>: deletion of site (implied) • <u>MU1 & MU2</u>: higher densities of housing development than currently proposed (implied). • <u>B2</u>: Deletion of site or improved pedestrian connection to village centre (implied) • <u>Waste Water and Flood Risk</u>: public sewer connection requirement for allocations H1, B1 and MU1. Deletion of MU1 if public sewer connection not feasible. That part of H1 that falls within the 1 in 200 year flood risk area should be deleted. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H2</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. • <u>MU1 & MU2</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. • <u>B2</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. • <u>Waste Water and Flood Risk</u>: ADD public sewer connection requirement where feasible. Strengthen flood risk requirement for site H1. 		

Reasons:

- **H2:** There were previous (now lapsed) planning consents for 4 houses on the site. The site has already been reduced in capacity from 20 to 4 units and the boundary adjusted to the now lapsed planning consent boundaries. The location of the suggested alternative site is unclear but likely to be relatively distant from the village centre compared to allocated alternatives and is likely to lead to further ribboning of the village.
- **MU1 & MU2:** The sites are constrained in terms of: a lack of a feasible public sewer connection; woodland cover; flood risk, and; trunk road junction capacities. The proposed densities reflect these constraints and any increase would not be appropriate.
- **B2:** The site represents a brownfield opportunity with the support of the landowner (Forestry Commission). The existence of a footpath on the south side of A 87(T) and the business nature of the allocation mean that there are fewer concerns regarding pedestrian safety. The site's distance from the main settlement is a potential advantage for any bad neighbour use.
- **Waste Water and Flood Risk:** The additional developer requirement on H1 will ensure that no built development will be supported on land proven to be within the 1 in 200 year flood risk contour. SEPA's position on MU1 is unreasonable in applying an effective embargo on any development on a site that is close to community facilities and the centre of this dispersed village. The Council would accept a "Scottish-water-ready" private arrangement requirement but this is not offered as a commended change given the "in principle" objection from SEPA.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- **H2:** None.
- **MU1 & MU2:** None.
- **B2:** None.
- **Waste Water and Flood Risk:** for H1: ADD developer requirement for built development to avoid land within the 1 in 200 flood risk boundary.

Issue (ref and heading):	INVERINATE	59
Development plan reference:	Inverinate – Settlement Development Area (SDA), AH (Land Next to Kintail Parish Church) Text MB79 – Map SL11 MB 79	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: I. A. MacRae (489) • <u>AH</u>: C. Fraser (204), D. MacRae (250), J. Talbot (544), S. & L. Kennedy (661) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA and AH Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: objection to the principle of development east of the primary school because, this would be a departure from the Adopted Skye and Lochalsh Local Plan, of the previous planning history, poor trunk road junction and local access road capacity and the potential adverse impact on schoolchildren safety. Although the previous housing allocation on this land has been deleted the area concerned has been retained within the SDA which carries a presumption in favour of development. The Council believes that the objector is unlikely to accept this policy presumption and has therefore treated the confirmed objection as unresolved. • <u>AH</u>: objections to development because of: lack of jobs; no locals need houses or they can build them on their family crofts; no indigenous demand so houses will go to inappropriate incomers; adverse impact on church because of proximity; adverse protected habitats and species impact; fear of crime; coastal flood risk to site and road access; claimed 1980 no development assurance from Council; property depreciation; inadequate capacity of Glebe Road; loss of peaceful rural character; inadequate drainage; adverse visual impact; increased noise pollution; construction disruption; loss of road play area; loss of church parking; impediment to beach access, and; a claimed ransom that objectors can prevent necessary road widening. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: unclear - likely to want land removed from Settlement Development Area (SDA) (implied). • <u>AH</u>: Deletion of site and exclusion from SDA. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: NO CHANGE. • <u>AH</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. 		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA</u>: The land was allocated in a previous Plan draft but the confirmed ransom issue led to the withdrawal of affordable housing agency interest in the site. Other access and heritage constraints also caused the site's deletion. However, the land is still in a sustainable location with an attractive outlook and the constraints are not sufficient to justify exclusion of the land from the village boundary. • <u>AH</u>: The Glebe road has no confirmed condition or coastal flooding constraint. The allocation policies of the affordable housing agencies are constrained by housing law and it is not possible to favour certain groups unless that priority relates to housing 		

need. A significant reduction in the site boundary to concentrate development on the frontage has already been made and will address heritage and neighbour concerns. Construction disturbance can be minimised by appropriate planning consent conditions. Loss of private views is not a material planning consideration. There will not be any loss of formal church parking or beach access. Not every local person has access to family croftland for their affordable housing needs and not all crofts have sufficient suitable sites in planning terms. With declining household sizes the same number of people will require more houses. The vast majority of the local housing association's units are let or sold to those with a local connection.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- SDA: None.
- AH: None.

Issue (ref and heading):	KENTALLEN Settlement Development Area (SDA)	44
Development plan reference:	Kentallen SDA Text MB 39 – Map LO27 MB 39	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
K. R. Banyard (459), P. McFatrige (798)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K. R. Banyard - objection to SDA not including area of extant planning consent and area of land on seaward side of A828. • P. McFatrige - suggests extension to SDA to include the old railway pier and a small strip of ground adjacent to the shore as a suitable rounding off of the settlement pattern. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K. R. Banyard - extension of the SDA to include land on the seaward side of the A828. • P. McFatrige - extension of the SDA to include the pier and land to the west along the shore. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - The Council has already extended the SDA to reflect an extant consent. The suggested changes are beyond the natural boundaries and constraints of the settlement. They may be acceptable under the Plan's housing in the countryside policies but are not sufficiently unconstrained as to merit positive identification within the development plan. There may be difficulty in achieving a suitable access here without compromising the cycle path linking Fort William with Oban. The extension to the west of the chalets lies within a geological SSSI so a presumption in favour is not considered appropriate. The proposed area at the pier lies within the indicative 1 in 200 year flood risk maps produced by SEPA, a flood risk assessment would also be required to support proposals. Only water related or harbour uses would be acceptable within the flood risk areas so inclusion within the SDA could be considered misleading. Development on land by the chalets may also have an adverse impact on woodland, amenity and public views.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	KILBEG	66
Development plan reference:	Kilbeg - Suggested Housing Allocation Text MB100 – Map SL37 MB 101	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Suggested Housing Allocation: Church of Scotland Strath & Sleat Glebe (98)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Suggested Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>Seek new housing allocation because: neighbouring land has already been designated for building purposes; a number of buildings have been erected on the land adjoining i.e. a house used as a Manse, a primary school, a health centre and a further education college; the land at present has virtually no agricultural value being used only for rough grazing and is therefore not significant within the current tenant's farm enterprise; the visual amenity of the open space need not be destroyed and could even be enhanced with a carefully planned residential development; the conservation value of the site is very limited and has been even further reduced by the removal of the roadside trees during the road improvement programme; the need for housing in Sleat, and; the land's proximity to the school and health centre.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Housing allocation on Glebe land between Kilbeg and Kilmore.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> – Although the land is central to many local facilities and there are other seaward side of the road development precedents, the suggested extension / allocation would erode the distinction and physical separation between Kilmore and Kilbeg and may lead to householder pressure to clear adjacent native woodland. Adequate and better alternative housing land has been allocated.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	KILCHOAN - Settlement Development Area (SDA)	35
Development plan reference:	Kilchoan SDA Text MB 24 – Map LO12 MB 25	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Lochaber Housing Association (105), I. Carmichael (788), West Ardnamurchan Community Council (378)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA & Suggested Business Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I. Carmichael - request for SDA extension because: the extension is minor; development on the land enclosed would be in keeping with the established settlement pattern; it is needed for working of the croft, and; it is the only option on the croft. • Lochaber Housing Association - requests SDA extension because they have land banked a site for 2 units adjacent to “Queen’s Cottage” which had a previous consent. It intends to develop this site when the demand increases for social housing in the area. • West Ardnamurchan Community Council - wants extension of the SDA at Glebehill because: there will be no SSSI impact, it is central, has good road access and is in several ownerships. Also want business allocation opposite church for shop and petrol pumps because it’s central. Believe SDA should be much more widely drawn to not prejudice any particular proposal on any particular croft. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Various extensions to the SDA and business allocation opposite church.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE other than factual correction detailed above.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I. Carmichael - this objection has been maintained because although his submission was supported at Committee the mapping change was not carried through. It is considered that this area should be included within the SDA. The precise proposed change to the SDA has been confirmed. • Lochaber Housing Association - the site already lies within the SDA and therefore carries a presumption in favour of development unless the site-specifics indicate otherwise. • West Ardnamurchan Community Council - the proposals may have merit but are not specific enough to justify a current change. The Council believes that these small scale proposals are best pursued and tested via the development management process and considered on their merits against the general policies of the plan. A widely drawn SDA would carry too positive a policy presumption that could compromise the established settlement pattern, good croft land, and heritage interests. In the centre of the village the SDA does not join up because of the functional flood plain. 		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

There is a very minor factual correction to be made to the SDA at the south west end of the settlement. The SDA boundary bisects an existing property and the owner wishes it to be included within the SDA. The Council have agreed to make this change albeit at the scale of the map the change will be imperceptible.

Issue (ref and heading):	KINLOCHLEVEN - H2 Foyers Road	24
Development plan reference:	Kinlochleven H2 Text MB 16 – Map LO7 MB 17	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Ms S. Scott (163)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objects to: loss of daylight, loss of views and privacy; inadequate car parking for local people, and; traffic safety issues due to loss of parking.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of site (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.		
<u>Reasons</u> - Amendments have already been made to safeguard and rationalise parking and to half the site's capacity from 10 to 5 units. The site boundary has not been reduced as this may prejudice layout options.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	KINLOCHLEVEN H3 - Wades Road	25
Development plan reference:	Kinlochleven H2 Text MB 16 – Map LO7 MB 17	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
M. MacSween (271), J. & E. MacLean (657), Mr A. Blair (658)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objections because of: high water table; adverse impact on habitat for wildlife; existing surface water drainage problems; loss of pathway and privacy; the site's proximity to the sub station, and; the lack of local employment.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of site (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The site's developer requirements have already been amended to recognise objectors' concerns by requiring open space provision and to safeguard/enhance pedestrian connections.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	KYLE OF LOCHALSH	53
Development plan reference:	Kyle of Lochalsh – Commerce boundary, H2 (Phone Exchange), H6 (Langlands Terrace (West)), MU1 (Old Co-op), MU4 (Harbour) Text MB 66 – Map SL1 MB 67	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Commerce boundary</u>: G. L. Hearn on behalf of Co-op (515) • <u>H2</u>: M. MacRae (345) • <u>H6</u>: C. Clark (583) • <u>MU1</u>: T. J. Cairns (29) • <u>MU4</u>: SNH (697) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Commerce Boundary, H2, H6 and MU1 Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Commerce boundary</u>: Co-op objection to boundary being drawn too widely. Believes it should just be the mixed use core of the village and the current boundary makes it very difficult to apply the sequential test. Points out the policy contradiction with other allocations within the village boundary carrying a different policy on the same site. • <u>H2</u>: neighbour objection to development because of: the blind visibility at the potential access; traffic lights being inappropriate on a hill; the site being better suited to a new hall and/or parking for the existing hall; it being better suited for employment use since there are no jobs for new householders; concern regarding higher flats leading to overlooking / loss of privacy from south east portion of site. • <u>H6</u>: neighbour objection to development because of: rocky ground conditions; the need for blasting and therefore potential damage to property and foundations; the loss of daylight; loss of private view; loss of privacy, and; property depreciation. • <u>MU1</u>: neighbour objection because of depreciation in value of adjacent property if rented housing is pursued and adverse impact on already problematic Old Plock Road parking. • <u>MU4</u>: - SNH request that for sites where particular development proposals could have a significant adverse impact on Natura sites, that such developments be precluded by the terms of the policy. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Commerce boundary</u>: suggestion for much tighter boundary limited to commercial core of settlement adjoining A87 and Main Street. • <u>H2</u>: non housing uses on north and west part of site and low rise houses on balance. • <u>H6</u>: deletion of site (implied). • <u>MU1</u>: deletion of site or low cost sale units and no increase in parking on Old Plock Road. • <u>MU4</u>: - Stronger reference to and safeguard for SAC. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Commerce boundary</u>: NO CHANGE. • <u>H2</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. • <u>H6</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. • <u>MU1</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATION. 		

- **MU4:** RETAIN ALLOCATION but see commended change re. Natura interest below.

Reasons:

- **Commerce boundary:** The central area of Kyle has so few developable areas that a wider boundary is appropriate. A tight boundary would not be appropriate to Kyle of Lochalsh because of its central parking problems, its lack of feasible central development sites and because peripheral sites may be just as accessible for many existing and new residents. The potential policy confusion is recognised but the boundary is related to a general policy which will be interpreted as subservient to a specific allocation.
- **H2:** There is a 6 flat, outline planning application pending on site H2. The access constraints and overlooking safeguard are now referenced within the site's requirements. If the BT building becomes available then a shared car parking and access improvement with the village hall may be possible. The Plan allocates sufficient employment land to balance for the housing sites it zones.
- **H6:** An additional overlooking / privacy and daylighting safeguard has now been added. Loss of private views is not a material planning consideration. The set-back requirement will also address issues of potential construction.
- **MU1:** The property depreciation claim is not a material planning consideration and access, parking and turning constraint on Old Plock Road is now recognised and referenced.
- **MU4:** A further safeguard is appropriate as a result of appropriate assessment. It is not known whether the commended change will satisfy SNH's objection.

Any Further Plan Changes Committed by THC

- **Commerce boundary:** None.
- **H2:** None.
- **H6:** None.
- **MU1:** None.
- **MU4:** ADD sentence to developer requirements box "proposals will only be supported if developers can demonstrate no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjoining Natura site"

Issue (ref and heading):	KYLEAKIN	70
Development plan reference:	H1 (Old Kyle Farm Road), H2 (Former Dairy), AH (East of Playing Field), B1 (N of Primary School), MU (Former Youth Hostel), LT (South of Playing Field), I (Altanavaig Quarry) Text MB 108 – Map SL44 MB 109	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
C. Clouston (AH, H2, B1, LT) (82) L. R. Graham (H1, I) (522) D. Mellor (H1) (133) Kyleakin & Kylerhea Community Council (MU) (231) Kyleakin & Kylerhea Community Company (MU) (365) SNH (I) (697) I. Sikorski (MU) (881) P. Lyons & S. Newband (MU) (888) J. Mackinnon (H1) (895) S. Dew (AH, H2) (896) H. M. Grant (AH, H2) (906)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Site Allocations.	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>H1: Owner of part of site seeks extension on the grounds that: adequate trunk road access is possible; the land is required for a family housing need; part of the area benefits from a previous albeit lapsed planning consent; the land is adjacent to that zoned for development or developed; he has already funded a tidy up of the site, and development will cross-subsidise redevelopment and environmental improvement of the former filling station land. Neighbours oppose further development because: recent developments on the same site have encountered severe ground conditions problems; further development will encounter the same problems and will magnify flooding issues, and; previous developers have a poor track record in dealing with surface water drainage problems.</p> <p>H2: The landowner believes this would better be earmarked for private housing because this would yield a higher value. A neighbour is concerned about the potential close proximity of the site's access road to their property.</p> <p>AH: The landowner believes this would better be earmarked for private housing because this would yield a higher value. A neighbour is concerned about the potential close proximity of the site's access road to their property.</p> <p>B1: The landowner asserts that the site is unsuitable for business development and would be better used for affordable housing.</p> <p>MU: Parties believe the former youth hostel should only be used for community or business purposes because: of the loss of tourist trade on which the village depends; the loss of facilities in terms of internet access, showers and laundry which are very attractive to tourist yachts; the recent loss of shops and public toilets; the loss of previous business allocations to housing uses; the commercial attractiveness of the site's centrality, passing trade, adjacent car parking and attractive outlook; of the long standing commercial use of building; the loss of a visitor destination facility in a bypassed village; the long term public sector cost of a declining village; other allocated business sites are not in commercially attractive locations or suffer from planning problems, and; other better alternatives are already allocated for affordable housing.</p> <p>LT: The landowner believes that this should be available for housing because: part of it is bare land croft which carries an automatic presumption in favour of development; she has</p>		

retained legal right of access to the land, and; she has already given up land to the community for the football pitch.

I: Owner of part of site bemoans lack of consultation with him and other owners regarding the future of the site. He also disputes the restriction on commercial uses on this site because of the need for economic development at the bridgehead as well as within the village. SNH request that for sites where particular development proposals could have a significant adverse impact on Natura sites, that such developments be precluded by the terms of the policy.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- C. Clouston - requests the following land use changes - AH to H; B1 to AH; LT and land to south to H.
- L. R. Graham - extend H1 to west, no restriction on uses at quarry site I.
- D. Mellor - delete undeveloped part of H1 (implied).
- Kyleakin & Kylerhea Community Council - MU - amend acceptable uses to just business and community.
- Kyleakin & Kylerhea Community Company - MU - amend acceptable uses to just business.
- SNH - I - Stronger reference to and safeguard for SAC.
- Sikorski - MU - amend acceptable uses to business / tourism only.
- P. Lyons & S. Newband - MU - amend acceptable uses to commercial only.
- J. Mackinnon - delete undeveloped part of H1 or guarantee net betterment of surface water drainage (implied).
- S. Dew - a firmer indication of access point to AH and H2.
- H. M. Grant - an access defined away from the eastern boundary of sites AH and H2.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) -

H1: RETAIN ALLOCATION.

H2: RETAIN ALLOCATION.

AH: RETAIN ALLOCATION.

B1: RETAIN ALLOCATION.

MU: RETAIN ALLOCATION but see commended change below to reflect recent planning consent.

LT: RETAIN DESIGNATION.

I: RETAIN ALLOCATION but add stronger appropriate assessment dependency wording.

Reasons:

H1: The Council has increased the capacity of road related drainage infrastructure but a permanent and comprehensive solution would lie with intercepting the hill flow west of the site. A net betterment requirement for on and off site surface water drainage already exists. The landowner has other options within the allocated site which has already been enlarged. Any further enlargement would create ribbon development and increase proximity issues with the quarry.

H2 & AH: A higher proportion of private housing may be appropriate on the initial site to open-up land to the south. This decision on the access alignment will depend upon the layout proposed at planning application stage but a prescriptive set-back from any particular property would not be appropriate.

B1: It is important that the Plan safeguards sufficient business land and therefore potential employment in balance to housing allocations. The site is most appropriate for a small storage building given site size, shape and access constraints.

MU: The site is on the market and a mixed use development would be appropriate to its village centre location. A mixed use consent now exists for part of the site for 11 flats and

ground floor community space.

LT: The suggested extension may be suitable within the next Plan period but the present housing and mixed use allocations should be sufficient to meet local need and demand to 2014/5. The land also suffers from its good agricultural quality and its proximity to heritage interests, a playing field and a flood risk area.

I: A further safeguard is appropriate as a result of appropriate assessment. There is a pending application on site I to review the old mineral permission at Altanavaig quarry.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

H1: None.

H2/AH: None.

B1: None

MU: AMEND to reflect planning application decision. This was made on 3 March 2009, to grant consent for 11 flats and a community space on the ground floor.

LT: None

I: ADD sentence to developer requirements box "proposals will only be supported if developers can demonstrate no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjoining Natura site"

Issue (ref and heading):	KYLERHEA	69
Development plan reference:	Kylarhea Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 107 – Map SL43 MB 107	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
A. & S. Scott (247), J. Bannister (752), SNH (697)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objections on grounds of: the objective wording being too vague to be enforceable; loss of traditional settlement pattern and better croft land if the central area is developed; irreversible loss of good in bye land; there is sufficient alternative potential within the rest of the SDA, and; potential adverse natural heritage impact.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Exclusion of central area from SDA. Greater natural heritage safeguards.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE to boundary. See below re. commended augmentation of heritage objectives.		
<u>Reasons:</u> Planning consent for 1 house has recently been granted on appeal on the central in bye land. This recent appeal decision has set a powerful precedent regarding the future of this land. The Reporter concluded that the central area of the SDA was acceptable for development in terms of settlement pattern and road capacity, and did not record any concern in terms of croft land quality. The Council resolved to follow the Reporter's lead given the even balance of planning merits for and against development in the central area. Further heritage safeguards are commended and appropriate to known interests but it is not clear whether these are acceptable to SNH.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
ADD objectives "to secure a developer funded otter survey where appropriate" and "to avoid significant cut and fill in the visually prominent parts of the settlement"		

Issue (ref and heading):	LOCHALINE - B2 North East of War Memorial	34
Development plan reference:	Lochaline B2 Text MB 22 – Map LO11 MB 23	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
D. Brevis (907)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Business Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objection to development on the basis of the loss of public open space and woodland, the steepness of the site makes the land un-developable and the loss of public views.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of site (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> - RETAIN ALLOCATION. See commended augmentation of developer requirements below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - Most of the footpath has been excluded from the allocation so that it is safeguarded. Only part of the site is steeply sloping and it will be for an application to determine exact layout. Further augmentation of developer requirements will address outstanding and relevant concerns.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Committed by THC		
ADD developer requirements to “retain footway link to lower road”, “maximise retention of woodland” and “safeguard public views over Sound of Mull”.		

Issue (ref and heading):	LOCHALINE H3 - East of Dunaline	33
Development plan reference:	Lochaline H3 Text MB 22 – Map LO11 MB 23	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
T. Roff (432)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objections relating to the development management process:- concern that drilling may damage foundations of other properties; belief that new development should be single storey; that privacy concerns and therefore windows be carefully considered; that a fence be constructed along the boundary, and; that where possible, mature trees be retained and care is taken not to damage tree roots from objector's property.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Guaranteed control of detail of development. Will withdraw objection if guarantees offered.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The Plan reflects the planning consents granted and no further guarantees are appropriate. A condition on the planning consents issued specifies that houses not exceed 1.5 storeys.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	LOCHALINE - General	32
Development plan reference:	Lochaline General Text MB 22 – Map LO11 MB 23	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
W. Lamont (214)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Suggested Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Suggests housing site at property Lochview for 3 or 4 double units with elderly people in mind using land behind as necessary. The proximity to the shop and Post Office with level walking to some would make the site ideal for elderly accommodation. The ground behind property is owned by the Ardtornish Estate and they are willing to see some of their land used for this purpose. Suggestion that building could be demolished to achieve a suitable access to land.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
New housing allocation.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> - It is not necessary to allocate land of this scale when the Settlement Development Area (SDA) policy is generally supportive. Also there is a lack of certainty over the site and proposal and there may be difficulties in taking forward proposals in terms of access - due to proximity with the junction and the filling station. This matter can be dealt with through the development management process rather than through the local plan. No further details have been submitted to support the land's allocation. If access issues can be overcome then the potential of the garden ground still appears to be limited given the need to maintain the amenity of adjacent housing.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	MALIGAR	78
Development plan reference:	Maligar Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 158 – Map SL104 MB 158	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
R. A. MacDonald (Grazings Clerk) (611)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Grazings Clerk requests a wider SDA to allow development on poorer croft land, close to services and where there is evidence of previous settlement.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extensions to SDA.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – EXTEND SDA as detailed in commended change below.		
<u>Reasons</u> – The suggested extensions are minor, will allow development on poorer croft land and will not have an undue impact on any known heritage or other constraint.		
Any Further Plan Changes Committed by THC		
EXTEND SDA as requested on map supplied by objector.		

Issue (ref and heading):	MALLAIG	45
Development plan reference:	Mallaig – H3 (Fank Brae), B1 (Glasnacardoch), New Allocations Text MB 42 – Map LO29 MB 43	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H3</u>: Strutt & Parker on behalf of Nevis Estate (584), W.C. & D. Longmuir (97), J. & H. MacPherson (574) • <u>B1</u>: Strutt & Parker on behalf of Nevis Estate (584) • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Lochaber Housing Association (105), HIE (495) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	H3, B1, New Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H3</u>: Objection to allocation because: part of site is good croft land; part of site is undeliverable due to site conditions; it should be extended further west; neighbours do not want to be surrounded on all sides; of loss of private views; overlooking concerns; the proposals are too vague; there are burns and streams running through the site rendering it un-developable; of overshadowing concerns; of inadequate access and traffic arrangements; significant groundworks are needed; relocation of powerlines is needed; of pedestrian safety concerns; of loss of amenity; of loss of woodland and habitat; of adverse impact on wildlife, and; inadequate waste water treatment facilities. • <u>B1</u>: Objection to allocation because of loss of good croft land and suggest better alternative site to the west. • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Request for affordable housing allocation of land at croft St Elmo for 1 house. Suggestion for a regeneration policy to encourage employment sites within Mallaig and in particular a water based tourism proposal at East Bay. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>H3</u>: Majority request deletion of site. One landowner suggestion for extension to west. • <u>B1</u>: Strutt & Parker on behalf of Nevis Estate - delete B1 and exchange it with site to the west. • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Lochaber Housing Association (allocate land for 1 house at croft St Elmo), HIE (add enabling policy regarding East Bay regeneration). 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> -		
<u>H3</u> : RETAIN ALLOCATION.		
<u>Reasons</u> :		
<p>The northern part of the site is undeliverable according to the owners who do not wish it to be developed and has been deleted. A requirement for exceptional siting and design quality has been added in order to ensure that any new development will not overlook or overshadow nearby properties. The developer requirements cater for most of the other grounds of objection. Access, traffic and pedestrian safety issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage. The loss of private views is not a valid material consideration. In addition there are no public seaward views affected. The land west of the road is steep and might impinge on public views over open water. The principle of appropriate development on the west side is supported within the Settlement Development Area (SDA). The relevant crofting</p>		

interests have not opposed the allocation.

B1: RETAIN ALLOCATION.

Reasons:

The relevant crofting interests have not opposed the allocation and the land is not actively worked. The land on the west of A830(T) was part of a site option in the earlier Lochaber Futures draft but was opposed by the crofting tenant. The SDA supports the principle of infill development and redevelopment of this brownfield site in case the relevant crofting interest wishing to release the land.

Suggested New Allocations: NO CHANGE.

Reasons:

The St Elmo site lies within the SDA and therefore carries a presumption in favour of development unless the site-specifics indicate otherwise. An appropriate development would be supported by the existing policy. The settlement's objectives have already been amended to reflect the potential for East Bay regeneration. A more positive allocation would not be appropriate given the landscape sensitivity of the location and the current lack of a definitive proposal and funding.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- **H3**: None.
- **B1**: None.
- **Suggested New Allocations**: None.

Issue (ref and heading):	MINGARRY Settlement Development Area (SDA)	43
Development plan reference:	Mingarry SDA Text MB 36 – Map LO24 MB 36	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Bidwells on behalf of Loch Shiel Estate (735)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objection to SDA as encouraging an inappropriate settlement pattern which will be detrimental to the crofting landscape character of the area. Believes the current boundary is likely to promote closer spaced linear development adjacent to the road. Also objects because part of the site is situated on the Deeke Common Grazings and it should not be taken out of crofting tenure.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Unclear. Representation refers to a map that was subsequently withdrawn.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The boundary has been drawn to allow further development potential of a pattern that could be compatible to that existing. For example it will allow a degree of separation that is traditional in crofting settlements and will allow particular site selection to avoid the best croft land. The existing pattern is largely one of roadside development and shared access arrangements are preferable from a road safety point of view.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	MORAR	46
Development plan reference:	Morar – General Comments, H1 (North of Achnaluin), H2 (Beoraid (South)), MU (East of cemetery/Loch Morar), C2 (Cemetery), Text MB44 – Map LO30 MB 45	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General Comment</u>: Morar Community Council (CC)(468) • <u>H1</u>: Transport Scotland (859) • <u>H2</u>: SEPA (446), Strutt & Parker on behalf of Nevis Estate) (584), Strutt & Parker on behalf of Loch Morar Association (592), A. & M. Maclean (462), Morar CC (468) • <u>MU</u>: Strutt & Parker on behalf of Nevis Estate (584), Strutt & Parker on behalf of Loch Morar Association (592) • <u>C2</u>: A. & M. Maclean (462), Morar CC (468) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General Comments, H1, H2, MU, C2 Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General Comment</u>: Community Council believe that insufficient land for housing with realistic potential for development has been identified to reverse the current decline in population and economy. Also foul drainage improvements should be progressed. • <u>H1</u>: Objection because deliverability of access from the local road network should be proved before the adoption of the plan. • <u>H2</u>: Objections because: of adverse impact on views over open water; only low density would be acceptable; of adverse impact on landscape, and; there is no acceptable private foul drainage solution. Landowner wants extension to H2 because: the land is available; there is an absence of alternatives; development will promote growth in the village; part of the site was allocated for housing before, and; development will help reverse the trend of declining and ageing population and improve the local economy. • <u>MU</u>: Objections because of the adverse impact of development on views over open water and suggest that there is a better; alternative site. • <u>C2</u>: Objections because of inadequate consultation on burial ground extension and that the landowner is unwilling to release land for the cemetery expansion. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General Comment</u>: lobbying policy to achieve better wastewater investment and more effective housing allocations (implied). • <u>H1</u>: Transport Scotland want deletion of site or local road network access • <u>H2</u>: SEPA want public sewer connection requirement; landowner wants extension of site. Part deletion of site. • <u>MU</u>: Delete site or change use. • <u>C2</u>: Delete site. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s) & Reasons:</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General Comment</u>: NO CHANGE. The Plan already allocates sufficient land for the size of the community, environmental constraints and in relation to infrastructure capacities. There is already an objective to lobby for enhanced public sewerage provision. The 		

Council continues to work with SEPA and Scottish Water to progress schemes across Highland.

- **H1: RETAIN ALLOCATION.** There is an outline planning permission granted for one house on the southern half of site H1 which is proposed to have access from the trunk road whilst the northern half is covered by an agricultural notification for a shed and a full planning permission for one house accessed via the local road network (junction west of the hotel). The Plan content has already been amended to make clear there is no preference for trunk road access. That said, access from the local road network will be very problematic given the recent pattern of consents and development.
- **H2: RETAIN ALLOCATION.** Site H2 already has 4 planning permissions. There is a fifth planning permission for the land East of the northern preferred access. See commended change below re. public sewerage. The site already has 2 planning consents for the north and the east side. There is an adequate supply of housing land already allocated and there is no demand argument to justify the size of the proposed extension. A requirement for careful siting and high quality design will ensure that any intrusion on important public views will be minimised. The objectives promote a comprehensive approach to wastewater treatment issues in Morar. The Plan allocates for a sustainable mix of uses within the community and also, wherever possible to avoid the allocation of good, actively worked croft land.
- **MU: RETAIN ALLOCATION.** A requirement for exceptional siting and design quality will ensure that the development is integrated within the existing landscape while a flood risk assessment will also be required to address that issue. The relevant crofting interests have not opposed the allocation. Furthermore, the acceptable uses of the site provide for open ground proposals which would not have a detrimental effect on views over Loch Morar.
- **C2:** The Beoraid cemetery will require expansion within the Plan period given current and projected demand for lairs and therefore it is appropriate to allocate for that need. The allocation of land for the expansion of cemeteries does not merit any more consultation than that for any other allocation.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- **General Comment:** None
- **H1:** None.
- **H2:** ADD developer requirement for “public sewer connection”.
- **MU:** None
- **C2:** None.

Issue (ref and heading):	NORTH BALLACHULISH - B Adjoining the Business Park	21
Development plan reference:	North Ballachulish B Text MB 12 – Map LO5 MB 13	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
H. Cameron (364), L. Hannaford (448), C. Hannaford (659)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Business Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objections because of: noise pollution; adverse scheduled monument impact; property depreciation, and; inadequacy of the existing access.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of site (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - RETAIN ALLOCATION. <u>Reasons</u> - the material concerns of nearby residents have already been addressed by adding requirements for a 10m set-back from scheduled Moss and restricting uses to those compatible with residential properties adjacent. It is sustainable in travel terms to identify land that can be used for local employment and fits with HIE's aspirations on this issue.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	NORTH BALLACHULISH - H1 Between North Ballachulish and Oldtown & H2 North of Loch Leven Hotel	20
Development plan reference:	North Ballachulish H1 & H2 Text MB 12 – Map LO5 MB 13	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<p><u>H1</u> - L. Stewart (421), P. and K. MacIntyre (431), L. Hannaford (448), W. MacPhee (645), Nether Lochaber Community Council (753)</p> <p><u>H2</u> - A. Beech (198)</p>		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p><u>H1</u> - Objections to development because of: excessive scale; lack of fit with settlement character; lack of identification of land for community playing field which adopted Lochaber Local Plan supported; loss of croft land; potential adverse impact on trees bordering site; loss of important habitat; lack of suitable waste water treatment facilities, and; potential adverse archaeological impact.</p> <p><u>H2</u> - Request for better clarification of northern boundary, and need for strict archaeological supervision.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<p><u>H1</u> - deletion or reduction of site (implied).</p> <p><u>H2</u> - clarification of boundary and better archaeological requirement</p>		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN BOTH ALLOCATIONS. See further commended change for H1 below.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> -</p> <p><u>H1</u> - Developer requirements have been added to address objectors' material concerns. The scale of the development proposed has been reduced and an open space requirement has been added. Further developer requirements concerning the access arrangements, woodland retention/enhancement and the phasing of development have also been re-affirmed. These have been added to make explicit what will be expected of the developer. The developer will also need to produce a masterplan to explain how the site will be developed. This has been added as a requirement because of the level of development allocated and various issues such as woodland retention/enhancement, access arrangements and phasing which will need to be addressed. However it will also help communicate and engage the community on the details proposed. The requirement for a watching brief will be considered at the planning application stage. The density is appropriate to a village location. The Crofters Commission have not maintained their objection to this site. Enhanced sewage treatment capacity is proposed for the area albeit there is disagreement about the location of the plant. The potential for adverse protected species impact necessitates an additional developer requirement.</p> <p><u>H2</u> - The boundary and wording accords with the recent planning consent and the Council sees no reason for further amendment.</p>		

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

H1 - ADD developer requirement for "protected species survey".

H2 - None.

Issue (ref and heading):	NORTH BALLACHULISH - Settlement Development Area (SDA)	19
Development plan reference:	North Ballachulish SDA Text MB 12 – Map LO5 MB 13	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Mr A Dykes (377), HIE (495)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr A Dykes - wants whole of croft at 9/10 Oldtown to be included within SDA because this would allow affordable family plots and lack of alternatives for family members. HIE - consider there to be potential for two further small sites to be developed within the existing North Ballachulish Industrial Estate. One of these has been excluded from the SDA having been previously included and should be reinstated. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr A Dykes - extension of SDA to include whole of croft 9/10 in Oldtown. HIE - extension of business allocation (area unclear) 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> -		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr A Dykes - the proposed extension at Oldtown crofts would have an adverse impact on local landscape character because it is not in keeping with the established crofting settlement pattern and will set a precedent that will increase pressure for similar incursions into the central inbye land which would be detrimental to retention of locally important agricultural land. Moreover, no suitable existing access exists. The HIE proposal, if it relates to the existing industrial estate, would be likely to impact upon the scheduled Moss area and should therefore not be supported. 		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ONICH H - Former Garage	26
Development plan reference:	Onich H Text MB 18 – Map LO8 MB 19	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Mr A. Campbell (240) and Transport Scotland (859)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Housing Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr A. Campbell - objects to the lack of clarity in Council's position. He was notified by the Council's development management case officer that outline permission had been granted for the development, subject to the condition that "the access to Camus House and Garage House should not be taken through the proposed car park unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Planning Authority." Subsequently he noted that the West Highland and Island Local Plan Report on Recommendations Received states that "Prior to details being submitted it would be inappropriate for the Local Plan to support the principle of development." These statements appeared to be contradictory and he was concerned because the condition relating to access has not yet been discharged. Transport Scotland - objects to the site because of inadequate trunk road junction visibility. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr A. Campbell - unclear. Transport Scotland (859) – deletion of site. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - There is no contradiction between the local plan content and the planning consent issued for the site. To further clarify the report referred to was also considering another representation. The part of the response which suggests that, "Prior to details being submitted it would be inappropriate for the Local Plan to support the principle of development" relates to another representor. It is the principle of the proposed extension that was not confirmed in the Local Plan as it would be subject to an Appropriate Assessment to consider whether there would be significant impacts on the integrity of the SAC. The condition on the planning consent relating to the access is unaffected and will need to be met before it is discharged. The site already has planning consents. The relevant conditions attached to the consents are listed below.</p> <p><i>No works shall commence on site until full details of an amended access and car parking layout has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Such details shall show a single access onto the trunk road with a shared driveway to Camus House and Garage House, and a separate spur into the car park with the car park position and layout adjusted accordingly. The access to Camus House and Garage House should not be taken through the proposed car park unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.</i></p>		

Thereafter, prior to the commencement of works on the foundations of the proposed house the improved vehicular access, proposed car park and new driveway shall be fully formed in accordance with the approved details.

The proposed access shall join the trunk road at a new junction which shall be constructed by the applicant to a standard as described in the Department of Transport Advice Note TA 41/95 (Vehicular Access to All-Purpose Trunk Roads)(as amended in Scotland) complying with Layout 3 (the layout will be similar to layout 8). The junction shall be constructed in accordance with details that shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority, after consultation with the Roads Authority, before any part of the development is commenced.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

None.

Issue (ref and heading):	OSE	79
Development plan reference:	Ose Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 167 – Map SL166 MB 167	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Ose Township Clerk - N. Montgomery (127)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Township Clerk requests that the SDA should be extended because: it should follow the Ose township boundary; the land is of poor agricultural quality, and; the area suggested is on the on landward side of the public road and will therefore not affect any public seaward views.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> The boundary has already been extended beyond the limits of existing development and further extension could potentially lead to coalescence with development on the southern edge of Shaggary. The SDA boundaries needn't necessarily follow township boundaries as they fulfil a different function. There is sufficient development potential within the Ose SDA.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	PLOCKTON	54
Development plan reference:	Plockton Settlement Development Area (SDA) (Glebe), AH2/C Land South of Cooper Street, H War Memorial Site, B1 & B2 Land N of Sewage Works & Land South of Airstrip Hangar, MU Primary School, AH1 Burnside, Commerce Boundary Text MB 68 – Map SL2 MB 69	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA (Glebe)</u>: J. T. Nicolson (503), N. Mackinnon (553), A. Nicolson (585), I. Begg (780), D. McAndrew (790), M. Walker (801), Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland (945) • <u>AH2/C</u>: - F. Macsween & Stuart (On behalf of A. MacKenzie and others) (18), M. Newsome Linington (783), I. MacLaren (207), I. MacKenzie (300), C. M. MacRae (302), G. R. Webster (303), G. & A. James (332), Plockton & District Community Council (354), Dr & Mrs Morgan (410), M. Kennedy (414), K. & D. Havard (420), M. Ewing (481), N. Mackinnon (553), A. J. Storie (575), J. Buckley (979) • <u>H</u>: I. MacLaren (207), N. Mackinnon (553) • <u>B1 & B2</u>: Plockton Grazings Committee (241) • <u>MU</u>: N. Mackinnon (553) • <u>AH1</u>: N. Mackinnon (553) • <u>Commerce Boundary</u>: A. J. Storie (575) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA, Allocations and Commerce Boundary (relates to General Policy 17)	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SDA (Glebe)</u>: objections to the Plan endorsing any development potential on the land because of: loss of scarce green/play space; loss of community events space; adverse built heritage impact because land integral to setting of block listing of surrounding Telford buildings; adverse impact on conservation area; adverse landscape impact; loss of key public views; distance to the alternative playing field for primary school age children; loss of scarce daylight for adjacent householder; adverse Tree Preservation Order (TPO) impact; Cooper Street possibly providing a better elderly housing alternative; loss of climate station; poor visibility of access or listed wall/ tree loss if access improved; increased on street parking and congestion; the proposal is speculative; the Council's incorrect and misleading reference to school use being infrequent (actual use frequent); loss of vital recreational and educational asset for the school; the offer of continued community use and non-Council maintenance; infrequent but beneficial community use; existing arrangements saving the Council money in providing for free and maintained open space; the land being valued open space under the terms of national planning guidance (SPP11) and the Council's inaction in not undertaking an audit which would have revealed deficiencies for Plockton, and; of the land's presence within SDA inflating its value, which will prompt inappropriate development proposals. • <u>AH2/C</u>: in terms of parties seeking development potential, the intentions of the Thomas Mackenzie family are unclear from their maintained solicitor's representation but their planning application (now withdrawn) sought consent for 4 houses (by implication non-affordable) across the entire site bordered by allocations AH2 and C. Mr A. MacKenzie also sought this development potential in his previous (not maintained) representation. The other maintained party that supports the Mackenzie family position argues for development because: the site is to meet a housing need of long standing local residents; there is a precedent of other similar developments, and; there is an opportunity for good designs that could be an asset to the visual appearance of the 		

village. Objections to the principle of any development on the land are based upon: lack of mains sewerage; increased road congestion; lack of off street parking; loss of scarce useable green/play/events space; adverse visual impact; adverse impact on the conservation area; adverse tourism impact; that there are better and adequate housing site alternatives such as Burnside; the claimed community consensus against the site; the claimed National Trust for Scotland support for no development on the land; the development being a departure from the Adopted Skye and Lochalsh Local Plan; the better possibility of a community buyout; the concern that further on street parking will block visibility; ground conditions being poor; coastal flood risk; the site not being safe for the elderly because there is no pavement; 2 units being a small gain compared to extent of adverse impact; adverse habitats and species impact; the Council having undertaken no audit of open space as required by SPP11 (which would have demonstrated a significant deficiency); loss of grazing land; the allocations being contrary to certain Plan objectives, and; the claim that the western part of the site is not owned by the MacKenzie family and therefore it will be difficult to implement a development that knits to the existing built form.

- H: objections to development because of the site's excessive density (although lower density, higher quality design private houses may be acceptable) and fear of poor design quality.
- B1 & B2: objection to loss of relatively high quality croft land.
- MU: objection to development based on: opposition to the relocation of the primary school; the centrality of the existing school to the community and walking patterns, and; that the school provides a productive use for a building of high design quality and has attractive landscaping.
- AH1: fear of poor quality designs that will adversely affect quality of conservation area village.
- Commerce Boundary: objection to any commercial development within the older village because: there is a lack of housing within the older village and this policy would encourage change of use from housing; that too much emphasis on tourism will undermine the residential core of community, and; the allocated housing sites may be lost to second / holiday homes.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- SDA (Glebe): oppose inclusion within village boundary and/or request open space safeguard.
- AH2/C: Mackenzie family seek (non-affordable) housing allocation on whole site (implied). Objectors seek deletion of allocations and exclusion of land from SDA (implied).
- H: lower density, stronger design quality requirements and inclusion of site within amended conservation area.
- B1 & B2: deletion of allocations (implied).
- MU: deletion of allocation (implied).
- AH1: stronger design quality requirements (implied).
- Commerce Boundary: remove boundary from historic core of village.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authorityResponse(s) -

- SDA (Glebe): NO CHANGE.
- AH2/C: RETAIN ALLOCATIONS.
- H: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- B1 & B2: RETAIN ALLOCATIONS.
- MU: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- AH1: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- Commerce Boundary: NO CHANGE.

Reasons:

- SDA (Glebe): Although the site benefits from an Adopted Local Plan designation, it was not re-allocated because of the constraints highlighted by representors. Any development of the site would have significant visibility problems which could only be addressed by a 5 metre set-back of the frontage wall and it may not be possible to retain the integrity of the wall in moving it. However, the land is central, flat, available and does not represent public open space in the sense that it is private ownership and is not laid out as public open space. Its use by the school and community is infrequent. It would therefore not be appropriate to place a development embargo on the land. With careful and high quality siting and design it should still be possible to produce an acceptable development proposal for the site. Notwithstanding the above it does not merit positive identification as a 6 unit housing site as previously suggested by the local housing association. The listed constraints are accepted but still do not justify excluding the land from the SDA or safeguarding it as valued public open space. The Plan should not be used to artificially depress land values without reference to the particular development potential merits and de-merits of the land concerned.
- AH2/C: There was a 2008 outline planning application lodged by A. MacKenzie on site AH2/C for 4 houses which has been subsequently withdrawn. Given the polarised opinions of representors it is not possible for the Council to offer changes that will appease all concerned. It is therefore reasonable for the Plan to remain unchanged in offering a compromise between known development interests and the majority community view that the site should not be developed, in any part, for housing. The Examination will allow for independent scrutiny of the issue by the Reporter. The Council included the site in response to a developer pre-application enquiry as a means of securing public open space on the balance of a site that might reasonably expect to obtain planning permission for frontage development. There are no insurmountable servicing constraints affecting the site albeit ideal standards cannot be achieved at this and many other existing sites within the historic core. With careful and high quality siting and design it should still be possible to produce an acceptable development proposal for the frontage of the site without compromising the character of the conservation area and other heritage constraints. Burnside does meet a large proportion of the area's housing need but Cooper Street provides an opportunity in particular for accommodation suitable for the elderly in a flat and central location. Sites for such development are equally as scarce in old Plockton as areas of greenspace. The emergence of a new claimed ownership interest further complicates the viable development potential of the site but referral to Examination will allow consideration of all competing views.
- H: A particular protected species issue has been raised and merits reference. The constraints raised by representors may well curtail the actual capacity of the site when a more detailed feasibility study is undertaken. The access is likely to be below ideal standard and this and other ground condition and vegetation factors are likely to reduce house numbers. Existing requirements address other issues.
- B1 & B2: The Council believes that the land is not within crofting tenure rather an agricultural tenancy. Although of comparatively good quality it has advantages for

employment uses in terms of being detached from the historic core of the conservation area, proximity to similar and compatible uses and proximity to the airstrip.

- MU: It is accepted that there is no active proposal to relocate the school. However, it is important that future options are kept open and planned for. A clarification has been included that any development would be a conversion not a demolition.
- AH1: The site benefits from an extant planning consent and is under construction.
- Commerce Boundary: The policy and boundary is to support employment and leisure uses not to promote more second / holiday home conversions. Precluding the change of use of ground floor accommodation from residential to commercial use within the core of a tourist village would not be appropriate.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

None.

Issue (ref and heading):	PORTNALONG & FISKAVAIG	99
Development plan reference:	Portnalong & Fiskavaig Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text WS 79 – Map LFM SL140	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Bidwells on behalf of Marine Harvest Scotland (973)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Request for inclusion of land within development boundary on the grounds that the site would represent redevelopment of a brownfield site plus it would also make safe an old road, dam and salmon smolt hatchery.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension to SDA.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> The site is divided by a natural watercourse and has flood risk issues. It may support development but the constraints are sufficient to not offer more positive support.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	PORTREE	95
Development plan reference:	Portree Settlement Development Area (SDA), General Comments, H2 Woodpark, H3 Home Farm, H4 Kiltaraglen (West), H5 Kiltaraglen (East), LT Shullishadder, MU2 Former Co-op & Woolen Mill, MU3 Bayfield Text WS 66-70 – Map LFM SL136	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
GL Hearn on behalf of Co-op (Commerce Centre) 515, Portree Community Council (General Comments) 138, Muir Smith Evans on behalf of Co-op (H2) 941, J. H. MacDonald (C1, LT) 438, J. Matheson (H4) 162, M. MacPherson (H4 & H5) 703, M. & K. Allen (MU2) 325, J. & L. MacDonald (MU3) 146, A. Williams (MU3) 192, J. C. Nicolson (MU3) 707, W. Nicolson (MU3) 708, SEPA (MU3, MU5) 446.		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Commerce Centre, General Comments & Allocations H2 (Woodpark), C1 (Home Farm), LT (Shullishadder), H4 (Kiltaraglen (West)), H5 (Kiltaraglen (East)), , MU2 (Former Co-op & Woolen Mill), MU3 (Bayfield), MU5 (Harbour)	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GL Hearn on behalf of Co-op (<u>Commerce Centre</u>) - objects to the 2 commerce centres which have been identified as not having a clear hierarchy and function and a concern that they will conflict with each other. Concern about large scale retail development at Dunvegan Road. It disputes the justification for the Council's approach. Portree Community Council (<u>General Comments</u>) - is concerned about the effects of a digester waste plant and highlight the need for a decentralised bus garage. Muir Smith Evans on behalf of Co-op (<u>H2</u>) - objection to northern section of site, which is in Co-op ownership. Believes there are other better, allocated housing site alternatives. Retail development would be more appropriate because the land is within the commerce boundary, would allow for a varied retail land supply and will help consolidate this commerce centre. J. H. MacDonald (<u>C1, LT</u>) - objects to the long term designation because: he is the owner of land with a current consent; he disputes the need for an access reservation; he queries whether the LT site will ever be developed, and; there are other better access routes. He wants a more positive allocation of C1 for guaranteed public open space because of the potential to extend the existing footpath network and the need for more greenspace within village. J. Matheson (<u>H4</u>) - objects on basis of: loss of good croft / agricultural land which is used for lambing and winter silage; title restriction on adjoining land that prevents development; loss of winter sledging land; better and adequate land allocated elsewhere, and; there is a waiting list for new crofts. M. MacPherson (<u>H4 & H5</u>) - objects to loss of good grazing land and fears an adverse impact from vacant private properties. M. & K. Allen (<u>MU2</u>) - object to any further bulky goods retail and want a guarantee that there will be no adverse impact on their access. J. & L. MacDonald (<u>MU3</u>) - object to allocation (in particular, that part south west or River Leasgeary) because of: loss of locally scarce greenspace; loss of natural heritage value; lack of housing demand; inadequate jobs and supporting infrastructure networks; their son's medical condition which requires peace, quiet and privacy; loss of private view; the fact that the river/bay front could better be developed as a promenade. 		

- Williams (MU3) - objects to the loss of the Green gap site because of the adverse impact on his property, the loss of one of the principal tourist vistas of the Cuillin and the loss of scarce village greenspace. Believes that the wider site's development for Tesco would have an adverse impact on village centre shopping and Bayfield parking.
- J. C. Nicolson (MU3) - objects to the land south west of the River Leasgeary because of: landslide risk; river erosion; the loss of salt marsh habitat; the loss of locally scarce greenspace; adverse visual impact, and; inadequate demand.
- W. Nicolson (MU3) - objects to the land south west of the River Leasgeary because of landslide risk and the loss of greenspace.
- SEPA (MU3, MU5) - objects to sites because they are within or partly within the 1 in 200 year fluvial and coastal flood risk areas.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- GL Hearn on behalf of Co-op (Commerce Centre) - a more robust justification for the Dunvegan Road commerce centre and (implied) a reduction in the boundary to exclude potential retail sites.
- Portree Community Council (General Comments) - deletion of energy from waste proposal on allocation I and formal identification of a site for bus parking and garage (implied).
- Muir Smith Evans on behalf of Co-op (H2) - want site re-allocated for retail or mixed use including retail.
- J. H. MacDonald (C1, LT) - deletion of that part of LT site that affects his current consent (implied) and C1 - stronger developer requirements guarantee of public open space provision (implied).
- J. Matheson (H4) - deletion of allocation and associated link road.
- M. MacPherson (H4 & H5) - deletion of sites (implied).
- M. & K. Allen (MU2) - deletion of reference to bulky goods retail and better guarantee of access preservation.
- J. & L. MacDonald (MU3) - deletion of allocation (implied).
- Williams (MU3) - exclusion of Green gap site from allocation and no retail use (implied).
- J. C. Nicolson (MU3) - deletion of site south-west of Leasgeary (implied)
- W. Nicolson (MU3) - deletion of site south-west of Leasgeary (implied)
- SEPA (MU3, MU5) - deletion of sites or pre-confirmation flood risk assessment.

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s) -

- Commerce Centres: AMEND Dunvegan Road Commerce Centre as detailed in commended change below.
- General Comments: NO CHANGE.
- H1: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- H2: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- C1: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- LT: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- H4: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- H5: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- MU2: RETAIN ALLOCATION.
- MU3 & MU5: RETAIN ALLOCATION

Reasons:

Commerce Centres: A more definitive village centre boundary has been incorporated. There have been recent supermarket consents granted at Dunvegan Road and therefore an amended boundary is appropriate to enclose the consented areas. The changing hierarchy

within Portree reflects these recent planning application and non call-in decisions.

General Comments: The bus operator has a planning consent to move to the industrial estate and some long stay parking will be available there. The clarification of the type of waste facility at allocation I and further consultation should allay any potential concerns. The site is separate from the community and already accommodates a recently closed landfill area. It may also provide a sustainable source of cheaper local heating.

H2: The site is constrained in terms of access and would function best in land use terms if developed in conjunction with adjoining land to the south. Residential development would be most appropriate given the pattern and character of existing uses across the wider site.

C1: A fuller explanation of the Home Farm planning consent details have been added for clarification which includes details of supporting infrastructure, greenspace and community use. The Upper Leasgeary Corridor is not an existing cherished area of greenspace and therefore a community allocation to promote the creation of such an area is more appropriate.

LT: The safeguard is for a proper planning purpose and the alternative route suggestions are less direct and therefore more expensive, and/or suffer from similar constraints. Formal blight procedures are available to the representor.

H4: The land is required to complete the Portree Link Road connection to Staffin Road. Considerable private and public finance has already been invested in the project which is substantially complete. The landowner's opposition is noted but the agricultural value of the land is not significant compared to the benefits of the road's completion. The land is allocated for housing as a natural infill site compatible with adjacent uses and to provide a financial incentive to attract private finance to fund the completion of the link but it is accepted that it will not provide an essential contribution to the Plan's effective housing land supply. Compulsory purchase powers may be required to complete the link which is essential to provide improved connectivity and accessibility within the settlement and to relieve pressure on the lower section of Staffin Road / Mill Road / Bosville Terrace which has severe alignment and width constraints.

H5: The site has already been reduced to exclude the area of ancient woodland and is of very limited agricultural value. It's allocation is also important to provide an adjacent development value incentive to the private sector to finance and construct a suitable connection between the Link Road and Staffin Road.

MU2: The needs of the existing and integral residential property are already addressed by a specific developer requirement. The site is suitable for bulky goods retail given the pattern of existing and surrounding uses, its size and accessibility, and its location on the strategic road network.

MU3 & MU5: The road around the Lump and the harbour redevelopment are interdependent and would most likely be developed, financed and assessed together. The west side of the river below Bridge Road does not function as useable public open space. The saltmarsh issue is already addressed in the developer requirement Plan wording. Portree is the island capital and principal centre for employment, community and other supporting services and facilities. The land is overlooked by surrounding development rather than vice versa. The land is suitable for retail activity of a scale appropriate to its constraints and the degree to which they can be rectified. Important public views should be maintained and the open vista from the Green is already referenced in the developer requirements. The steepest land is unlikely to be developable. Existing private parking provision is unlikely to be affected and there should be no net loss of public parking provision. Private views are not a material planning consideration. A recent consent, which may be taken up by Tesco, has been

granted elsewhere in the village.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

SDA, Commerce centres: AMEND Portree Inset Map Dunvegan Road commerce centre boundary to include area consented to Oatridge.

General Comments: None.

H2: None.

C1/LT: None.

H4: None.

H5: None.

MU2: None.

MU3 & MU5: None.

Issue (ref and heading):	RERAIG	56
Development plan reference:	Reraig – MU (East of Caravan Park) Text MB73 – Map SL6 MB 73	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
R. Smuts-Miller (15), C.H. Glen-Riddell (86), D. Glen-Riddell (286), R. Holt (932)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	MU Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
<p>Objections to development on the grounds of: the allocation's excessive scale (25% settlement growth); it being contrary to the Plan objective of preserving the best agricultural land; inappropriate precedent; the height of buildings should not exceed 2 storey and single storey preferable; loss of corncrake habitat; no supporting infrastructure/services; there is already enough affordable housing within the village; adverse impact on other habitats and species; the housing not being for indigenous demand; loss of views; adverse impact on the caravan park as a tourism business and other tourism enterprises by loss of views and amenity; there being better land in Auchtertyre; pluvial flood risk, and, poor ground conditions.</p>		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Majority want deletion of site and exclusion from Settlement Development Area (SDA) (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> – RETAIN ALLOCATION.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> The landowner, local housing association and the local shinty club are developing a proposal for a mixture of frontage housing and mixed community use (shinty pitch and clubhouse) on the balance of the field. The Council is supportive in principle of such a proposal. The land is of relatively high agricultural value but is not in crofting tenure and in large part will not be lost to irreversible development. Servicing and other constraints are not insurmountable. The allocation policies of the affordable housing agencies are constrained by housing law and it is not possible to favour certain geographic groups unless that priority relates to housing need. 1.5 storeys would be a typical rural Highland requirement but a prescriptive height would not be appropriate for a site that does not have a particular landscape sensitivity.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ROAG	81
Development plan reference:	Roag Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 173 – Map SL122 MB 173	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
P. Gorton (865)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objections on grounds of: the land enclosed within the SDA is different and therefore a departure from the Adopted Skye and Lochalsh Local Plan; any development there would be contrary to the established settlement pattern; irreversible loss of good croft land; the land is prominent and any development would be obtrusive, and; adverse impact on important public seaward views, which is contrary to the Plan's other policies and objectives.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Reduction in SDA to accord with Adopted Skye and Lochalsh Local Plan boundary.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> The land has limited significance in public seaward views and there is a precedent for development in this area. Any adverse landscape impact can be addressed by careful siting and design at the planning application stage.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ROSHVEN Settlement Development Area (SDA)	42
Development plan reference:	Roshven SDA Text MB 33 – Map LO20 MB 33	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Ms P. Conacher (154)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objects to over-development of the area because of: inadequate infrastructure, adverse landscape impact and the lack of a strategic approach to look at infrastructure and other capacities and an appropriate scale of development.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Unclear.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The Council's firm identification of a suitable township boundary and associated objectives has provided greater certainty and guidance for landowners, the public and other Plan users than leaving proposals to be considered solely on their individual merits. The settlement objectives address the issues raised by the objector.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	ROY BRIDGE	50
Development plan reference:	Roy Bridge – Suggested New Allocations, Settlement Development Area (SDA), H1 (Field off Bohenie Road), B1 (Stronlossit) Text MB 54 – Map LO36 MB 55	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Bidwells on Behalf of Achaderry Estate (971) • <u>SDA</u>: S. Mallison (793) • <u>H1 & B1</u>: H. & N. Critchley (166), SEPA (446) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	New Allocations, SDA, H1 & B1 Allocations	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Landowner suggestion to include a series of allocations to provide community land, public open space and 7 house plots off Achaderry road because it will provide a lower density and impact of development than previously proposed and will deliver community uses and affordable housing. • <u>SDA</u>: Resident opposes any more development at Bunroy until railway bridge condition and capacity is improved and the road network serving Bunroy is adopted. • <u>H1 & B1</u>: Objections to development because: further development would be inappropriate to the existing settlement pattern; of loss of woodland; of loss of habitat; adverse impact on species; of poor surface water drainage; underground services will need to be safeguarded or relocated; adverse impact on adjacent hotel as existing tourism business; the density proposed is excessive; of flood risk; adverse impact on social balance of community; the development is not energy efficient in terms of the length of the access road; obtrusive main-road signage will be needed or frontage trees felled, and; a pre-site-confirmation flood risk assessment should be required. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Landowner suggestion to include mixture of sites to provide community land, public open space and 7 house plots off Achaderry road. • <u>SDA</u>: Removal of Bunroy from SDA or objective added to ensure any further development at Bunroy dependent upon bridge and road adoption/upgrading (implied). • <u>H1 & B1</u>: Deletion of allocations or redraw H1 boundary to exclude flood risk area and pre-confirmation flood risk assessment for B1. 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s):</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: NO CHANGE. • <u>SDA</u>: NO CHANGE. • <u>H1 & B1</u>: RETAIN ALLOCATIONS. Add stronger flood risk requirement as detailed in commended changes below. 		
<u>Reasons:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: A planning application is pending consideration to the north of H1 which may affect opportunities for widening the Achaderry road. The proposal may 		

have merit but significant issues still remain in terms of: pluvial and fluvial flood risk; protected species impacts; loss of woodland; the need for guaranteed delivery of useable public open space; previous objections to the allocation of land in this area, and; the need for and feasibility of developer funded access improvements.

- SDA: The development in Bunroy was approved on the basis of a negligible increase of traffic by the replacement of the 15 chalets with 14 permanent houses. It is also subject to a legal agreement to obtain better maintenance of a section of this unadopted road. The Council does not intend to adopt the road beyond Roy Bridge school due to landownership constraints, the attitude of Network Rail regarding the bridge, the opposition of some residents to road widening and financial considerations.
- H1 & B1: Site H1 has a 7 houses planning application pending consideration. The allocation's housing capacity has already been reduced and requirements added to address the need for tree retention, structural planting and exceptional siting layout and design quality. The site is sustainable in terms of its village centre location and serviceable. It also has the commercial tourism benefit of trunk tourist route frontage. Developer requirements and the Plan's general policies do or will address flood risk, surface water and woodland issues. Good siting, layout and design will also address the adjacent hotel's "loss of commercial view" interests. A pre-determination rather than pre-site-confirmation flood risk assessment is sufficient. The allocation of business land is necessary for the creation of mixed use sustainable communities. Appropriate business uses would be compatible with surrounding uses.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- New allocations: None.
- SDA: None
- H1 & B1: ADD/AMEND developer requirement for "pre-determination flood risk assessment".

Issue (ref and heading):	SALEN - Settlement Development Area (SDA)	40
Development plan reference:	Salen SDA Text MB 29 – Map LO15 MB 29	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
P. Stace (988)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Concern that the George V playing field adjacent to the hall is shown within the SDA. This land was gifted to the people of Salen in 1945. Planning permission may lapse and it should be a playing field.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Remove area from SDA or add an open space safeguard (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response</u> - NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> - A reserved matters planning permission for housing was granted on the relevant land in July 2008. The site therefore benefits from an extant consent for housing. Its ownership position is unclear. However, the site is central, developable, free from known constraints and should therefore be retained within the SDA with a positive development presumption. The land is not currently in active playing field use.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	SALLACHY	62
Development plan reference:	Sallachy Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB 87 – Map SL23 MB 87	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
J. C. MacRae (723), SNH (697)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for extension of SDA because: the SDA as drawn only allows development on one apportionment not on truly common grazings that would benefit the wider crofting community; the Crofters Commission will not allow development on in bye land; the additional suggested area would be on common grazings and will be serviceable, and; of the lack of local sites to satisfy demand. SNH concern over potentially adverse landscape impact of ad hoc development within the undeveloped portion of the present SDA. 		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension of SDA to east. SNH seek stronger developer requirement for "production of a master or design plan for the expansion area to be submitted at the same time as the first planning application" 		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<p><u>Response(s)</u> - NO CHANGE.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> The objectives have already been amended to encourage a co-ordinated crofting community led expansion of the settlement. Such a proposal would replicate a traditional scattered crofting pattern. The suggested strengthening of the requirement is not proportionate to the scale of development and the resources of a grazings committee. A further extension to the SDA may threaten landscape and road capacity. The apportionment area could still be developed on a collective basis and other capacity exists on poorer land within the SDA.</p>		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	SPEAN BRIDGE	49
Development plan reference:	Spean Bridge – General Comments, Suggested New Allocations, AH (Morrison Avenue), H1 (Redevelopment of haulage depot (and possibly Little Chef)), MU1 (Burn Bank) MU2/LT2 (Opposite Little Chef) Text MB 52 – Map LO35 MB 53	
Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General Comments</u>: A. Robinson (695), SNH (697), P. & R. Dart (533), M. Roady (277), Mr & Mrs W. Maclachlan (715), Glen Spean & Great Glen Tourism marketing Group (304), HIE (495) • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Ferguson Transport (20) • <u>AH</u>: J. Andrews (470) • <u>H1</u>: V. Millen (176), M. Roady (277), B. & M. Ham (243) • <u>MU1</u>: P. & R. Dart (MU1, MU2, General Comment) (533), Glen Spean & Great Glen Tourism marketing Group (304) • <u>MU2/LT2</u>: P. & R. Dart (533), Mr & Mrs W. Maclachlan (715), M. Roady (277), Glen Spean & Great Glen Tourism marketing Group (304), G. F. Rivett (75), B. & M. Ham (243), M. Tregaskis (903), K. Louguray (976) 		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General Comments, Suggested New Allocations & Allocations AH, H1, MU1, MU2/LT2, H2 & H3	
Summary of representation(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General Comments</u>: concern that the capacity of allocated land is in excess of the capacity of the supporting infrastructure and employment opportunities - i.e. objectors want an increase in village amenities or a reduction in the number and capacity of housing allocations. Belief that brownfield sites should be developed first. Others comment on the need for footpath provision on the south side of the A82(T) close to the Ferguson Transport developments, for better protection of the SSSI and for specifically allocated business land. • <u>Suggested New Allocations</u>: Local developer wants infill housing development potential on land between south-west Settlement Development Area (SDA) boundary up to Mossgiel because it is needed to finance the relocation of an existing local business, the land is previously developed and is part consented. • <u>AH</u>: Objection to allocation because: the area was not allocated for development in the Adopted Lochaber Local Plan; there is enough provision of land for affordable houses; the land is needed for a play area and village hall extension, and; there are too many affordable houses in the area already. • <u>H1</u>: Neighbours concerned about inadequate drainage, the height of houses that may cause overshadowing and increased traffic. • <u>MU1</u>: Objectors believe the land would better be allocated for business / tourism use. Poorly designed buildings would detract from the only pleasant approach to Spean Bridge and would be detrimental to existing businesses in the area. The local access to the site is owned by Burnbank House and Burnbank Lodges who may inhibit access from this boundary. • <u>MU2/LT2</u>: Resident objections to: the excessive housing density; the incompatibility between mixed commercial and housing uses; the lack of an obligation to provide a car park, public toilets and commercial/tourist facilities; the increase in traffic and inadequate 		

access; flood risk; inadequate drainage; the adverse impact on river and riverbank and wildlife; the likelihood of diesel spillage; the lack of protection of trees; the suggested uses being too vague; inadequate community services and infrastructure; inadequate demand/need; the adverse visual impact on the existing settlement pattern; the development not adding anything to village culture and quality of life; the adverse visual impact; no guarantee of playing field provision; the lack of sheltered / affordable houses; the need to relocate overhead lines; the loss of part of the site to provide a right hand turn lane and other A82 widening; inadequate school capacity; poorer pedestrian safety, and; the loss of watercourses running through the site.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

- General Comments: Reduction in number and capacity of housing allocations and/or additional objectives or allocations to secure enhanced supporting infrastructure (implied). More specific tourism / business allocations. Better reference to geological SSSI.
- Suggested New Allocations: housing allocation or SDA extension to include land south west of village.
- AH: Deletion of site (implied).
- H1: Delete or amend developer requirements to control impact on neighbouring properties (implied).
- MU1: Deletion of site or allocation for attractive tourist facility use (implied).
- MU2/LT2: Deletion of site or greater proportion of community / tourist facility uses on site (implied).

Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority

Response(s):

- General Comments: NO CHANGE except reference to SSSI in commended changes below.
- Suggested New Allocations: EXTEND SDA as commended change below.
- AH: NO CHANGE.
- H1: NO CHANGE.
- MU1: RETAIN ALLOCATION. See commended change re reduced capacity below.
- MU2/LT2: RETAIN ALLOCATION. See commended change re. a specific community safeguard below.

Reasons:

- General Comments: The village objectives provide adequate policy coverage on the need to secure general improvements to the village. Additional tourist facilities could come forward on the mixed use sites. The Council must also allocate for choice, flexibility and effectiveness in terms of the range of housing sites zoned. Some sites have been allocated with larger capacities to justify the costs of high initial servicing but can still be phased. Higher housing numbers will provide a larger local population catchment for local commercial enterprises and may attract others. Available brownfield sites are zoned but do not comprise a sufficient land supply on their own.
- Suggested New Allocations: Although the site would complete a series of ribbon development, distant from the village centre, it does represent an infill, brownfield site. The existing settlement objective will be used to secure extension of the existing footpath connection to the village centre.
- AH: Housing and Property Services have confirmed that Spean Bridge is a priority settlement for affordable housing. The site's development will improve and expand the existing play area whilst it will not compromise any future plans for extension of the village hall. The decrease of the indicative capacity will ensure that the development is

in keeping with the adjacent ones.

- H1: The site's capacity has been reduced and developer requirements already amended to address neighbour's concerns. The site is brownfield, has no heritage constraints, has an existing access and represents an acceptable infill opportunity close to the village centre. A housing planning application is pending consideration on the site.
- MU1: The developer requirements cater for the retention of a green screen to the A 86 and for high quality design but a capacity reduction would make these easier to achieve in planning application layout terms. The trunk road is well aligned in this section and an access from it should prove feasible if the objector is not prepared to negotiate access from the west.
- MU2/LT2: Amendments have already been made to better address phasing, the need for developer-funded infrastructure improvements and non-housing uses. There is a lapsed outline planning consent for 13 houses for part of site MU2. Scottish Water confirmed that there is existing water and sewerage capacity to accommodate the allocated development. The Highland Council is aware of a potential capacity issue in the Spean Bridge primary school in the future and the 7th objective supports its extension in case such an issue emerges in the future. The issue of surface water drainage is addressed by the Plan's general policy on this topic. The local plan covers a time period longer than a particular cycle in the housing market. No significant widening of the A82 should be required. Safe pedestrian connection improvements are specified. The affordable housing policy of the plan requires 25% of developments over 4 units to be affordable and THC's policy is for 25% of these units to be suitable for the elderly. Under-grounding or diversion of overhead lines is a cost for the developer but not an insurmountable one for this site. Flood risk is also addressed by a developer requirement. A further specific requirement for sports pitch provision is appropriate given existing and magnified future deficiencies in local provision.

Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC

- General Comments: ADD objective "to protect the geological SSSI in the Western part of the settlement".
- Suggested New Allocations: EXTEND SDA to include suggested land south of the A82.
- AH: None
- H1: None.
- MU1: RETAIN site but reduce indicative capacity to 8 units.
- MU2/LT2: ADD specific developer requirement for a "minimum of 1.5ha for a sports pitch and other public open space".

Issue (ref and heading):	STRONTIAN - B2 Hotel Site	37
Development plan reference:	Strontian B2 Text MB 26 – Map LO13 MB 27	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
R. Freeman (933), P. and A. Adams (943)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	Business Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Objection to any allocation because of: insufficient consultation; an ownership dispute; poor ground conditions; adverse traffic safety impact; the recent appeal decision; potential root damage to trees if the access is extended, and; a belief that business uses are not compatible with housing adjacent.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Deletion of any development potential on the site (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – DELETE ALLOCATION. The Council's latest position is as the commended change below.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The recent appeal decision to grant housing development on the last remaining frontage element of the site undermines its reason for allocation as a business site in that it could have been commercially attractive to a tourism facility. This and the tree preservation order constraint mean that any future potential should be limited to selective and appropriate infill judged against the SDA policy and boundary.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
DELETE allocation but leave within SDA.		

Issue (ref and heading):	STRONTIAN - Settlement Development Area (SDA)	36
Development plan reference:	Strontian SDA Text MB 26 – Map LO13 MB 27	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Mr D. Ashburner (111)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Requests extension to SDA to allow required extension of Drimnatorran cemetery with new access and car park, also to include a new caravan and camping site within the fields at Drimnatorran Farm.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension to SDA to include development proposals.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> – NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons</u> - The SDA has been enlarged partly at Drimnatorran but road capacity is limited and therefore no further expansion is proposed. Moreover, the suggested changes may have merit but are not specific enough to justify any further change. Therefore any proposals outwith the extended SDA would best be pursued and tested via the development management process.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	TARSKAVAIG	64
Development plan reference:	Tarskavaig Settlement Development Area (SDA) Text MB98 – Map SL35 MB 98	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
D. MacInnes (989), Tarskavaig Common Grazings Committee Clerk (J. MacDonald) (990)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	SDA	
Summary of representation(s):		
Seek extensions to the SDA because: this will meet potential local family housing need; the particular apportionment of the common grazings is close to the family croft and within the township, and more generally; the SDA should follow the township boundary and adjoining apportionments.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Extension of SDA to include at least one apportionment and ideally the whole township and adjoining apportionments.		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> The SDA is a boundary to enclose areas where development will be supported subject to the site-specifics of particular applications. Therefore, it will not always follow crofting township boundaries. The additional areas identified may compromise landscape character. SNH lodged a previous representation opposing development harmful to the particular “classic” coastal crofting landscape character of the area. The SDA has already been extended beyond the limits of existing development.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		

Issue (ref and heading):	UIG	75
Development plan reference:	Uig - General Comments & I (North of Industrial Estate) Text MB 142 – Map SL84 MB 143	
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):		
Uig Community Council (908)		
Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:	General Comments & Industrial Allocation	
Summary of representation(s):		
Community Council believe the Plan should promote: better car parking at the pier head; more efficient use of the CalMac building, and; better enforcement of Touchwood recycling activities.		
Modifications sought by those submitting representations:		
Additional settlement objectives to encourage the provision of better car parking at the pier area and to promote more efficient use of existing buildings at the pier area (implied). A requirement for site I for uses compatible with adjoining residential uses (implied).		
Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority		
<u>Response(s)</u> - NO CHANGE.		
<u>Reasons:</u> The matters raised by the Community Council are not directly relevant to the Plan's provisions and it is unlikely that any potential Plan changes would be effective in addressing the concerns raised.		
Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC		
None.		