

APPENDIX 2

TO:

**23 SEPTEMBER 2008
PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE ITEM**

SUTHERLAND LOCAL PLAN

REPORT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Please note: this reference version includes amendments made to this document after the Committee date, namely:

- 1 - the removal of parts of the submission by Mr and Mrs Wilson (ref. 570) on their request, these being supplementary only and the Council's transcription containing errors - page 470 onwards.
- 2 - the inclusion of a follow-up letter from Golspie Community Council (ref. 568) which in error did not appear in the Appendix - page 64 onwards.

APPENDIX 2

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT (STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT)

It should be noted that many of the issues raised via the Draft Environmental Report will be answered through responses to the Local Plan and should be read alongside this table.

Policy or Text	Recommended "Decision"
General	ADD more “plain English” commentary and graphics to better explain SEA and Plan decision making process to lay person especially how seemingly better (in SEA terms) sites have not always been preferred over others. AMEND text to highlight all main changes from Draft Environmental Report. AMEND Plan timetable and process including reference to new documents such as Action Programme. All the above will make the Environmental Report a more readable and understandable document.
General	Confirm ADDITION to clarify that SEA addresses built and cultural heritage as well as natural heritage. This will reflect the spirit and detail of SEA legislation.
Purpose and Local Plan Context	Confirm ADDITION of references to other relevant documents. The section has already been updated for the augmented ER that accompanied the Pre-Deposit Draft but further updates will be included as available.
SEA Site Matrices	Confirm ADDITIONS and ADD new factual corrections where environmental impacts missed. ADD new matrices for new sites. These changes will be consistent with the approach followed to date.
Appendices	Confirm ADDITIONS and ADD to update references to related policy, guidance and advice - e.g. Memorandum of Guidance and SEPA letter of 24 November 2006. The section has already been updated for the augmented ER that accompanied the Pre-Deposit Draft but further updates will be included as available.
Screening	Confirm DELETION of references to screening. The legislative requirement has now been dropped.
Table 5.1 Matrix of Plan Objectives to SEA Objectives	ADD list of assumptions made in scoring - e.g. that the Plan’s policies will be implemented and that “average current practice” developer mitigation will be secured. ADD explanation that enhanced mitigation will be sought as a result of SEA and examples of that mitigation. AMEND scoring so that: positive or negative scores are attributed to “Infrastructure” Plan objective for SEPA SEA objectives; positive scores are recorded for the “Environmental Limits” objective; positive scores are recorded for the “Directing development” objective; positive score is recorded for “sustainability and innovation” for natural heritage; negative score for “renewables” for natural heritage; neutral score for

	<p>“flood risk avoidance” for natural heritage, and; neutral score for “promote other plans” for natural heritage. REJECT suggestion that concentrating development in accessible locations does not benefit human health.</p> <p>The above changes have been raised by the consultation authorities and would reflect a more accurate scoring assessment.</p>
Baseline Data	<p>ADD/AMEND data or links to data where updates available. ADD AGLVs and landscape character assessments to baseline data. ADD cross reference to better mapping of features within Plan documentation. It is appropriate to include cross-reference new and/or relevant data when it becomes available or known to the Council.</p>
Strategic Alternatives	<p>Confirm ADDITION of site matrices within and rejected from previous Plan drafts. ADD matrices for newly rejected sites. Confirm and update ADDITION of expanded commentary. Further augmentation is appropriate.</p>
SEA Site Matrix Questions	<p>Confirm DELETION of social and economic questions but REJECT further suggested changes. The questions need to be applied consistently through the process and therefore changes mid-process would not be appropriate. It may be possible to refine questions for future plans. The suggested deletion of the “wild land” question would downgrade the importance of the topic and remove its potential relevance to future plan allocations. The suggested addition of a loss of good croft land question would only blur the distinction between environmental, social and economic issues.</p>
Matrices of General Policies to SEA Objectives	<p>AMEND scoring to reflect how consideration of the environmental effects of the draft general policies has led the Council to recommend/make changes to offer better mitigation of those effects.</p> <p>ADD fuller summary of scoring and mitigation assumptions.</p> <p>ADD examples of mitigation that will be incorporated in changes to the Pre-Deposit Draft.</p> <p>It is accepted that a listed set of assumptions and mitigation will make the matrices more meaningful.</p>
Monitoring	<p>ADD reference to monitoring data and indicators if/when provided by consultation authorities.</p>
SDA SEA Matrices	<p>REJECT suggestion. The large number of SDAs and the potential variety of development proposals and locations that could be supported within them makes assessment impracticable. However, additional consideration of cumulative effects and mitigation is recommended below.</p>
Cumulative and Residual Effects	<p>ADD paragraph on consideration of cumulative and residual effects. Highlight policies and proposals most likely to generate negative cumulative effects and proposed mitigation. List likely residual effects.</p> <p>REJECT suggestion that cumulative impact on the trunk road network of further development is a local plan SEA issue. Any cumulative impact of new trunk road accesses is more closely connected to road safety than environmental considerations.</p>

Report

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Whole Policy Text WS General Comment		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	Missing from the Plan is any proposal on midges which are perhaps the biggest single deterrent for tourists. Any B&B or camp site owner will tell you this with tales of tourists booking in and out again the same evening because of midges. And of course the midges are at their worst up here in the peak tourist months of July and August. Research is being done at Edinburgh University on midges and we would suggest that the Plan contains a proposal to work with Edinburgh University to eliminate midges using a Sutherland community like ours as a trial case.	Midges are indeed an important issue in terms of the impact it has and research efforts associated with this are to be welcomed. However, dealing with the issue is outside the scope of the Local Plan which is a land-use planning document.
197 Director of Housing & Property Services Inverness	<p>Sheltered Housing - Can you also please change any reference to sheltered housing to 'housing for older people' or 'housing aimed at older people'.</p> <p>There are a wide range of accommodation options for older people which we are moving towards which are not reflected by the term 'sheltered housing' - the trust of the Council's (and government) policies is a move away from sheltered housing.</p>	Agreed. Amend any references to sheltered housing in the Plan that are intended to refer to new developments, to "housing for older people".
250 Mr David Forbes Lairg	The new voting system change to S.T.V the new reorganisation of the local government in Highland area and the new multi - member wards, noting all three are very major recent changes (whilst the new local plan was being proposed/discussed), are likely to make a significant effort on the way decisions are made on the future. This is not acknowledged in the local plan or explained how the effects might be on a very low population density (ultra - low) such as NW Sutherland which is highlighted in the plans statistics. It is not correct or proper to ignore these significant changes as the plans planners and council (L. Authority) are all one including elected members.	It is agreed that there have been significant changes but many of these are administrative matters rather than being for the content of the Plan. However, the introduction to the Plan will be updated to reflect progress with the introduction of the Planning, etc. Scotland Act 2006 and changes it brings to the role of the Development Plan
250 Mr David Forbes Lairg	<p>There are now over 20 maps etc which show extra designations for Planning development purposes e.g. Radar, SSSI etc. There are even more such as marine, fish farm etc not shown in local plan but linked to local aquaculture industry development.</p> <p>There are too many and they, by volume dilute their individual importance. Planners need to somehow correlate all this into an easily understood form. Joe public is your customer not agency a,b,c, x,y,z</p>	The Local Planning Authority is required to have regard to a great many different interests, constraints and features of importance in considering planning proposals. We have sought to present this in a concise manner in the Plan through the use of red-amber-green mapping for features and a structured policy approach, particularly through policies 4 and 10. No fundamental change is proposed to that approach.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Whole Policy Text WS General Comment	etc etc. There are literally not enough letters in our alphabet!!	
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	Master Planning and Design Statements SNH recommends that relevant PANs such as PAN83 Masterplanning, PAN68 Design Statements are referred to and their requirements consistently applied in relation to housing allocations within the Local Plan.	There is a risk in attempting to refer in the Plan text to all the relevant PANs that something will be missed or that it will become out-of-date quickly. The Plan may be amended to refer more generally to having regard to useful guidance and advice on a range of topics available on the Scottish Government website, which has recently been restructured to make information more accessible by topic. The intention is to have regard to such advice in all relevant cases. An appendix to the Environmental Report identifies many relevant documents and will remain available as a point-in-time reference list.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	Renewable energy, and some other development related issues will, SNH understands, be taken forward soon in policy terms through the Highland-wide Local Development Plan in order that they can be considered at the Highland rather than at any Area level. While SNH can appreciate the reasoning behind this, it does create potential confusion for those issues where it would be expected that a policy framework will be found in this Local Plan. Accordingly SNH recommends that a section is inserted towards the front of this Plan which sets out what issues of relevance for Sutherland will be included in the forthcoming Highland-wide Local Development Plan, with a brief interim policy commentary. SNH understands that this would include the following (if unable to be added to a modified version of this Local Plan): - Renewable energy spatial policy framework for large scale and community scale projects Marine fish farming spatial policy framework, including classification of the coast in terms of guidance in NPPG 13 Wild land areas Open space strategy AGLVs, especially citations	It is agreed that it would be helpful to identify key matters that will be picked up through the new Local Development Plans that will follow this Plan. We will amend the text accordingly to refer to these and/or to cross-refer to the Council's Development Plan Scheme if it identifies the matters adequately.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Whole Policy Text WS General Comment

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

SNH Position
SNH welcomes many aspects of the local plan. In particular, it seeks to be a "user friendly" document that is as succinct as possible and also seeks to give local expression to the wider principles of sustainability. The importance of the natural heritage is recognised through the identification of features of international, national and local/regional importance. We commend the Council's work on the identification and mapping of features of local/regional importance. The importance of landscape character in seeking to accommodate housing sites and define settlement boundaries was recognised by the Council in the joint commissioning with SNH of a Housing Landscape Capacity Study for Sutherland. For many settlements and proposed allocations, SNH has no comments on the Local Plan approach.

SNH understands that an appropriate assessment is required in respect of the provisions of the plan in line with the requirements of Article 6.3 and 6.4 of the Habitats Directive and that this has not yet been undertaken. SNH therefore objects to the proposals, as currently submitted, that are likely to have a significant effect on Natural sites, either alone or in combination . This objection will be reviewed once the required assessment has been undertaken. The main settlements of concern with regard to appropriate assessments are: Dornoch, Ardgay, Bonar Bridge, South Bonar Industrial Estate, Rosehall, Invershin. While our concerns are focussed on these settlements and the possible impact of the allocations on the River Oykel SAC, Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC and the Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet SPA, the requirement for appropriate assessment needs to be considered throughout the Local Plan Area.

All Dornoch allocations are likely to require Appropriate Assessments, individually and cumulatively in relation to their possible effect on the Dornoch Firth SAC and so SNH objects until the results of the Council ' s appropriate assessment can be considered.

The support expressed for many aspects of the Plan is welcomed. The holding objection to a number of the Plan's proposals pending Appropriate Assessment is noted. Strategic Environmental Assessment has examined some of the issues to be looked at through Appropriate Assessment. Work is in progress with the Appropriate Assessment itself and that progress will be completed before the Plan is adopted.

373 Miss Johan MacKay
Bettyhill

Response sheet submitted but no comments made.

No response is required

Whole Policy Text WS General Comment

495 Historic Scotland
Edinburgh

Thank you for consulting Historic Scotland on the Draft Deposit Sutherland Local Plan and Environmental Report. The purpose of this letter is two-fold, firstly, to confirm our position on the plan itself and, secondly, to provide comments on the Environmental Report which accompanies the plan.

Historic Scotland is a consultee under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 on behalf of Scottish Ministers. In that role we have now undertaken an appraisal of this plan, concentrating on its implications for nationally important elements of the historic environment. Our review of the Environmental Report is undertaken in our capacity as a Consultation Authority under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Scotland) Regulations 2004.

Our response to Sutherland Futures in December 2006 identified our respective roles in dealing with applications this Local Plan may generate and, for completeness, I reiterate that advice here. Any development which has a direct impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument additionally requires Scheduled Monument Consent from the Scottish Ministers, applied for through Historic Scotland. Development which may affect A-listed buildings or their setting, Scheduled Ancient Monuments or their setting and which may affect Gardens and Designed Landscapes, requires to be referred to Historic Scotland under the General Development Procedure Order (GDPO). Proposals involving changes to A- and B-listed buildings and the demolition of Category C(S) listed buildings require to be referred to Historic Scotland on behalf of Scottish Ministers where your Council is minded to grant listed building consent. Responsibility for assessing alterations to Category C(S) listed buildings and development affecting the setting of B- and C(S)-listed buildings lies with your Council.

For the avoidance of doubt this response is set out in two parts: the first part provides our comments on the draft deposit plan, and the second part provides our comments on the Environmental Report.

PART 1: SUTHERLAND DRAFT DEPOSIT LOCAL PLAN

We refer to your letter of 9 November 2007 providing background information on this Draft Deposit Local Plan and instructions on how to submit objections or supporting representations. We have submitted a number of objections by email following the instructions provided.

The general points made are noted. The acknowledgement of the clarity of approach taken to Plan preparation is welcomed. The matters of concern are picked up and responded to under the relevant parts of the Plan.

Whole Policy Text WS General Comment

However, for the avoidance of doubt, I confirm that Historic Scotland has submitted the following objections:

. Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage . Appendix 1 Definition of Natural & Cultural Heritage Features . Golspie MU4 . Helmsdale MU1 . Edderton HI . Tongue MU2

For ease of reference I attach a hard copy of each here

I should emphasise that we are content with the principle of development on the four land allocations to which we have objected. The substance of the four objections relating to land allocations is to do with the wording of the Developer Requirements associated with the individual sites.

At Edderton, in particular, planning permission for housing on Site H1 was granted with conditions on 28 August 2007. Historic Scotland worked closely with The Highland Council to realise a design which would protect the setting of the two Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Accordingly, we have asked for the wording of the Developer Requirements to reflect that effort, should any review of the planning consent take place in the future. Simply for information, I have attached a plan of the consented application, which is also available at <http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/EF6D0618-2292-4C6C-8433-595BE62DA1D/0/Item414PLC2007.pdf>.

Our objection to Policy 4 covers five issues:

- the lack of detailed policy guidance;
- the emphasis of protection in the policy
- the categorisation of features;
- the issue of site and setting; and
- the wording of supporting information.

Details are set out in the objection form. I am aware that SNH have also raised concerns about this policy and have suggested some alternative wording. A useful way forward for resolution of SNH's and our concerns may be to have a meeting to discuss and agree wording that will satisfy all three parties. (I should note that our objection to Appendix 1 is for the purposes of correcting some errors of fact, as well as to take

Whole Policy Text WS General Comment

forward points made in our objection to Policy 4.)

We believe that all these objections are capable of early resolution and would be happy to discuss this further with you. In that context, where appropriate, the objection forms have identified the specific Historic Scotland Inspectors responsible for each of the issues raised.

Historic Scotland is currently drafting a new policy on battlefields which we anticipate will be the subject of public consultation from Spring 2008. This will form part of the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) series and the consultation will seek views on the approach to identifying and protecting battlefields. The Battlefield SHEP will, if approved, set out Scottish Ministers' policies for battlefields and their settings.

Finally, Historic Scotland welcomes the clarity of approach taken to preparation of this Local Plan. We found it easy to use and to follow, and welcome the identification of the Development Factors for the Settlement Development Areas, and the inclusion of the Developer Requirements with the specific site allocations.

497 RSPB
Golspie

Thank you for inviting RSPB Scotland to comment on the above plan. As part of the plans development process we previously submitted comment on The Council's issues and options consultation paper for the new Sutherland Futures 'Vision & Strategy' (15th December 2006) and on the background review papers covering 'Housing', 'Economic Development' and the 'Environment' in January (RSPB/HC 06/01/2006) to which we would like you to refer.

RSPB Scotland is concerned that the deposit draft fails to take adequate account of Sutherland's existing natural heritage interests and the associated protective legislation. We believe its adoption in the current format would be a failure of the Highland Council to meet its statutory responsibility to improve or safeguard biodiversity. We wish to object specifically to the wording of Policy 4 and have submitted alternative replacement text in the Appendix below. We have also suggested a number of modifications and points requiring further consideration that we believe will be helpful in the completion of the Plan.

As referred to in response to representations picked up in respect of specific parts of the Plan, the Plan's policies and in particular policies 4, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are being amended in response to concerns expressed. We will update references to other plans and strategies and refer to our Development Plan Scheme, which sets out future plan and guidance preparation.

Whole Policy Text WS General Comment

In general terms we believe the inclusion of maps detailing the protected areas to be a useful addition, however, the terminology and phrasing of policies contained within the deposit draft are misleading and suggest a presumption in favour of development regardless of environmental constraints. We consider that, as a starting point, it should be recognised that development on sites with important natural heritage interests is unlikely to be successful, We believe it would be more helpful and less likely to lead to confusion and challenge in the planning process if this standpoint were to be adopted in the Plan.

We recommend that references to current strategies, guidelines and environmental legislation should be improved and others, referenced within the Plan, will require Completion and adoption to enable a comprehensive Strategic Environmental Assessment, to accompany the final plan.

The reasoning behind our comment is expanded upon in the attached appendix

543 Alister I Sutherland & Son Ltd
Edderton

Is there sufficient employment in the area to support the occupants of all the proposed housing as there is very little local industry? Most of the service jobs in the hotels are low paid and seasonable and a high proportion of the positions are currently filled by Eastern Europeans.

If it ends up with a surplus of affordable housing, will it not end up with them being occupied by problem families from outside the area or with numerous EU workers all living in the one property, this is already happening in the region.

There are also all the private developments that are proposed for the "flood plains" on the downside of the road opposite the War Memorial and also between Sutherland Road and the sea. (Is global warming and rising sea levels not going to affect the Dornoch Area)? A development that has to pump drainage water surely tells it own story.

Is Dornoch not going to end up with more housing that the local infrastructure can support ?

The Plan provides through its policies and proposals for both housing and jobs growth, including a choice of locations and sites which may be considered for appropriate development. It also seeks to support fragile communities. Affordable housing provision is driven by the identification of local need. The Council and its partners continue to consider innovative ways to meet housing needs of the area. In respect of flood risk concerns, the relevant Plan policy will be tightened and regard has been had to the issue through preparation of the Plan too in considering the appropriateness of site allocations. In terms of infrastructure provision, we have consulted key organisations and the public during plan preparation and carefully considered these matters. Through defining developer requirements and additionally putting in place a policy framework for developer contributions we intend that development will be suitably serviced and sustainable. With regard to housing in the countryside, the Council's restrictive policy within

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Whole Policy Text WS General Comment	<p>There is a definite requirement for affordable serviced plots to be available to buy by private individuals who want to self build, this can be with "water tight conditions of sale to stop speculators from buying plots and either not developing them or developing and immediately selling on for massive profits. In the 1970s the local council successfully did this at Darroch Brae in Alness and also at Conon Bridge.</p> <p>A more relaxed planning attitude is also required that would allow houses to be built out with the current designated zoned areas.</p>	<p>hinterlands is currently being discussed and will be fully reviewed as part of preparing the forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan</p>
574 Scottish Rural Property & Business Association Ltd Ballachullish	<p>Thanks for your letters regarding SEA assessments, I have looked over the old and new material and confirm we are happy to note the changes</p>	<p>No response is required</p>
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>SUTHERLAND LOCAL PLAN – WRITTEN STATEMENT – PRE-DEPOSIT DRAFT</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Pre-Deposit Draft Plan. I offer the following combined comments from the Scottish Government, including those of Transport Scotland, for your consideration. Detailed comments from Transport Scotland are attached as an appendix to this letter.</p> <p>GENERAL POINTS</p> <p>The layout of the Plan is generally concise and accessible, with a clear vision for Sutherland’s future development setting the context for detailed policies. The table on page 3 is helpful in setting out clearly the Plan process.</p> <p>In terms of presentation, it would be useful to include a map of the Plan area at the beginning of the document, showing its relationship to adjoining plan areas. For ease of reference it would be helpful to use paragraph numbers throughout the General Policies chapter.</p> <p>There appears to be no explicit reference to monitoring of the Plan and its implementation, which would be expected at this stage. It is noted that additional documentation relating to monitoring may be included within or accompany future drafts of the Plan.</p>	<p>The acknowledgement of conciseness, accessibility and clarity in the Plan is welcomed. It is agreed that a map of the Plan area should be added at the beginning of the document and that paragraph numbers are required for the policies chapter. In addition it is agreed that more is required on Monitoring of the Plan; paragraph 4.39 will be expanded to include this and to discuss implementation in more detail too.</p>

Whole Policy Text WS General Comment

I hope that you find the above comments useful in developing the Plan. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss any of the points raised.

Chapter 01 G General Comment

497 RSPB

Golspie

1.0 General

The diverse natural and cultural heritage of Sutherland -its habitats, species, scenery and artefacts- is a major asset. The area supports habitats and species of international significance as well as the three categories stated in the review (local, regional & national). We suggest that recognition of these sites and species, with a view to preserving, enhancing and sustainably exploiting them, should be a core objective of the vision whilst maintaining a commitment to:

Meet the requirements of the duty under part 1 of the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 to further the conservation of biodiversity

Meet the requirements of the European Birds and Habitats Directives
Lead and facilitate the process of delivering the aims of the Highland LBAP and UK BAP'

Explicit reference will be added to the importance of Sutherland's natural heritage assets within the objectives, strategy and vision of the Plan

Chapter 02 G General Comment

326 Scottish Natural Heritage

Golspie

Thank you for your letter of 9 November 2007 inviting our comments on the Deposit Draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. Our detailed comments are included in the annexes to this letter. Many comments on the written statement take the form of recommended and-suggested modifications and additions, including some additional general policies, which we trust you will be able to incorporate in the modified plan. However for some key issues and sites, SNH is of the opinion that these merit an objection at this stage.

SNH objects to the omission from the Background Maps, and on the Proposals Map, of Search Areas for Wild Land or Remote Areas of Value for Recreation. This is viewed as a serious missed opportunity for

Noted. Comments are responded to elsewhere in respect of the relevant parts of the Plan.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 02 G General Comment	<p>Sutherland in the light of advice within NPPG 14. This objection will be reconsidered upon the inclusion of relevant maps as outlined in Annex 1.</p> <p>SNH objects to paragraph 4.43(q) which identifies 'the priority coastal ridge and hinterland areas' for wind farm development. This objection would be withdrawn if the text is amended to be non-location specific.</p> <p>SNH objects to Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage, parts 2 and 3, as currently worded. This objection would be withdrawn if the policy was amended to conform to NPPG14 and Pilot Model Policy Study (Scottish Executive, 2006).</p> <p>SNH objects to Policy 11 European Protected Species as currently worded. This objection would be withdrawn if our proposed wording is used or similar wording agreed in order that it complies with the legislation and guidance. SNH objects to site allocation H.I at Bonar Bridge (Inset Map 8.1) as currently drawn.</p> <p>SNH objects to site allocation H.2 at Point of Stoer (Inset map 10.2) as currently drawn.</p> <p>SNH objects to the inclusion of an area of the Durness Special Area of Conservation within the Settlement Development Area at the west of the village (Inset map1 3.1).</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss our objections with you, and how they can be addressed in the next stage of the Local Plan preparation. Please contact Valerie Wilson to take this forward.</p>	
Chapter 02 IC 2.06	<p>Annex 1 SUTHERLAND LOCAL PLAN DEPOSIT DRAFT -WRITTEN STATEMENT SNH COMMENTS</p> <p>Chapter 2 - Introduction and Context</p> <p>SNH recommends that section 2.6 at the beginning of the plan be</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policies 11, 12 and 13 are re-drafted and pick up on habitats. Their points are responded to elsewhere.</p>

Chapter 02 IC 2.06

strengthened to include specific reference to other relevant plans and strategies, including those of other agencies, to allow these to be considered as material considerations. This is included in the Wester Ross Local Plan (adopted June 2006) and so there is a significant inconsistency here. Whilst other plans and strategies are mentioned in a general sense in section 2.6, more details presently can only be found in the Environmental Review, and this would not be a working document once the Local Plan is adopted. It is therefore strongly recommended that a link should be made to a further appendix which lists and summarises the most significant plans and strategies which require to be taken into consideration.

These would include: Core Path Plan
 Aquaculture framework plans
 The Sutherland Local Biodiversity Action Plan
 Caithness and Sutherland Peatlands Management Strategy
 Caithness and Sutherland Landscape Character Assessment (already included as Appendix 3)
 Sutherland Landscape Capacity Study: an analysis of housing potential (SLCS)
 SNH Natural Heritage Futures documents
 In addition, further cross-references can be made by noting relevant plans and strategies in the supporting text to policies. For example, PAN 83 Masterplanning (when issued) can be added to the supporting text for Policy 18, the Sutherland LBAP can be added to the supporting text for Policies 11-13 and the SLCS can be added to the supporting text for Policies 1, 3 and 16.

497 RSPB
 Golspie

We believe it is a failing of the Deposit Draft that more comprehensive reference is not made to pertinent plans and strategies. Whilst other plans and strategies are mentioned in a general sense in section 2.6 (page 2, deposit draft), specific detail is lacking in the Deposit Draft. For example, specific reference requiring consideration of the 'Core Path Plan', 'Aquaculture Framework Plans', 'The Sutherland Local Biodiversity Action Plan', 'The Caithness and Sutherland Peatlands Management Strategy' or 'The Highland Renewable Energy Strategy

An Appendix to the Environmental Report identifies many relevant documents and will remain available as point-in-time reference list. We will include in the Plan an explicit cross-reference to it. We will also include specific reference to individual documents where it is essential for clarity in the Plan

Chapter 02 IC 2.06

and Planning Guidelines' should be made where relevant at the outset of any development proposal.

Chapter 03 G General Comment

490 The Theatres Trust
London

The Theatres Trust is a statutory body established by the Theatres Trust Act 1976 and The Theatres Trust (Scotland) Act 1978 'to promote the better protection of theatres for the benefit of the nation'. The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992, Article 15, Para I(k) sets out the requirement of all local authorities to consult the Trust before they issue a decision on any planning application involving land on which there is a theatre.

Objective 'j' in paragraph 3.4.3 of the Plan deals with local services and will be strengthened to better support provision of accessible and varied leisure and recreational facilities. Support for fragile communities is referred to elsewhere in the Plan. A new travel policy is to be added to the Plan which will promote accessibility.

Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use in the UK, or the potential for such use but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies. Due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and therefore anticipate policies relating to cultural facilities. We have read most of the documents available on the website and our comments are of a general nature but are nevertheless essential for the future well-being of the residents of Sutherland.

An objective of the Local Plan should be to protect and enhance town and village facilities and services. In order to increase participation in cultural activity and meet future community needs for cultural facilities consideration should be given to developing local facilities that combine space or resources for a range of cultural, commercial and community activities in one place.

This is especially important in villages to enable groups to have the opportunity to participate where they are excluded from, or are less able to access, mainstream services in town centres, such as younger or older people and those without access to a car. Local activities such as performance arts can promote social inclusion, bringing together existing and new communities of all ages, particularly in areas of growth, and good quality, accessible local cultural facilities are key to creating communities where people will want to live and work.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.1		
227 Mr Tom Jamieson Inverness	I note your awareness of the Forest Crofts initiative, and feel that this should be encouraged and allowed to develop before additional housing developments are considered.	The forest croft initiative is supported as one of the Plan Objectives and forms part of the overall strategy and the successful development of this initiative will provide opportunities for housing and economic development for the wider area. There is still a need, however, to meet the general needs housing requirements for the area and the settlement.
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	Forestry We thoroughly support the various supportive comments on community and crofting forestry (paras 3.4d, 4.31, 4.45i and j). We have been trying to get a scheme off the ground on the common grazings for some time but the marginal quality of the land means that, with limited funds, the grants go to better land. But Sutherland needs trees probably more than those other areas of Scotland which get the grants. We would suggest that as well as the supportive statements referred 1.0 above on forestry, action is proposed to counteract this bias against marginal areas which will always be a hindrance to forestry schemes in Sutherland. Funds should be made available and ring-fenced for marginal developments where there would be maximum benefit and visual impact.	Comments are noted. However, funding arrangements for forestry schemes are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	3.4.1 (d) - The reference to "forest crofts" here is unclear (see also 4.43(0)) - for its interests SNH would wish this to be linked to resultant opportunities for improved woodland management while at the same time having full regard to housing in the countryside policies	ADD text to Chapter 3, 3.4.1 (d) at end of paragraph add , cooperative working and effective woodland practice." It is accepted that development of forest crofts relies on effective woodland practices. The development of forest crofts is reliant on community based cooperative working.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	For sub-theme 3.4.1(a), this could be made clearer and could develop the main theme if it commenced - "Conserve and promote the uniqueness of Sutherland's natural, cultural and social heritage, including its landscape 19 The reference to "heritage" in sub-theme 3.4.1 c should be expanded to make it clearer that this relates to both the cultural and the landscape heritage.	The words "natural, built and cultural" will be inserted into 3.4.1a between "Sutherland's" and "identity", and also into 3.4.1c before the word "identity"; this will reflect wording used elsewhere in the Plan and includes landscape in its meaning.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.2		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	The promotion of opportunities for small scale community-led renewable energy developments is included in 3.4.2(h) and repeated in 4.34 under the Strategy, however, this should still be balanced with the consideration of environmental impacts, including cumulative effects. Although the spatial framework for wind farms required under SPP 6 is primarily geared to developments over 20MW generating capacity, SNH sees great merit in the Council having a spatial framework for developments of less than 20MW to guide smaller scale developments to the optimum locations and to address cumulative impacts. This would take forward the work so far carried out under the Highland Renewable Energy Strategy and Planning Guidelines (2006) where local scale schemes are defined as less than SMW capacity.	The Plan will be clarified to refer more clearly to the Highland Renewable Energy Strategy & Planning Guidelines and to the forthcoming new SPG for on-shore wind energy developments (to comply with SPP6 Annex A) and which will set out a clear spatial planning framework for both large and small scale developments, including having regard to environmental impact.
497 RSPB Golspie	It is our belief that the wording of Section 3.4.2 'Adopting a proactive approach to the wise use of the natural environment' is likely to be misleading regarding considering the environment as part of the planning process and fails to address an area where conflict already exists between mitigating or compensating environmental impacts from perceived beneficial development opportunities. The promotion of opportunities for small-scale community-led renewable energy developments for example is included in 3.4.2(h) and repeated in 4.34 under the Strategy. We understand that further planning for renewables will be taken forward soon in policy terms through the Highland-wide Local Development Plan in order that developments can be considered at the Highland rather than at the local level. We are also aware that 'The Highland Renewable Energy Strategy and Planning Guidelines' are under revision to ensure compatibility with SPP6, and we understand that there is unlikely to be any significant changes to the document regarding spatial planning guidance. Reference to the HRES in both the deposit draft and cross referenced to the Highland-wide Local Development Plan would be both appropriate and helpful as part of the planning decision making process.	As above

Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.3

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.3		
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>TS Ref.Plan Ref.Site Ref.Representation TS01Page 6 Section 3.4.3 (i) Under Section 3.4.3 (i) there is the statement: Recognise that large parts of the Sutherland community will remain car-dependent.</p> <p>This statement is considered contrary to Scottish Government Policy related to encouraging and promoting sustainable transport modes, particularly SPP 17 (Planning for Transport), PAN 75 (Planning for Transport) and SPP 3 (Planning for Housing).</p> <p>Transport Scotland is concerned that there is no clear commitment in the Plan to promoting sustainable transport modes to encourage a shift from away from private car use. The Plan does not provide a clear strategic approach to integrated land use planning as outlined in SPP 17, paragraph 35, which states that a well constructed Local Plan:</p> <p>Seeks to reduce car dependency; Seeks to maximise the mode share of sustainable travel modes (walking, cycling and public transport) compared to the share by private car; Adopts the priority/hierarchy of travel modes set down in SPP 17 as follows: walking; cycling; public transport followed by motorised modes; and Seeks to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>This point is further supported by PAN 75, paragraph 62, which states that:</p> <p>SPP17 refers to the contribution different travel modes make to sustainable personal access. In order of preference and as priorities for integrated land use and transport planning they are walking, then cycling, public transport and finally motorised modes. A variety of measures can be implemented that encourage the use of alternative modes of transport other than the car.</p> <p>Also, SPP 3, paragraph 36, states:</p> <p>Access to jobs and facilities should be carefully considered by both</p>	<p>The Plan text will be amended to reflect as follows. Given the rural nature of the Plan area, significant use of the private car can be expected to continue for many trips, particularly in the more remote and sparsely populated areas or where the population is highly dispersed. Nevertheless, through careful consideration of development proposals a greater level of sustainability can be achieved in new development in the Plan area overall, supporting sustainable travel modes. Opportunities may be taken through this to bring about accessibility improvements of wider benefit to communities, helping in their economic and social development. A new general policy and supporting text on travel will be added to provide a more robust and updated approach to sustainable travel and accessibility in advance of a fuller suite of policies in the Highland Local Development Plan. (Note: paragraph 44 of SPP3 is incorrectly quoted in the representation and SPP3 has now been revised in any case; however, the overall message is unchanged.)</p>

Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.3

planning authorities and developers. In planning the expansion of existing settlements or the development of new ones, consideration should be given to locations which can be well integrated with existing and proposed public transport, walking and cycling networks.

In addition, SPP 3, paragraph 44, states:

Meeting housing requirements through extensions to existing towns should not be considered as an integral part of the development process and the aim should be to provide opportunities for non car access before houses are occupied and patterns of travel established.

Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.5

307 Laid Grazings Committee
Loch Eriboll

Broadband
Although it is now promised by the end of this year, Laid does not have broadband - and businesses in Laid are therefore at a competitive disadvantage. A translation business for example suffers especially from the delays in transmission of long documents.
An isolated community - and the businesses therein - have a special need for up to date technology like broadband and "policies which accommodate employment generating development" para 3.4.5q on page 7. On page 21 you rightly list "Small-scale technology-based e-business springing up" - but how can that happen without technology being up to date.
We suggest that ensuring broadband be made universal throughout Sutherland should be an urgent objective of the Plan.

Broadband is indeed important and the Council is actively engaged in efforts to improve broadband in Highland. The Plan text will be amended to refer to this more explicitly, although as its achievement is largely beyond the scope of the Plan it is not appropriate as an objective.

325 HIE Caithness & Sutherland
Thurso

I would like to ask you to consider a number of issues in the later stages of the plan process.

Relating to Objective 3.4.5 Creating an improved business environment. Obviously as a development agency we support this objective and we would ask that in areas where there is either limited land identified for business and industrial development (for example Lairg and Dornoch) or no land identified (for example Bettyhill) that consideration be given to identifying areas or ensuring that areas identified for mixed use would accommodate this type of development.

We have sought to explore site options for a range of uses, including for business and industrial development, during preparation of the Plan. Some sites have been excluded as they were found to be unsuitable. However, in a number of cases we have introduced new sites. We have particularly tried to identify specific sites where the community has identified a need locally. In respect of mixed use sites, some will be suitable to accommodate such uses and we have indicated in the Plan for each site the mix that we consider as appropriate. Further, the policy framework is such that proposals may also come

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.5		forward for consideration on other, non-allocated sites with no presumption against development in many areas.
Chapter 03 PO 3.04 3.4.6 272 Mr Alexander B Mearns Rogurt	3.4.6: The need for Quality Living Environments: The planning guidelines take little account of modern design and are rigidly and anachronistically tied to 1 1/2 storey designs appropriate to the 19th century. The guidelines need to accommodate a much broader range of design solutions, and be more pro-active and encouraging eco-friendly systems of all kinds.	The Council intends to prepare house siting and design guidance which will supplement the plan. Through existing guidance on Designing for Sustainability the Council already seeks to promote energy-efficient design. The design quality and place-making policy in the Plan will be amended to mention open space as an element of places and to clarify that proposals should demonstrate sensitivity and respect for local distinctiveness, so clearly providing scope for appropriate contemporary design.
Chapter 04 G General Comment 307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>We were surprised to find that, after two detailed paragraphs on the subject in Background Paper No 2 distributed under cover of Mr Ogilvie's letter of 8th December 2005, there is no mention of the superquarry in the Local Plan. It has been explained by your services that this is a wider issue to be considered in the round and in a broader Highland context.</p> <p>We still feel that you should follow the conclusion of your own Durness Coastal Quarry Study which recommended "that no further consideration should be given to the development for aggregate use of any of the rock resources at Durness".</p> <p>Why this project is still being considered, and resources wasted on keeping it alive, despite the clear and unequivocally negative conclusions of your own study (which was accepted by the Planning Committee at that time) has never been clear to us.</p> <p>But by including it in the Structure Plan and in your Background Paper No 2 you put a planning blight on this area.</p> <p>Having made these attempts to keep this outrageous project alive, at the very least you should explain why there is no mention of what would be the biggest project in Sutherland's history in its Local Plan - and at the same time record the total opposition of Laid to this project. Your letter of May 2008 on the Council consulting again on the Subhead Local Plan was tabled and discussed at the Grazings Committee meeting of 31st May and I was asked to write to make the following</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Whilst the desire for an unequivocal position from the Council on this matter is understandable, for us to say that no superquarry development should happen Northwest Sutherland without the necessary evidence and consideration would not be a tenable position.</p> <p>Many factors can adjust over time to merit considering a similar development again such as technologies and practices altering the impacts. As mentioned in your representation an Environmental Impact Assessment would be required to help determine the suitability of any superquarry proposal.</p> <p>It is recommended that the super quarry issue is best dealt with in a strategic manner on a Highland wide basis when we progress and widely consult on a Highland Wide Local Plan. National advice suggests that Planning Authorities should consider identifying coastal exporting quarry search areas. It also says that coastal quarries may be deemed acceptable as a significant employer in a rural area where the impacts on local communities are</p>

Chapter 04 G General Comment

points.

As you know from our submission of 24th January 2008, the way the superquary was not mentioned in the final draft of the Sutherland Local Plan has always rankled with the Grazings Committee.

We were most alarmed by the two paragraphs in Sutherland Local Plan Background Paper No 2 dated November 2005 and pointed this out to you at the time.

We were totally mystified by the fact that it then received no mention whatsoever in the final draft which we commented on in our submission of 24th January 2008. And even more planned when your people, asked about this omission, said it was being held back "as a wider issue to be considered in the round in a broader Highland context" according to a note I made of a telephone conversation.

As set out in your own Highland Council Dnness Coastal Study of April 1994 the superquary would be the biggest project in Sutherland's history involving inter alia; - removal of 275 million tonnes from the limestone site @age 12)

- 235 million tonnes from the gneiss site (page 13)
- a marine terminal on Loch Eriboll of 125 acres (page 25) - a G mile conveyor belt 1.5-2.0 metres above the ground (page 19)
- 24 hour working (pages 19, 35 and 53)
- five times a week, two weeks a year blasting (page 36)
- other plant noise and vibration (pages 36 and 39)
- bulk carriers coming into Loch Eriboll with the inevitable threat of pollution (page 48)
- dust giving rise to possible health hazards (pages 29, 30 and 32)

In other words the effect on one of the most peaceful and beautiful environments in the Highlands would be disastrous and Laid itself would quite simply be wiped out as it stands at the moment.

And, as we have pointed out, a final draft Sutherland Local Plan has been compiled without any mention of the above, quite apart from carrying out an official environmental assessment which we believe is now a legal requirement before such a project is even considered far less given the detailed analysis of paragraph 3.4 of your Background Paper No 2.

Incidentally we would appreciate your confirmation of the legal position on the environmental assessment.

Since the Sutherland Local Plan is apparently being revisited from an environmental point of view, we would ask for these factors to be taken into account - and, as a result, ask for the superquarry to be eliminated

acceptable and those communities have been properly consulted. Where provision is to be identified the development plan should set out the criteria to be satisfied by quarries and their associated infrastructure.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Chapter 04 G General Comment

officially from all planning activities.
 The conclusions of your 1994 Report were clear, unequivocal, totally negative for any superquany project in this area and accepted by Highland Council Planning Committee at the time (meeting of 14/4/94).

 Yet here we are some 14 years later with the proposal first in then out of the Sutherland Local Plan but apparently still going, presumably in the hope of slipping it through "in a wider Highland context", despite f50,000 of public money being spent on proving it was a non-starter in 1994.

197 Director of Housing & Property Services Inverness	Housing Need - I would welcome discussion on the way the housing need is presented in local plans in the future.	We are liaising with Housing & Property Services about the information requirements to support the Housing Strategy and Local Development Plans in accordance with the latest methodologies set out by the Scottish Government.
--	--	---

Chapter 04 KF 4.01 & Table 1

576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>In section 4, (paragraphs 4.1-4.4), it is unclear whether the existing backlog housing need identified in Highland Council's Local Housing Strategy (LHS) has been included in the Additional Dwellings figures or is addressed elsewhere in the document. Combining the final two sentences of paragraph 4.4 would more clearly convey that the level of housing land allocated will help to deliver a higher build rate.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6 could be clearer about what criteria will be used to determine whether a site is suited to the provision of housing for varying needs or sheltered accommodation and suited to additional care home provision. This mirrors feedback given to the Council's LHS in 2007.</p>	We will add text to clarify the make-up of the figures of dwelling requirement given in the Plan. It is agreed that the final two sentences in paragraph 4.4 should be combined. We will also clarify paragraph 4.6, referring if appropriate to the Local Housing Strategy, although the paragraph is only intended to give a broad indication of locational criteria rather than setting out policy on the issue. The addition of a policy on travel, promoting accessibility, will be relevant.
--	---	--

Chapter 04 KF 4.04

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 KF 4.04		
<p>307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter of 9th November 2007 on the above and for the additional copies of the Plan you sent for the Grazings Committee.</p> <p>The Committee have had three meetings where the Sutherland Local Plan Deposit Draft was on the agenda and have invited comment from the wider Laid community, which has informed the debate. The Committee has asked me to make the following comments.</p> <p>Whereas we laud the objective of 1,300 additional dwellings in the Plan, we feel there is too much emphasis on this and not enough on how to fill these dwellings and how to improve services to them and the existing population.</p> <p>In our comments below we have tried under each heading to give the sort of concrete suggestions which we would expect to see in the Plan.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Missing from the Plan is any proposal on midges which are perhaps the biggest single deterrent for tourists. Any B&B or camp site owner will tell you this with tales of tourists booking in and out again the same evening because of midges. And of course the midges are at their worst up here in the peak tourist months of July and August. Research is being done at Edinburgh University on midges and we would suggest that the Plan contains a proposal to work with Edinburgh University to eliminate midges using a Sutherland community like ours as a trial case.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to help deliver those aspects of the Community Strategy/Plan which have land-use planning implications. The plan objectives provide a focus to the plan and help us to ensure that its individual policies and proposals are relevant and necessary so that the plan is fit for purpose. Building on the base of the plan vision the objectives and strategy are formed taking into account demographic factors. The Local Plan then allocates land for development and has a general policy framework to use to assess planning applications.</p> <p>Taking direction from the Community Strategy for Sutherland the overarching aim of the Sutherland Local Plan is 'Positively influencing population change in Sutherland to achieve, over time, a vibrant, viable and revitalised population that enjoys a high quality of life.' The plans provisions are based on a vision of maintaining a stable working age population which requires 1,304 houses over the 2008 to 2018 period.</p>

Chapter 04 KF 4.13

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 KF 4.13		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>The encouragement of job creation should perhaps be the next main priority and, although this is a constant theme of the Plan, we do not see any urgency in the proposals - or indeed any concrete proposals.</p> <p>Which brings up a third general comment. The Plan contains many admirable sentiments, and indeed little that could be objected to. But there is an lack of focus and particularly concrete proposals. In trying to be all things to all men it fails to point ways ahead except in its emphasis on housing. We agree with most of what is said but would like to see more specifics.</p> <p>Small Business We feel that Sutherland is essentially small business country and that one of the main thrusts of the Plan should be to encourage small rural businesses at all costs. This is not the case at present. One of the businesses set up in Laid in recent years is thinking of leaving because of the lack of broadband. Another is being crippled by having to pay business rates. We would suggest that top priority should be given to providing a welcoming climate for small businesses including perhaps exemption from business rates.</p>	<p>The plan seeks to provide a policy framework which enables a range of employment-generating developments to come forward, be they on sites specifically allocated for development or in other locations. The Plan cannot foresee every type of proposal that may come forward from established businesses or new entrepreneurs, but seeks to start consideration of proposals from a positive standpoint. It is agreed that small businesses are a key component. Arrangements for business rates are beyond the scope of the Local Plan. Broadband is indeed important and the Council is actively engaged in efforts to improve broadband in Highland.</p>

Chapter 04 ST 4.15		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Chapter 4 - Key Forecasts, Strategy and Vision B- Strategy An overarching aim is spelt out in paragraph 4.15 and SNH is disappointed that there is no mention of maintaining and enhancing the outstanding quality of the natural and cultural heritage of Sutherland as part of this. SNH would therefore strongly recommend the first sentence of this paragraph should be amended to - " .. and sustain the highest standard of services, while maintaining and enhancing the outstanding natural and cultural heritage of the area".</p>	<p>It is agreed that the overarching strategic aim in paragraph 4.15 should be amended but, in preference to the suggestion, the additional wording should read "while maintaining and enhancing the outstanding quality of the natural, built and cultural heritage of the area".</p>

497 RSPB Golspie	<p>An overarching aim is spelt out in paragraph 4.15 (page 13 deposit draft) and we are disappointed that there is no mention of maintaining and enhancing the outstanding quality of the natural and cultural heritage of Sutherland as part of this.</p>	<p>As above</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 ST Caring for the Heritage 4.34		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>We have suggestions also under Heritage below for the highlighting of the rich past history and monuments so that folk will stay longer in Sutherland rather than just passing through as many do at present. This should be given high priority</p> <p>Heritage Our heritage is rich and interesting but little known except by a few experts. We completely agree with para 4.34 on the need for safeguards. But there is also a need for the highlighting of the heritage both as way of maintaining it and also to show it off to tourists who drive past admiring the scenery without knowing about the deeper past. We suggest that the Plan endorses a bigger effort to highlight our heritage with the creation of Heritage Trails which would also serve as tourist attractions.</p>	It is agreed that there could be scope for more interpretation of heritage and for heritage trails to be considered; reference to these will be woven into the Plan's vision in paragraph 4.43 and 4.45.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	SNH welcomes the section 'Caring for the Heritage'. However, it is strongly recommended that the first sentence should make reference additionally to landscape. The reference to the Council's Renewable Energy Strategy and Planning Guidelines may need to be amended if this is to be revised in the light of SPP 6 and within the Highland-wide Plan.	It is agreed that the first sentence of paragraph 4.34 should be amended to include reference to landscape. The reference to HRES will be updated to refer to the current preparation of SPG to provide a new spatial planning framework for wind energy in accordance with SPP6.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>The following aspirations should be weaved into the paragraphs under "Caring for the Heritage" in the Strategy section, but failing that, they should be included in the vision under "A Place of Outstanding Heritage".</p> <p>The four National Scenic Areas wholly or partly in Sutherland - Dornoch Firth Kyle of Tongue, NW Sutherland and Assynt-Coigach - having landscapes of national importance cared for and managed to an agreed vision in consultation and partnership with communities.</p> <p>The remote and wild landscapes of Sutherland being recognised and managed for their increasing scarcity and appeal for outdoor recreation, spiritual benefits and tourism.</p> <p>The rich biodiversity of Sutherland being increasingly recognised through early work on the Local Biodiversity Action Plan and ongoing</p>	These matters are more appropriate to be woven into the Vision rather than the Strategy. Add further references to the Vision that pick up broadly on these themes: covering the recognition and management- or the contributive role- of NSAs, remote and wild landscapes (distinguishing between actual and perceived), biodiversity, coastal and marine areas, native woodlands and geodiversity.

Chapter 04 ST Caring for the Heritage 4.34

work collecting information by local biodiversity groups, and other interested parties.

Coastal and marine areas of Sutherland being looked after in an integrated way with benefits that include tourism.

Sutherland's remaining native woodlands, which include some of the most northerly examples in the UK, being increasingly valued for landscape, wildlife and their role in carbon capture.

Following on from the Geo-Park designation for NW Sutherland, the recognition of the rich geo-diversity of Sutherland and the safeguarding and promotion of this as an important part of the natural heritage of the area.

Chapter 5 - General Policies

As stated above SNH recommends that an additional policy is included to link to the plan objectives.

Chapter 04 ST Creating Prosperity 4.29

239 Dornoch Rail Link Action Group
Thurso

4.29 - We ask that recognition is given to the serious potential for rail as well as road improvements to develop the Caithness economy post - Dounreay in Paragraph 4.29, and that substantially improved rail services are vital in encouraging positive development of the Caithness economy with regard to accessibility to passengers, freight, tourism, oil/gas and sea freight development potential.

Items received by the Council from Mark Norton for Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (DorLAG), September 2007 onwards and which form part of DoRLAG's submissions on the Draft Sutherland Plan (all available for reference upon request):

- Letter dated 07/09/2007 seeking protection of the suggested route for a Dornoch Rail Link and which includes reference to correspondence and documents submitted prior to September m2007, including submissions on "Sutherland Futures" (which included route delineation mapping).

- Further letter dated 07/09/2007 which formally introduces DoRLAG

For Strategic Transport Projects, we received requests that Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link should be the subjects of route safeguarding in this Local Plan. In particular, in respect of the rail link we received a representation from the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group, submitting information about the route which the Group is promoting and a copy of its Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance- STAG1 (modified) study. The route conflicts with certain development land allocations in the Draft Local Plan. The Group has also made representations on National Planning Framework 2 (NPF2) and considers that the link, in bringing about savings in journey times and in serving Dornoch, would enable the Far North Line to develop the Caithness and Sutherland economy post Dounreay. We have received a number of other representations from individuals and organisations, supporting the Group's proposal.

On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to-

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 ST Creating Prosperity 4.29	<p>and appends a note of its specific reasons for the Dornoch Rail Link construction and reasons for retention of the Lairg section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter dated 21/01/2008 and enclosed documents "Executive Summary of the modified STAG 1 appraisal of the Dornoch Rail Link" and "Dornoch Rail Link Study" (engineered feasibility study). - Objection form received 30/01/2008 setting out objections to paragraphs 4.29, 4.32 and 4.44 of the Draft Local Plan. - Letter received 20/01/2008 and enclosed document: "STAG 1 Appraisal-Dornoch Rail Link and the far North of Scotland" - Letter dated 14/02/2008 supplying electronic copies of large documents previously submitted in paper format. 	<p>Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. They are not currently committed to by Transport Scotland and the strategy of this Local Plan is not critically dependent upon them. The importance of the strategic road and rail network to the economic well-being of the region has been voiced by the Council and others in response to the NPF2 consultation. The outcomes of that and of the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) are awaited. In the interim the Local Plan should be amended to provide more information on background and status for each project and to refer to processes that would be required to be followed in order to progress them. The forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan will provide a pan-Highland context for considering transport issues, the outcomes of NPF2 preparation and the STPR.</p> <p>Safeguarding routes which are not committed to (about which there is not sufficient certainty in terms of delivery) could cause significant planning blight for property along the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided, by not safeguarding such routes. Settlement Development Boundaries in east Sutherland have been drawn tightly around the existing built up areas and the sites specifically allocated for development. The policy framework for consideration of development proposals within and outwith the SDAs is such that whilst there may in some instances be scope for development outwith, generally that would not be intensive development. Therefore the amount of additional constraint placed on any future transport route selection would be less where it is outwith the SDA rather than within it.</p> <p>In terms of the allocations of land for new development at Dornoch and to a lesser extent at Embo, a route safeguard would introduce a significant additional constraint upon the design and layout of development. The proposed developments as currently within the Plan</p>

Chapter 04 ST Creating Prosperity 4.29

represent opportunities for well-planned extensions of the settlements and that at Dornoch North is already identified within the current adopted Local Plan for the area. In the context of a rail link, the attractiveness in principle of providing a rail station at Dornoch close to the centre of the settlement is understood; however, doing so increases the adverse impact on property. The Dornoch Rail Link Action Group has followed good practice in preparing documentation in line with the STAG approach; however, further work would need to be undertaken and the scheme would need to receive support from the Scottish Government in order for the possibility of route safeguarding to be considered further.

At this time the Local Plan must have regard to the HITRANS Strategy and the priorities identified within it. It must also have regard to the Local Transport Strategy, which is under review, and we have referred to the Sutherland Partnership's Transport Vision. A variety of transport provisions will be appropriate to improve accessibility across the Sutherland area. Preparation of the Highland Local Development Plan will provide opportunity to review current transport policies of the Structure Plan in the light of the STPR, the new Local Transport Strategy, NPF2 and any further evidence on regional issues and specific schemes.

Chapter 04 ST Regenerating Communities 4.19

576 The Scottish Government
Edinburgh

The use in paragraph 4.25 of the term coincidentally is confusing to the reader. It appears to be used because both the figures for the county's population and where new homes are being built are the same, at 60%, rather than it being coincidental as to where development has occurred. This could be made clearer.

The text may be amended for clarity by deleting the word "coincidentally" from paragraph 4.25.

Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.32

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.32		
<p>239 Dornoch Rail Link Action Group Thurso</p>	<p>4.32 - the Dornoch - Golspie - Brora potential for larger scale development could be greatly magnified by the provision of a rail service greatly improved by the implementation of the Dornoch Rail Link, as discussed in the Stage 2 study attached. We also ask that definite protection is given to the route for a Dornoch Rail Link, to complement our earlier representations on this scheme.</p> <p>Items received by the Council from Mark Norton for Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (DorLAG), September 2007 onwards and which form part of DoRLAG's submissions on the Draft Sutherland Plan (all available for reference upon request):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter dated 07/09/2007 seeking protection of the suggested route for a Dornoch Rail Link and which includes reference to correspondence and documents submitted prior to September m2007, including submissions on "Sutherland Futures" (which included route delineation mapping). - Further letter dated 07/09/2007 which formally introduces DoRLAG and appends a note of its specific reasons for the Dornoch Rail Link construction and reasons for retention of the Lairg section. - Letter dated 21/01/2008 and enclosed documents "Executive Summary of the modified STAG 1 appraisal of the Dornoch Rail Link" and "Dornoch Rail Link Study" (engineered feasibility study). - Objection form received 30/01/2008 setting out objections to paragraphs 4.29, 4.32 and 4.44 of the Draft Local Plan. - Letter received 20/01/2008 and enclosed document: "STAG 1 Appraisal-Dornoch Rail Link and the far North of Scotland" - Letter dated 14/02/2008 supplying electronic copies of large documents previously submitted in paper format. 	<p>For Strategic Transport Projects, we received requests that Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link should be the subjects of route safeguarding in this Local Plan. In particular, in respect of the rail link we received a representation from the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group, submitting information about the route which the Group is promoting and a copy of its Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance- STAG1 (modified) study. The route conflicts with certain development land allocations in the Draft Local Plan. The Group has also made representations on National Planning Framework 2 (NPF2) and considers that the link, in bringing about savings in journey times and in serving Dornoch, would enable the Far North Line to develop the Caithness and Sutherland economy post Dounreay. We have received a number of other representations from individuals and organisations, supporting the Group's proposal.</p> <p>On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to- Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. They are not currently committed to by Transport Scotland and the strategy of this Local Plan is not critically dependent upon them. The importance of the strategic road and rail network to the economic well-being of the region has been voiced by the Council and others in response to the NPF2 consultation. The outcomes of that and of the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) are awaited. In the interim the Local Plan should be amended to provide more information on background and status for each project and to refer to processes that would be required to be followed in order to progress them. The forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan will provide a pan-Highland context for considering transport issues, the outcomes of NPF2 preparation and the STPR.</p> <p>Safeguarding routes which are not committed to (about which there is not sufficient certainty in terms of delivery) could cause significant planning blight for property along</p>

Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.32

the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided, by not safeguarding such routes. Settlement Development Boundaries in east Sutherland have been drawn tightly around the existing built up areas and the sites specifically allocated for development. The policy framework for consideration of development proposals within and outwith the SDAs is such that whilst there may in some instances be scope for development outwith, generally that would not be intensive development. Therefore the amount of additional constraint placed on any future transport route selection would be less where it is outwith the SDA rather than within it.

In terms of the allocations of land for new development at Dornoch and to a lesser extent at Embo, a route safeguard would introduce a significant additional constraint upon the design and layout of development. The proposed developments as currently within the Plan represent opportunities for well-planned extensions of the settlements and that at Dornoch North is already identified within the current adopted Local Plan for the area. In the context of a rail link, the attractiveness in principle of providing a rail station at Dornoch close to the centre of the settlement is understood; however, doing so increases the adverse impact on property. The Dornoch Rail Link Action Group has followed good practice in preparing documentation in line with the STAG approach; however, further work would need to be undertaken and the scheme would need to receive support from the Scottish Government in order for the possibility of route safeguarding to be considered further.

At this time the Local Plan must have regard to the HITRANS Strategy and the priorities identified within it. It must also have regard to the Local Transport Strategy, which is under review, and we have referred to the Sutherland Partnership's Transport Vision. A variety of transport provisions will be appropriate to improve accessibility across the Sutherland area. Preparation of

Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.32

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.32		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>We feel that there should be much more emphasis on job creation and services - if we get these right the houses will follow.</p> <p>But the balance in places like Laid where the problem of services risks outweighing the other attractions is not addressed in the Plan. And there is little point in forecasting additional housing unless the services are there which is not the case at present for Laid. We have several suggestions in that respect.</p> <p>We will return to job creation later but services do not receive nearly enough attention in the Plan. Here in Laid the only service which has shown any improvement over the last years is the electricity supply where big advances have been made in ensuring a regular uninterrupted supply. All other services have either deteriorated (water, library, transport, road maintenance) or failed to keep up with improvements elsewhere (roads, telephone, care of the elderly, police, fire). This is in a township which has more than tripled the number of resident households over the last fifteen years - and is still growing - and which can therefore be said to be expanding. You give as a Strategic Objective on page 5 "Confident & thriving settlements". Laid is thriving but how can we be confident when the three emergency services are all a very minimum of half an hour away and such services as we have in Laid are deteriorating?</p> <p>We feel that improvement in services in small communities must be addressed as a matter of absolute priority otherwise people will just leave.</p> <p>Fire protection</p> <p>We heartily endorse the sentiment in para 4.38 on page 19 about the deficiencies in services being "addressed and the quality and accessibility of services improved where necessary".</p> <p>As we have already said, all our services in Laid have deteriorated over</p>	<p>the Highland Local Development Plan will provide opportunity to review current transport policies of the Structure Plan in the light of the STPR, the new Local Transport Strategy, NPF2 and any further evidence on regional issues and specific schemes.</p> <p>The challenge of effective service delivery in rural areas is acknowledged. The various services and organisations responsible for delivering particular services have to plan how best to manage their resources and invest in improvements. In preparing the Local Plan we have consulted widely, to enable these organisations to input to Plan preparation and to have regard to the Plan in preparing their own plans and strategies. This is part of effective community planning. The Local Plan does seek to deliver development which is sustainable and to support fragile communities. On the issue of care for the elderly, the Plan must provide for the consequences of other policies and strategies of the Council and other organisations in terms of how the need for facilities is to be responded to, hence the specific reference in the Plan to Migdale. Also the general policy framework of the Plan is such that if other solutions to provision are chosen in the future, the Plan provides a basis for the consideration of proposals without having tried to foresee every eventuality and be prescriptive.</p>

Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.32

recent years and continue to do so.

Fire protection is perhaps an exception in that recent improvements have been introduced for which we are grateful. But Laid still has no fire hydrants and this is a major worry for households in the township.

Care for the elderly

There are various references to the ageing of the Sutherland population and we agree that this is a trend likely to continue.

We also agree with the objective in para 4.42j on page 20 about "most communities well equipped with health/day facilities".

But our community which is part of Durness parish has no day care facilities and the elderly have to travel to Tongue of Kinlochbervie for this. This is something which should be addressed in the Plan. Furthermore we would strongly suggest that the aim of the Plan should be for the elderly to go into care in their own communities when they can no longer cope at home. The aim therefore should be for day care and residential care to be available near to their home community and in this respect any investment in Migdale (para 4.32 page 17) makes no sense to us. Certainly they should have their own residential care facility for Bonar Bridge but to try and centralise residential care there for Sutherland with old folk being taken out of their own communities to pass their last days there, is wrong especially as there is no public transport. And money spent on centralising services in Migdale will automatically detract from money spent in their own communities which is where the elderly must be cared.

Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.33

307 Laid Grazings Committee
Loch Eriboll

Water

Here in Laid, which has twenty one houses, we have just had £1 million spent on upgrading our water supply (which we did not ask for) "to European standards" as we were told.

Since the scheme was completed some two years ago the water has been undrinkable for much of the time and we now have a Highland township where most of the houses either have installed a filter system or use bottled water and the problems continue with surges of chlorine coming through regularly.

We would therefore strongly disagree with the statement on page 18 para 4.33 "First time water and drainage facilities have been installed in most communities" since our community does not feel that we have

We note your concerns about water quality. It is for Scottish Water to consider any outstanding concerns about quality following the recent investment made and to derive the benefit intended by that investment. It is implicit that such investment in services should bring about improvement rather than degradation and it is not necessary to require this specifically in the Plan.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 ST Supporting Communities 4.33		
	<p>proper water despite the £1 million spent.</p> <p>We would suggest that the rider that the water should be drinkable be added to para 4.44e on page 23 and that an accountability for Scottish Water to provide untainted water should be included in the Plan.</p> <p>There is another point here which is important to note for the Plan. £1 million has been spent to foul up the water supply to 21 houses in a township where virtually all other services are either completely missing or deteriorating. What could have been achieved for Laid if that £1 million had been spent on broadband, fire protection, roads, library, fare for the elderly, etc?</p> <p>We would suggest that the Plan should include some sort of verification process to check that money has been properly spent.</p>	
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>In relation to housing, in paragraph 4.33 this highlights some of the main infrastructure issues being faced in the Sutherland Area. Clearly then the Council's process of regularly monitoring and reviewing the effectiveness of housing land will be an important element towards ensuring that local infrastructure issues can be resolved and whether the Local Plan can be delivered in the timescales involved.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The section of the Plan on monitoring will be amended and added to, having regard to these issues.</p>
Chapter 04 ST Sustainable Services 4.38		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>Library</p> <p>The visit of the mobile library is another of the lifelines for a rural community and indeed one of the few real services which Laid receives more or less on the same basis as other places.</p> <p>When a £200,000 cut had to be made from the Library Service budget in 2006, the frequency of visits was reduced from fortnightly to three-weekly. Other cuts which were made hit Newtonmore, Applecross and Portmahomack - in other words the cuts were exclusively made to services to rural areas.</p> <p>This sort of reduction in our services is deeply resented especially when we hear of £250,000 being spent on a fireworks display in Inverness.</p> <p>We suggest that para 4.38 on page 19 be modified to put the accent on services to rural communities which, as we have already said, are being eroded where they exist at all. We pay the same council tax as anyone else but receive very few services.</p> <p>Alternatively the Plan could investigate a council tax system whereby the tax was geared to services received. But the Plan in its present</p>	<p>The Plan already acknowledges the rural service issues. It also seeks to support fragile communities and references to that will be strengthened. Arrangements for local taxation are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.</p>

Chapter 04 ST Sustainable Services 4.38

form treats everyone in Sutherland as if they were receiving the same services which is patently untrue.

Chapter 04 V 4.42

307 Laid Grazings Committee
Loch Eriboll

Education
We completely agree with para 4.42k on page 20 (except that again "k" is a low priority for education) and one of our new arrivals pays tribute to the standards at Durness Primary School and Kinlochbervie Secondary School. We would have thought however that more thought should be given in the Plan on how to maintain such establishments with an ageing population.
For swimming though they have to undertake a round trip of two hours to Bettyhill and we would suggest that a swimming pool for north west Sutherland be included in the Plan.

The items listed in the vision are not in any particular order of priority. In terms of provisions for key education and leisure facilities in the Plan area, the Plan needs to respond to other plans and strategies which determine the key investments to be made. We are working closely with ECS to achieve a common understanding of the implications of population change for future services and facilities across the Highlands.

Chapter 04 V 4.43

307 Laid Grazings Committee
Loch Eriboll

Fishing
Fishing has always been an integral part of the Sutherland coastal economy but receives only passing mention.
Loch Eriboll was traditionally fished by the crofters to allow them to survive and more recently has sustained prawn and lobster businesses.
The loch is now fished out for these traditional species due to over-fishing. The water remains however top quality and we have a salmon farm. Also currently Mussel and oyster farms are growing up.
Is this the best use of the loch? If so, how far should it go? What other species could be farmed in the loch? Nobody is sure but the loch remains, as it always was, a potential economic asset.
We suggest that real planning should go into such questions which were not addressed in the Loch Eriboll Aquaculture Plan of some years ago.
Also a regulatory framework is needed to prevent the over-fishing of the past.

No Change

The Loch Eriboll aquaculture framework plan provides greater detail and more specific advice than the Sutherland Local Plan does. It is used as supplementary planning guidance material to inform the determination of marine fish farming applications and appeals. When these applications are considered the compatibility of proposals with the general policies and the impact upon the natural and cultural heritage features identified in the Sutherland Local Plan will however form part of the decision making.

Fishing is an integral part of the economy for Sutherland and it is acknowledged in the Local Plan that the economy relies more heavily on the primary sector and that 'the natural resources industries also play an important part in the economic, social and cultural life of Sutherland.'

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.43		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>Tourism</p> <p>On page 21 para 4.43 tourism comes in at "k" on the list., i.e. in 11th place.</p> <p>Tourism must be one of the biggest industries in Sutherland and the potential for the future is even greater as more folk want to enjoy the sort of beauty, peace and space which we have.</p> <p>We would suggest that tourism be put as the top priority for the Plan both in terms of retaining these qualities and creating employment.</p> <p>Here we would suggest that the dead hand of the Scottish Tourist Board be taken away and, for instance, tourist offices be allowed to give out the full list of accommodation and services in an area and not just the ones registered with the Board.</p> <p>We would also suggest that more attention be devoted. In the Plan on how to alleviate the seasonal nature of tourism - e.g. out of season events such as the Cape Wrath Challenge and the John Lennon Festival recently held in Durness.</p>	<p>The importance of tourism to the area is acknowledged in the Plan. The items listed in the vision are not in any particular order of priority. Again, some of the matters referred to are beyond the scope of the Local Plan; other strategies and plans for tourism would need to address them.</p>
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Vision</p> <p>At p22, bullet q, only on-shore wind farms are mentioned, there is no reference to other renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>Under section 4.43 of the Vision A Competitive Place" in relation to wind farms being sited in the coastal ridge, I would have expected to see come caveat here in terms of minimising the impact on the landscape and wider environmental considerations. I appreciate that this is picked up elsewhere in the Plan, but think it would benefit from clarity here.</p>	<p>Delete all locational guidance for on-shore wind farms but retain support in principle references. Add clearer cross references to Highland Renewable Energy Strategy and proposed future supplementary guidance to supersede on-shore wind guidance. Retain specific area references relating to potential timber processing and fishery diversification; they are appropriate for the vision as setting out potential developing roles of sub-areas based on current characteristics and future opportunities, for example associated with lochs, harbours or the railway.</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity will be a key consideration within new supplementary planning guidance dealing with on-shore wind energy proposals, which the Council has begun to prepare.</p>
497 RSPB Golspie	<p>We believe specific reference to areas within the plan regarding timber processing, wind farm development and fishery diversification (Section 4.43 subsections, h, j & q, pages 21 & 22 deposit draft) to be misleading as they may be deemed preferential. We believe such reference should be removed from the deposit draft, and would again welcome reference to other strategies as outlined in 2.0 above to guide</p>	<p>As above</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.43		
	appropriate location.	
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	Wind farms We support the idea of wind farms exporting to the National Grid (para 4.43q on page 22). There are many areas in Sutherland where wind farms could be accommodated without scarring the landscape. We would however suggest that transmission lines be buried in line with preserving our outstanding landscape (see below).	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	SNH objects to paragraph 4.43(q), as currently worded and recommends that this be changed to be non-location specific in respect of windfarms. To identify the "coastal ridge" as a priority area, even in the "vision" section of the plan, would raise significant landscape and visual issues and conflict with an AGLV. Similarly the "hinterland areas" may coincide with AGLVs or areas yet to be identified for their wild land qualities. Reference could instead be made here to a spatial strategy helping to guide windfarms to the most appropriate locations, including smaller scale community schemes as set out above.	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	C -Vision SNH welcomes paragraph 4.43(k) with regard to tourism, leisure and recreation based on the natural and cultural heritage helping to make Sutherland a competitive economy. Specific references could be added here to the Geo-Park and to the experience of wildness that certain parts of Sutherland offer.	Add further references to the Vision that pick up broadly on this theme: covering the role of the Geopark and of the experience of 'wildness' (distinguishing between actual and perceived) in contributing to the economy through leisure, recreation and tourism.
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	Transport This is critical for rural Sutherland and we agree with the remarks at the end of para 4.32 which are just as applicable to us as to the "sparsely populated interior". But the Plan does not go beyond some well meaning statements. Most of Sutherland will never be able to justify normal bus services as set out in para 4.44b on page 22. On the other hand the postbus is ideally suited to carrying small numbers of passengers more or less anywhere. The withdrawal of the post bus in our area has been a blow not only for some residents who do not have access to a car but also to visitors.	A policy on Travel will be added to the Plan. This will play a key part in seeking to improve accessibility for communities, although necessarily it's scope is limited to that of the Local Plan in considering what can be achieved as part of proposals for new development. The Council is currently reviewing its Local Transport Strategy which may provide opportunity for consideration of other schemes and to reflect on the Sutherland Partnership's "Transport Vision".

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44	<p>We would suggest that the Plan envisages not only a halt in the elimination of the post bus service but also the restoration of the previous network and its expansion.</p> <p>Royal Mail should be given financial support and incentives for this with the money currently being wasted on trying to run bus services which are just not being used (e.g. the summer bus between Tongue and Durness).</p> <p>Also the Plan should specifically support the "Dial-a-Bus" service which is another greatly appreciated service.</p>	
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>Roads</p> <p>Whereas we have no objections to the A9 improvement schemes (para 4.44a on page 22) we would ask for much more importance to be given to para d of that same section.</p> <p>No improvement has been made to our local roads in living memory and there are many small improvements which could be made at small expense - for example improving the sight line on blind corners, extending passing places - and which need to be put up the priority list. We would suggest such minor improvements be given top priority.</p> <p>There is also the matter of drainage of tile road through the village. This has been allowed to deteriorate over recent years with the result. That several crofts in the village suffer from large quantities of surface water off the road coming down them.</p> <p>We would suggest that the section 14 on page 38 on Surface Water Drainage be modified to include existing roads as well as "new developments".</p>	<p>The significance of road maintenance and minor improvements is acknowledged. However, it will be for the new Local Transport Strategy to set priorities for investment in these. Concerns about drainage of roads is noted; however, the Local Plan's purpose is to deal specifically with proposals for new development and the change suggested for page 38 is therefore rejected.</p>
491 Orkney Islands Council Kirkwall	<p>From the considered assessment as part of the development of the Regional Transport Strategy, it was concluded that the priority for the A9 North Corridor (encompassing road, rail, bus-based public transport) should comprise works at Conon Bridge and speed enhancement measures on the existing alignment of the Far North Rail Line, together with the delivery of a Route Action Plan approach on the A9 North road to provide climbing lanes and other improvements (including by-passes) to reduce the average journey time on the road journey by up to 30 minutes. The Orkney Islands Council supports these recommendations from the Regional Transport Strategy, recommending that these should be reflected in the Sutherland Local Plan.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Plan should more closely reflect the recommendations of the HITRANS Strategy, unless it is overtaken by considerations carrying substantial weight (such as significant outcomes from the on-going Strategic Transport Projects Review).</p> <p>For Strategic Transport Projects, we received requests that Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link should be the subjects of route safeguarding in this Local Plan. In particular, in respect of the rail link we received a representation from the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group,</p>

Chapter 04 V 4.44

submitting information about the route which the Group is promoting and a copy of its Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance- STAG1 (modified) study. The route conflicts with certain development land allocations in the Draft Local Plan. The Group has also made representations on National Planning Framework 2 (NPF2) and considers that the link, in bringing about savings in journey times and in serving Dornoch, would enable the Far North Line to develop the Caithness and Sutherland economy post Dounreay. We have received a number of other representations from individuals and organisations, supporting the Group's proposal.

On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to- Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. They are not currently committed to by Transport Scotland and the strategy of this Local Plan is not critically dependent upon them. The importance of the strategic road and rail network to the economic well-being of the region has been voiced by the Council and others in response to the NPF2 consultation. The outcomes of that and of the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) are awaited. In the interim the Local Plan should be amended to provide more information on background and status for each project and to refer to processes that would be required to be followed in order to progress them. The forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan will provide a pan-Highland context for considering transport issues, the outcomes of NPF2 preparation and the STPR.

Safeguarding routes which are not committed to (about which there is not sufficient certainty in terms of delivery) could cause significant planning blight for property along the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided, by not safeguarding such routes. Settlement Development Boundaries in east Sutherland have been drawn tightly around the existing built up areas and the sites specifically allocated for

Chapter 04 V 4.44

development. The policy framework for consideration of development proposals within and outwith the SDAs is such that whilst there may in some instances be scope for development outwith, generally that would not be intensive development. Therefore the amount of additional constraint placed on any future transport route selection would be less where it is outwith the SDA rather than within it.

In terms of the allocations of land for new development at Dornoch and to a lesser extent at Embo, a route safeguard would introduce a significant additional constraint upon the design and layout of development. The proposed developments as currently within the Plan represent opportunities for well-planned extensions of the settlements and that at Dornoch North is already identified within the current adopted Local Plan for the area. In the context of a rail link, the attractiveness in principle of providing a rail station at Dornoch close to the centre of the settlement is understood; however, doing so increases the adverse impact on property. The Dornoch Rail Link Action Group has followed good practice in preparing documentation in line with the STAG approach; however, further work would need to be undertaken and the scheme would need to receive support from the Scottish Government in order for the possibility of route safeguarding to be considered further.

At this time the Local Plan must have regard to the HITRANS Strategy and the priorities identified within it. It must also have regard to the Local Transport Strategy, which is under review, and we have referred to the Sutherland Partnership's Transport Vision. A variety of transport provisions will be appropriate to improve accessibility across the Sutherland area. Preparation of the Highland Local Development Plan will provide opportunity to review current transport policies of the Structure Plan in the light of the STPR, the new Local Transport Strategy, NPF2 and any further evidence on regional issues and specific schemes.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>4.44 c) - Reference to a possible Dornoch Firth Rail Link and possible protection of a route in a future Local Development Plan will need to have been preceded if necessary by an appropriate assessment with regard to likely significant effects on the Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection Area embracing the Dornoch Firth</p> <p>4.44 (e) and (f) - Paragraph 4.44(e) regarding water and waste-water treatment looks more appropriately placed under "a regenerating place" and para</p> <p>4.44(f) regarding renewable technologies looks more appropriately placed under "a competitive place" rather than them being under "a connected and accessible place"</p>	<p>Reject suggested changes to the location of paragraph 4.44 'e' and 'f' within the report; whilst there is some overlap between the themes of the vision, the theme "A Connected and Accessible Place" is intended to include connection to utilities infrastructure generally and is not limited to transport infrastructure connections.</p> <p>For Strategic Transport Projects, we received requests that Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link should be the subjects of route safeguarding in this Local Plan. In particular, in respect of the rail link we received a representation from the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group, submitting information about the route which the Group is promoting and a copy of its Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance- STAG1 (modified) study. The route conflicts with certain development land allocations in the Draft Local Plan. The Group has also made representations on National Planning Framework 2 (NPF2) and considers that the link, in bringing about savings in journey times and in serving Dornoch, would enable the Far North Line to develop the Caithness and Sutherland economy post Dounreay. We have received a number of other representations from individuals and organisations, supporting the Group's proposal.</p> <p>On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to- Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. They are not currently committed to by Transport Scotland and the strategy of this Local Plan is not critically dependent upon them. The importance of the strategic road and rail network to the economic well-being of the region has been voiced by the Council and others in response to the NPF2 consultation. The outcomes of that and of the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) are awaited. In the interim the Local Plan should be amended to provide more information on background and status for each project and to refer to processes that would be</p>

Chapter 04 V 4.44

required to be followed in order to progress them. The forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan will provide a pan-Highland context for considering transport issues, the outcomes of NPF2 preparation and the STPR.

Safeguarding routes which are not committed to (about which there is not sufficient certainty in terms of delivery) could cause significant planning blight for property along the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided, by not safeguarding such routes. Settlement Development Boundaries in east Sutherland have been drawn tightly around the existing built up areas and the sites specifically allocated for development. The policy framework for consideration of development proposals within and outwith the SDAs is such that whilst there may in some instances be scope for development outwith, generally that would not be intensive development. Therefore the amount of additional constraint placed on any future transport route selection would be less where it is outwith the SDA rather than within it.

In terms of the allocations of land for new development at Dornoch and to a lesser extent at Embo, a route safeguard would introduce a significant additional constraint upon the design and layout of development. The proposed developments as currently within the Plan represent opportunities for well-planned extensions of the settlements and that at Dornoch North is already identified within the current adopted Local Plan for the area. In the context of a rail link, the attractiveness in principle of providing a rail station at Dornoch close to the centre of the settlement is understood; however, doing so increases the adverse impact on property. The Dornoch Rail Link Action Group has followed good practice in preparing documentation in line with the STAG approach; however, further work would need to be undertaken and the scheme would need to receive support from the Scottish Government in order for the possibility of route safeguarding to be considered further.

Chapter 04 V 4.44

At this time the Local Plan must have regard to the HITRANS Strategy and the priorities identified within it. It must also have regard to the Local Transport Strategy, which is under review, and we have referred to the Sutherland Partnership's Transport Vision. A variety of transport provisions will be appropriate to improve accessibility across the Sutherland area. Preparation of the Highland Local Development Plan will provide opportunity to review current transport policies of the Structure Plan in the light of the STPR, the new Local Transport Strategy, NPF2 and any further evidence on regional issues and specific schemes.

327 Mr Donald MacKintosh
Halkirk

The paragraph should surely be altered to include Golspie, Brora and Helmsdale.

It is not appropriate to include Golspie, Brora and Helmsdale in the reference to Invernet rail commuter services. Such a service would be dependent upon the Dornoch Rail Link. The Link does not currently feature in the Scottish Government's list of projects and the Plan does not foresee the Link coming forward, if it were to, and being operational within the period which is the subject of the Plan's vision.

For Strategic Transport Projects, we received requests that Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link should be the subjects of route safeguarding in this Local Plan. In particular, in respect of the rail link we received a representation from the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group, submitting information about the route which the Group is promoting and a copy of its Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance- STAG1 (modified) study. The route conflicts with certain development land allocations in the Draft Local Plan. The Group has also made representations on National Planning Framework 2 (NPF2) and considers that the link, in bringing about savings in journey times and in serving Dornoch, would enable the Far North Line to develop the Caithness and Sutherland economy post Dounreay. We have received a number of other representations from individuals and organisations,

Chapter 04 V 4.44

supporting the Group's proposal.

On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to- Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. They are not currently committed to by Transport Scotland and the strategy of this Local Plan is not critically dependent upon them. The importance of the strategic road and rail network to the economic well-being of the region has been voiced by the Council and others in response to the NPF2 consultation. The outcomes of that and of the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) are awaited. In the interim the Local Plan should be amended to provide more information on background and status for each project and to refer to processes that would be required to be followed in order to progress them. The forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan will provide a pan-Highland context for considering transport issues, the outcomes of NPF2 preparation and the STPR.

Safeguarding routes which are not committed to (about which there is not sufficient certainty in terms of delivery) could cause significant planning blight for property along the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided, by not safeguarding such routes. Settlement Development Boundaries in east Sutherland have been drawn tightly around the existing built up areas and the sites specifically allocated for development. The policy framework for consideration of development proposals within and outwith the SDAs is such that whilst there may in some instances be scope for development outwith, generally that would not be intensive development. Therefore the amount of additional constraint placed on any future transport route selection would be less where it is outwith the SDA rather than within it.

In terms of the allocations of land for new development at Dornoch and to a lesser extent at Embo, a route

Chapter 04 V 4.44

safeguard would introduce a significant additional constraint upon the design and layout of development. The proposed developments as currently within the Plan represent opportunities for well-planned extensions of the settlements and that at Dornoch North is already identified within the current adopted Local Plan for the area. In the context of a rail link, the attractiveness in principle of providing a rail station at Dornoch close to the centre of the settlement is understood; however, doing so increases the adverse impact on property. The Dornoch Rail Link Action Group has followed good practice in preparing documentation in line with the STAG approach; however, further work would need to be undertaken and the scheme would need to receive support from the Scottish Government in order for the possibility of route safeguarding to be considered further.

At this time the Local Plan must have regard to the HITRANS Strategy and the priorities identified within it. It must also have regard to the Local Transport Strategy, which is under review, and we have referred to the Sutherland Partnership's Transport Vision. A variety of transport provisions will be appropriate to improve accessibility across the Sutherland area. Preparation of the Highland Local Development Plan will provide opportunity to review current transport policies of the Structure Plan in the light of the STPR, the new Local Transport Strategy, NPF2 and any further evidence on regional issues and specific schemes.

239 Dornoch Rail Link Action Group
Thurso

I am writing with regard to the Pre-Deposit Draft Local Plan for Sutherland, as published in May 2008, on behalf of the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group. This is in support of the representations we have made on the 14th December 2006, 7th September 2007 and 21st January this year to the Highland Council on the necessity to protect the route of the Dornoch Rail Link, as delineated in the document submitted to the Council on the 21st January, from development as far as reasonably practicable.

For Strategic Transport Projects, we received requests that Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link should be the subjects of route safeguarding in this Local Plan. In particular, in respect of the rail link we received a representation from the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group, submitting information about the route which the Group is promoting and a copy of its Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance- STAG1 (modified) study. The route conflicts with certain development land allocations in the Draft

Chapter 04 V 4.44

We note the addition of the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Report submitted with the Plan for consideration along with the Sutherland Local Plan. We nevertheless wish to reemphasise the critically important strategic necessity for major rail upgrades for the Far North as a whole, as stated in our letters previously, which emphasises the importance of protection of the route.

With regard to general environmental issues, we recognise that the proposed route could have an impact on the environmentally sensitive areas in the Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet nature reserves, and I should state that we are in contact with the Scottish Natural Heritage, Scottish Wildlife Trust and Sutherland Estates on this matter. In regard to the environmental benefits of the rail link, this would have recognised benefits from the point of view of reducing carbon emissions from both private and commercial road transport, as well as reducing traffic congestion and increasing road safety. We are also seeking to revisit this issue with regard to the environmental impact of this corridor as part of the STAG 2 study we are seeking to carry out. All efforts will be made to ameliorate any recognised negative environmental impacts, and maximise positive impacts, in further work planned for this scheme.

Please feel free to contact me on the heading address or phone number, or call me on my mobile of 0770-970-91 11 if you require further clarification.

Local Plan. The Group has also made representations on National Planning Framework 2 (NPF2) and considers that the link, in bringing about savings in journey times and in serving Dornoch, would enable the Far North Line to develop the Caithness and Sutherland economy post Dounreay. We have received a number of other representations from individuals and organisations, supporting the Group's proposal.

On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to- Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. They are not currently committed to by Transport Scotland and the strategy of this Local Plan is not critically dependent upon them. The importance of the strategic road and rail network to the economic well-being of the region has been voiced by the Council and others in response to the NPF2 consultation. The outcomes of that and of the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) are awaited. In the interim the Local Plan should be amended to provide more information on background and status for each project and to refer to processes that would be required to be followed in order to progress them. The forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan will provide a pan-Highland context for considering transport issues, the outcomes of NPF2 preparation and the STPR.

Safeguarding routes which are not committed to (about which there is not sufficient certainty in terms of delivery) could cause significant planning blight for property along the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided, by not safeguarding such routes. Settlement Development Boundaries in east Sutherland have been drawn tightly around the existing built up areas and the sites specifically allocated for development. The policy framework for consideration of development proposals within and outwith the SDAs is such that whilst there may in some instances be scope for development outwith, generally that would not be

Chapter 04 V 4.44

intensive development. Therefore the amount of additional constraint placed on any future transport route selection would be less where it is outwith the SDA rather than within it.

In terms of the allocations of land for new development at Dornoch and to a lesser extent at Embo, a route safeguard would introduce a significant additional constraint upon the design and layout of development. The proposed developments as currently within the Plan represent opportunities for well-planned extensions of the settlements and that at Dornoch North is already identified within the current adopted Local Plan for the area. In the context of a rail link, the attractiveness in principle of providing a rail station at Dornoch close to the centre of the settlement is understood; however, doing so increases the adverse impact on property. The Dornoch Rail Link Action Group has followed good practice in preparing documentation in line with the STAG approach; however, further work would need to be undertaken and the scheme would need to receive support from the Scottish Government in order for the possibility of route safeguarding to be considered further.

At this time the Local Plan must have regard to the HITRANS Strategy and the priorities identified within it. It must also have regard to the Local Transport Strategy, which is under review, and we have referred to the Sutherland Partnership's Transport Vision. A variety of transport provisions will be appropriate to improve accessibility across the Sutherland area. Preparation of the Highland Local Development Plan will provide opportunity to review current transport policies of the Structure Plan in the light of the STPR, the new Local Transport Strategy, NPF2 and any further evidence on regional issues and specific schemes.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
239 Dornoch Rail Link Action Group Thurso	<p>4.44c - We ask that a more positive reference to the Dornoch Firth Rail Link is given in paragraph 44c, in light of the attached study and previously submitted technical study for the Link as submitted by DORLAG.</p> <p>Items received by the Council from Mark Norton for Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (DorLAG), September 2007 onwards and which form part of DoRLAG's submissions on the Draft Sutherland Plan (all available for reference upon request):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter dated 07/09/2007 seeking protection of the suggested route for a Dornoch Rail Link and which includes reference to correspondence and documents submitted prior to September m2007, including submissions on "Sutherland Futures" (which included route delineation mapping). - Further letter dated 07/09/2007 which formally introduces DoRLAG and appends a note of its specific reasons for the Dornoch Rail Link construction and reasons for retention of the Lairg section. - Letter dated 21/01/2008 and enclosed documents "Executive Summary of the modified STAG 1 appraisal of the Dornoch Rail Link" and "Dornoch Rail Link Study" (engineered feasibility study). - Objection form received 30/01/2008 setting out objections to paragraphs 4.29, 4.32 and 4.44 of the Draft Local Plan. - Letter received 20/01/2008 and enclosed document: "STAG 1 Appraisal-Dornoch Rail Link and the far North of Scotland" - Letter dated 14/02/2008 supplying electronic copies of large documents previously submitted in paper format. 	As above
354 Dr D G Guild Edinburgh	<p>The Sutherland Local Deposit Draft has to my mind some serious flaws, with overmuch confidence placed in road solutions. "Frequent community bus routes" sounds promising, but it should be realised at the start that buses are not substitutes for trains for delivering large numbers of people.</p>	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

Insufficient attention is paid to what the railway needs, if it is to deliver what is required.

A significant increase in rail freight, for instance would require more than the small improvements on offer on their own. Rail freight has much to offer. Inter alia, it would rerelease pressure on the roads and bring environmental benefits.

While claims for the railway has an economic lifeline are common currency, they remain little more than rhetorical effusions until the basic problems of the Far North Line are solved. In essence it is the journey time of more than four hours that has to be solved.

While the shortest distance between two points is a straight line, this emphatically does not apply to the North Line. Now the circuitous route may be a historical accident, but straightening the line has become an imperative in this day and age.

The solution is simple and has been known for some years now: to take the railway across the Dornoch Firth by bridge - there is already a road bridge.

The advantages would be manifest. In the first place this would bring Dornoch on to the rail network. In addition the journey times would be slashed, making them comparable with the road. Reasonable commuting times would give a boost to the whole region bringing Inverness within reach of the communities at the end of the line. Superior communications would not only help to alleviate the problems that will arise with the closing down of Dounreay, but will provide the resources needed to support the potential new developments in the field of renewables: wave and tide power.

By all means upgrade the line north of Inverness, but with the Dornoch Rail link, these are worthless.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
369 Eilidh Christie Edinburgh	<p>Having read the recent reports by MVA Consultants/Corus, you will realise how important it is for the residents and businesses in the far north to have an upgraded railway system fit for the 21st century: such upgrading much included a Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing as one of its pivotal components. There would be considerable benefits to all of the region north of Inverness. not forgetting the Orkney Isles. should such a project be undertaken.</p> <p>The railway in the north is just as important as the roads. Taking freight by rail would free the dangerous A9 of some of the heavy lorries as well as reducing some of the pollution.</p> <p>I, therefore, ask you to please consider including the Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing in the Sutherland Plan. To have a speedy journey to and from the north would be a big incentive for more folk to leave their cars at home and travel by rail. It will be the transport of the future.</p>	As above
557 Mrs Helen MacDonald Dornoch	I write to request that you protect, within the Sutherland Local Plan, the proposed Dornoch rail link. This project has not yet been resolved and requires inclusion in the plan so it is already covered if the link is given clearance.	As above
532 Mr William Manson Halkirk	<p>I object to the route of the proposed rail link as stated in the plan. That is crossing the Dornoch Firth would be an error.</p> <p>I think that the new line should cross Loch Fleet at Littleferry and run through the centre of Dornoch.</p>	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	3.1 Brora Similarly, SNH also recommends that the possible corridor for the A9 bypass should be indicated on the Brora map.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
332 Caithness Transport Forum Wick	<p>The Caithness Transport Forum wishes to express unanimously, concern that the future construction of a railway line along a corridor from the Dornoch Firth Bridge, through Dornoch and across Loch Fleet at Littleferry, Golspie, is not compromised at this stage and urge that the proposed route, as currently promoted by Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (DoRLAG) is protected in the new Sutherland Local Plan.</p> <p>Lack of provision for a Dornoch rail link and crossing at Dornoch Firth would be an error that could impact on the economic future of the communities of Caithness, North Sutherland, East Sutherland and Orkney. We believe that protection of the route within the local plan will provide for an opportunity in the future to develop rail transport, both passenger and freight, in response to economic regeneration activities, such as the proposed freight terminal at Scapa, and pressures to reduce carbon emissions by a shift from road to rail. It would, we feel, be short-sighted and irresponsible to preclude future development by a failure of the local plan to protect the Dornoch rail link route proposed by Howard Pack in 2007</p>	As above

330 Highland Branch Scottish Green Party Inverness	<p>The Highland Branch of the Scottish Green Party requests the designated route of proposed rail route be protected for the future. The Highland Council should also recognise that there are a wide range of social and economic benefits to be gained by the Dornoch Rail Link. The current deposit draft does not give sufficient weight to the rail link. In the light CORUS/MVA Study 'STAG1 Appraisal - Dornoch Rail Link and he Far North of Scotland', which provides evidence of the widespread benefits which could accrue from he building of a Dornoch Firth Rail Link. The range of constructive benefits, which would accrue from a ornoch Rail Link route should be acknowledged in the Local Plan given that the Council is aware of the contents of the aforementioned report.</p> <p>Additionally, The Dornoch rail route would bring great benefits from arrival of trains prior to nine o'clock in the morning. Correspondingly, this would help greatly people who have to travel to Inverness College and medical services such as Raigmore hospital. This would also alleviate traffic problems in the Highland Capital. With the Draft Local Plan not including sufficient weight to a Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing, communities which provide a sizable chunk of population such as</p>	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

Helmsdale, Brora and Golspie are sadly missing out on the benefits of a modern 21 century rail network which is taken for granted elsewhere in the country. It has been demonstrated clearly elsewhere in the country that an improvement in rail infrastructure led to greater loading on services that was originally expected, e.g. Edinburgh to Bathgate passenger route, where there was a 300% increase than originally projected. The main key driver of economic prospects, and the potential for growth for rail must surely be in the East Sutherland villages of Dornoch, Golspie, Brora and Helmsdale. It does not seem from the Draft Plan that equitable status has been afforded to this populace. If there are no significant improvement of the Far North Line, the position vis-à-vis the A9 Trunk Road will further deteriorate, continuing the position of rail in Highland as the 'poor relation'. The Scottish Green Party contends that this is a significant opportunity to show the Council have a progressive imaginative view of the improvements that can accrue from such a project.

The Council should not adopt such a blinkered narrow view of this project

292 Association of Community Councils (Caithness)

Reay

On behalf of the Caithness Association of Community Councils we wishes to express unanimously, concern that the future construction of a railway line along a corridor from the Dornoch Firth Bridge, through Dornoch and across Loch Fleet at Littleferry, Golspie, is not compromised at this stage and urge that the proposed route, as currently promoted by Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (DoRLAG) is protected in the new Sutherland Local Plan.

Lack of provision for a Dornoch rail link and crossing at Dornoch Firth would be an error that could impact on the economic future of the communities of Caithness. North Sutherland, East Sutherland and Orkney.

We believe that protection of the route within the local plan will provide for an opportunity in the future to develop rail transport, both passenger and freight, in response to economic regeneration activities, such as the proposed freight terminal at Scapa, and pressures to reduce carbon emissions by a shift from road to rail.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
357 Mr Stewart MacLennan Inverness	<p>As a resident of Inverness, I have over many years used the train for travel north to Caithness for purposes of business or meeting with friends.</p> <p>By any standards, the extremely long and wearisome length of rail journey from Inverness to Caithness, taking almost 4 hours to Thurso and even more to Wick, is really a public disgrace, and not surprisingly the many of the trains I have travelled on are 'nearly empty' for the northern part of the line after about Tain. Even at the fairly sizable villages such as of Golspie, Brora or even Helmsdale very few people ever get on or off the train which is a reflection of the time wasted, for going the 'long way round' by Lairg and Rogart - where hardly even a soul from those low population areas actually uses the train nowadays.</p> <p>Yet it has always seemed to me that there is, very probably would be a much greater demand for rail travel in the north of Scotland, to the main centres of population, if the journey could be made much faster.</p> <p>I note from last week's local paper that a Study has shown that journey times by train to Caithness, and Golspie, Brora etc could be reduced by around 45 minutes, by a rail crossing over the Dornoch Firth. This visionary project has been talked about for many years now in the Highlands and would certainly give the railway a real boost, to encourage more use of the line. Many of us fear that this antiquated, and poorly patronised railway north to Caithness cannot really survive in the longer term, without the benefit of such long-deferred investment to better compete with a constantly improving A9 road..</p> <p>A faster and more competitive line to Caithness would probably be very attractive to also helping get some of the excessive A9 heavy lorry road freight traffic back on to the railway !</p> <p>Yet when I read a copy of your 'Draft Deposit of the Local Sutherland Plan' there is only a very weak, 'wishy washy', skimped and wholly inadequate reference to the required Dornoch Firth rail crossing. The Plan statement fails to give proper or adequate recognition to the very many substantial benefits which would be conferred on the majority of the Sutherland area population (who overwhelmingly live in the coastal settlements between Dornoch and Helmsdale).</p>	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

There does seem to be an unfortunate element of discrimination against those areas which, astonishingly, are even mentioned in the Plan statement Page 23 - item 'c'. Yet these areas are all shown as 'growth zones' in other parts of your Plan, and the maps contained within the 2006 Consultation Draft.

I would respectfully suggest that in your further revision of this Plan, you will be prepared to give a fuller and more supportive outline of the broader benefits, to the greatest numbers, arising from a Dornoch Firth rail route.

Whilst I accept that Highland Council would not be responsible for the major financing of this vital rail project, your Plan has a duty to positively highlight potential benefits from the achievement of various projects - which it finds no difficulty in doing for other inherently desirable projects elsewhere within the Plan document.

I trust you will find it possible to incorporate such more fulsome and supportive remarks concerning the required Dornoch Rail route in your further stages of this Plan scrutiny.

509 Mr John D Moore
Fortrose

You already have in your possession copies of the technical report by Corus Infrastructure & I understand you also have in your possession the STAG 1 appraisal entitled "Dornoch Link and the far north of Scotland" completed by MVA Consultancy all as discussed at meetings with you by the Dornoch Link action Group. There is thus no need for me to attach further copies here 4.44c. I ask that there be a much more positive reference to the proposed Link Rail route as that given in this paragraph particularly in light of the Reports/studies referred to above.

As above

Furthermore, please also see the recommendations of the Scottish Government Transport Committee meeting of 29/01/2008 which accepts that Dornoch Link Railway line makes significant improvements of the area and also recommends the Government to conduct a further and full study.

Furthermore, given that a measure of protection to a proposed Dornoch Link Rail route is already contained in the Councils 2001 Structure Plan

Chapter 04 V 4.44

it would seem entirely inappropriate that the same protection be not afforded/mentioned/continued in this local plan. I regard continued protection of the proposed rail route as vital. 4.29. I ask that recognition is given to the serious potential for rail as well as road improvements to develop the Caithness/N.E Sutherland economy post Dounreay and that substantially improved rail services are vital in encouraging such development in every conceivable way. I regard this as particularly important.

4.32. The Dornoch-Golspie-Brora-Helmsdale potential for larger scale development as stated could be greatly magnified by the provision and implementation of the Dornoch Rail Link as discussed in the reports studies referred to above.

510 Margaret Moore
Fortrose

You already have in your possession copies of the technical report by Corus Infrastructure & I understand you also have in your possession the STAG 1 appraisal entitled "Dornoch Link and the far north of Scotland" completed by MVA Consultancy all as discussed at meetings with you by the Dornoch Link action Group. There is thus no need for me to attach further copies here 4.44c. I ask that there be a much more positive reference to the proposed Link Rail route as that given in this paragraph particularly in light of the Reports/studies referred to above.

As above

Furthermore, please also see the recommendations of the Scottish Government Transport Committee meeting of 29/01/2008 which accepts that Dornoch Link Railway line makes significant improvements of the area and also recommends the Government to conduct a further and full study.

Furthermore, given that a measure of protection to a proposed Dornoch Link Rail route is already contained in the Councils 2001 Structure Plan it would seem entirely inappropriate that the same protection be not afforded/mentioned/continued in this local plan. I regard continued protection of the proposed rail route as vital. 4.29. I ask that recognition is given to the serious potential for rail as well as road improvements to develop the Caithness/N.E Sutherland economy post Dounreay and that substantially improved rail services are vital in encouraging such development in every conceivable way. I regard this as particularly

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44	<p>important.</p> <p>4.32. The Dornoch-Golspie-Brora-Helmsdale potential for larger scale development as stated could be greatly magnified by the provision and implementation of the Dornoch Rail Link as discussed in the reports studies referred to above.</p>	
<p>498 Caithness Chamber of Commerce</p> <p>Thurso</p>	<p>Response to Deposit Draft Version Of The New Sutherland Local Plan</p> <p>The Caithness Chamber of Commerce re fully supportive of the Caithness Transport Vision, copies of which were distributed to the Highland Council. The Chamber are pleased to note the profile given to most transport issues in the Draft Deposit Plan as obviously better transport facilities, road and rail, through Sutherland help Caithness residents and businesses. In particular we note the following sections:</p> <p>Creating Prosperity</p> <p>4.29 "...and attract "footloose" e-commerce and inward investment which might be drawn to the Area by its accessibility and exceptional environment. Major improvements to transport infrastructure ill help to facilitate these objectives.. .."</p> <p>4.30 "...Continued promotion of the Invernet commuter rail service can be expected to increase custom,. . ."</p> <p>A Competitive Place</p> <p>4.43d. "...Choice in public transport which makes for efficient commuting,. . ." Connected and Accessible Place</p> <p>4.44c "...Substantial increase in passenger numbers on the Far-North rail line as efficiencies reduce the Inverness-Wick journey time.. .."</p> <p>Current proposed efficiencies will not have 111uch effect on journey times without the proposed Dornoch rail link.</p> <p>The Chamber is aware that the possibility of a Dornoch Forth Rail crossing has recently been the subject of a report by Corus Ltd for the Dornoch Rail Link Action Group. (We understand documentation from Corus has been submitted to the Highland Council) The possible rail</p>	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

link has been the subject of ongoing discussions at the Scottish Parliament - indeed only as recently as this week.

The Caithness Chamber of Commerce is therefore disappointed that the route proposed by Corus is not protected in the new Plan bearing in mind the advantages such a rail link would give to the Sutherland Community as well as to Caithness.

The Chamber note the comment under 4.44c of the Development Plan that "the Development Plan of the time could protect such a route!" There is a possible route there at present - it should be protected in view of the advantages such a route would bring. In view of the fact that land can be protected for possible future housing development we can see no reason why this should not apply to the rail route.

The Chamber note the apparent success of the Lairg/Inverness Invenet service and the Plans references to commuting. If the Lairg service is popular there is no reason why a shortened rail journey should not benefit those wishing to commute from Dornoch, Golspie and Brora. It would also be beneficial to rail users further north and to people in Orkney. The Chamber considers that the Inverness/Lairg link should be maintained when the Dornoch rail link goes ahead.

In conclusion we request that the Dornoch Firth Rail Link is given greater protection in the Draft Plan in view of the benefits such a link would give to rail transport not only to Caithness but to a large section of the Sutherland population.

549 Rob Gibson SNP MSP
Wick

I wish to register my support for the need to safeguard the possible route for a Dornoch Rail link as outlined in the Corus Report at STAG One stage.

As above

Please note that the Transport Infrastructure and Climate change committee of the Scottish Parliament has unanimously agree to progress this issue.

I hope that the pending economic developments of the Pentland Firth marine energy and Moray Firth oil developments can be fully taken into account as well as the potential 50% increase in passenger numbers

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44	using a modernised Far North line. The Wick unemployment figures are still stubbornly highest in the highlands. We need the Sutherland Plan to a help not an inhibitor.	
370 Mr Alasdair Christie Thurso	<p>In your new Sutherland Plan I hope you will be able to preserve the route of the proposed Dornoch Rail link. The route for the associated railway would run from south of Golspie by way of the mouth of Loch Fleet and into Dornoch and thence to the Firth to link up with the existing railway on the south side of the Firth.</p> <p>This development would bring great benefits to the residents of East Sutherland, Caithness and Orkney. The town of Dornoch would, once more, be linked to the railway system and again be on the map.</p> <p>On a journey from Wick to Inverness a saving of 40 minutes could be achieved. A shorter journey to and from the far north would encourage more people to use the railway and businesses to move freight via the line, thus clearing the roads of heavy transport. The fact, too, that the train would pass by Loch Fleet would be a great tourist attraction.</p> <p>I hope the new evidence provided in the reported by Corus/MVA Consultants will help you and your colleagues when making your decisions on our future railway system. Big improvements are necessary to ensure the long-term future of the Far North Line. We need all the help we can get to re-generate the economy post-Dounreay. We must ensure we provide a future for our young folk to prevent them from moving away from the area to seek work elsewhere.</p>	As above
260 Ms Lesley Cranna Golspie	I am very concerned about the failure to protect the route for a future Golspie by pass from other development. Whilst I recognise that this may not be a requirement of the Local Plan, it is nonetheless very important. Failure to protect this route -or more passively, to allow development on it, would be very short sighted and I object to all policies which might permit development on this route. Golspie is the first settlement north of London which has not benefited from a by pass. Currently heavy goods lorries thunder through the Main Street at all times of night and day. The Main Street is not equipped to cope with such traffic. Its foundations are wholly inadequate, creating a serious problem with vibration in the houses, and the lorries continue to get	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

bigger, causing increasing congestion and a generally unpleasant environment in the middle of the village. It would be very short sighted if the Local Plan fails to protect the by pass route -simply because it is not obliged to. Failure to act on this will have long-term consequences for Golspie because there are no alternative routes. This issue was brought up and received a lot of support at the community meeting in Golspie and it is disappointing to see that this has not been reflected in the plan.

291 RMT
Glasgow

The National Union of Rail Transport and Maritime Workers has, over many years, maintained a close and promotional interest in advocating measures which would significantly improve journey times on the long and very uncompetitive Inverness-Wick/Thurso rail link.

As above

We are pleased to have submitted evidence to both the Parliament's Petitions and Transport Infrastructure and Climate Change Committee in support of the Association of Caithness Community Council's Petition, which calls for a significant improvement of the current and unacceptably long journey times between Caithness and Inverness.

A direct rail crossing of the Dornoch Firth, and its estimated 45 minutes journey time saving, is regarded by this Group as a 'pivotal element' in any meaningful improvement of this rail route - a view which is shared by all objective transport professionals.

I have now seen the recently published report by the MVA /CORUS transport consultancy report, which confirms a range of very significant social inclusion and economic benefits to the north Highland mainland (and Orkney) from investment in a Dornoch Firth rail crossing. As the subsequent press reports have suggested, this modernisation project would help make up for 'decades of neglect'!

This is confirmed by the 'negligible use' of the rail service north of Tain for much of the year, where the competitive thrust of the rail service has been substantially eroded by massive A9 road improvements which have radically shortened journey times and distances from Inverness to the main population centres in the north. Such is starkly obvious north of Tain, where the 19th century historic rail route is still forced to divert inland for the hour long detour through sparsely populated scattered

Chapter 04 V 4.44

communities of very low rail usage and unlikely areas for further rail growth.

Dornoch a significant regional centre is ironically 'by-passed' by the historic rail route, and even significant rail- connected settlements such as Golspie, Brora, Helmsdale and medium sized towns of Wick and Thurso, all have disproportionately poor rail usage compared to other similar sized rail-served settlements elsewhere in Scotland.

It is not so much the lack of population or demand, but rather the 'strangulation' of excessively long and hopelessly uncompetitive journey times which are the 'killer' against rail usage in terms of the needs and expectations of these northern communities.

In this respect, and particularly in view of the 'new evidence' supporting a rail crossing of the Dornoch Firth, I am perturbed at the skimped and wholly inadequate reference, or even ambition to achieve such rail modernisation, as contained in Paragraph 4.44c of your Sutherland Local Plan Deposit Draft - October 2007.

It is wholly unacceptable that you refer to the rail service as a 'key driver in the economic prospects of Lairg, Ardgay and Bonar Bridge', yet conspicuously fail to make any mention the same attributes relating to the very major, and significantly greater rail potential which exists at Golspie, Brora, Helmsdale. Taken together with Dornoch (which would significantly benefit from being rail-connected from a Dornoch Firth crossing), these communities represent over half of Sutherland's total population.

If your Local Plan is to command the support and respect you seek, then it is important that you convey a sense of equity and fairness to the needs of these sizable communities in east Sutherland, rather than a curious absence of reference as is very 'obvious' from the current Deposit Draft Plan.

I accept that publication of the MVA/CORUS Consultancy Report, and their new 'evidence based' analysis for a Dornoch Firth rail crossing has come since your compilation of the Deposit Draft Plan back in October 2007.

Chapter 04 V 4.44

Therefore, in view of the 'new evidence' now available from this professional consultancy work, I would urge that in your further Planning deliberations, you will accept the case for a more wholehearted and positive Planning/documentary reference to a Dornoch Firth rail crossing.

This is not an unreasonable request, given that this route modernisation project, would not just better serve the travel needs of the majority of Sutherland's population. But, equally significant is the cold reality, that significantly greater usage of the rail line service is now increasingly being seen as crucial to any long term retention of the all-year-round passenger service north of Tain.

371 Mr Brechin
Thurso

Having read the recent reports by MVA Consultants/Corus, you will realise how important it is for the residents and businesses in the far north to have an upgraded railway system fit for the 21st century: such upgrading much included a Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing as one of its pivotal components. There would be considerable benefits to all of the region north of Inverness. not forgetting the Orkney Isles. should such a project be undertaken.

As above

The railway in the north is just as important as the roads. Taking freight by rail would free the dangerous A9 of some of the heavy lorries as well as reducing some of the pollution.

I, therefore, ask you to please consider including the Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing in the Sutherland Plan. To have a speedy journey to and from the north would be a big incentive for more folk to leave their cars at home and travel by rail. It will be the transport of the future.

298 Mrs Janetta Christie
Thurso

I trust that the new evidence provided in the reports by Corus/MVA Consultants is enough to ensure that you and colleagues realise the importance of the safeguarding of a route for the future Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing.

As above

It is necessary to recognise the importance of a strategic rail infrastructure upgrade to help Caithness and Sutherland to meet the challenges and development opportunities in take next 20 - 30 years. After decades of neglect, it is time for money to be allocated for big

Chapter 04 V 4.44

improvements to the inverness/Wick-Thurso line.. .which must include a rail crossing over the Dornoch Firth. The Cores/MVA reports provide the proof required to support the urgent need for such improvements.. .especially as this would ensure the long-term future of the Far North Line. To achieve a journey time of around 2 hours 30 minutes, it is necessary to have the firth crossing as well as all the minor improvements recommended .What an enormous benefit this would bring to many areas.. .both to individuals and businesses.. .the latter increasing freight transport.

Rail and Road should be treated equally in importance : as should all Areas. It is most noticeable that the A9 improvements for the future (though, I believe, not yet fully sanctioned) get praise and approval.. .yet not so the Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing which could bring, I am certain, tremendous benefits to East Sutherland, Caithness and Orkney. It is also most noticeable that those areas are not given the same consideration as the inward area of Sutherland even although over 60% of the Sutherland population actually live in and around the East Sutherland townships.

The Corus/MVA reports have assessed socio-economic and environmental benefits of a railway system suitable for the residents of the far north in the 21st century . We need all the help we can get to regenerate the economy post-Dounreay. It is necessary to ensure the future for generations to come. The Parliamentary Transport Committee is currently deliberating on the response to the Association of Caithness Community Councils' Petition (PE894) about the Far North Line. I am sure it will look favourably upon it.

Perhaps, if you and your colleagues still feel unable to include the Dornoch Firth Rail Crossing in the Sutherland Plan for the 2008 - 2013 period, you would consider inserting it as one of the longer-term projects of the future. It deserves a place of importance within the Sutherland Local Plan.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
505 Mr Anthony Lennon Motherwell	<p>Paragraph 4.44 sections (b), (c)</p> <p>I have serious concerns over much of the thinking regarding rail transport and its potential as indicated in paragraph 4.44 sections (b) and (c).</p> <p>Decades of substantial underinvestment in the far north line (FNL) from Inverness to Wick/Thurso has made rail, for most traffics/journeys, woefully uncompetitive compared to road based modes using the A9 and associated roads.</p> <p>To redress this position it is vital that the Dornoch Rail Link is built. This along with other necessary modernisation and upgrading - 'Efficiencies' if you wish - would equip the FNL to realise its potential and to make it a 'key driver' for substantial economic progress for the highland region in general and for Sutherland in particular.</p> <p>I ask that substantial backing and clear support for the construction of the Dornoch Rail Link and for other necessary modernisation and upgrades to the FNL is incorporated into paragraph 4.44 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Some of the planning thinking on, analysis of, rail potentials as indicated in section (b) and (c) need reconsideration. The claim of a 'substantial increase' in passenger numbers on the FNL based on 'Efficiencies' - in reality a series of (very) minor improvements yielding savings of less or equal to 15 minutes in total - is totally unrealistic and misleading. The recent Corus/MUA report confirmed that minor improvements on their own were virtually worthless in shortening journey times, making for a much more attractive service and for increasing present passenger numbers.</p> <p>There is a very obvious bias in (b) and (C) emphasising the benefits of rail to communities on the Lairg loop and an obvious exclusion for substantial social/economic benefits to the main east Sutherland Centres of Golspie/Brora/Helmsdale. These important centres at present have poor rail connectivity. The very much improved service (if the Dornoch rail link is built) is conveniently ignored for these townships and also for the very important and growing town of Dornoch.</p>	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

The Lairg Loop area is emphasised at the expense of the East Sutherland communities which have at least 60% of Sutherland's total population. If a rail line to the very low potential areas of the North West/Lairg Loop' is claimed to be a 'Key Driver' in their economic prospects, then this thinking should be extended to the Golspie/Brora/Helmsdale axis and to a rail-reconnected Dornoch Region. Furthermore, it must be remembered that these townships are identified as 'Growth Areas' in the Sutherland plan 'Sutherland Futures' consultation of October 2006.

Most commentators accept that, in future years, rail transport will/must play a far more important role both nationally and in the wider European context. It is vital that this is recognised by Highland Council and that a substantially upgraded FNL will play at least as important a 'key driver' role in social, economic, connectivity and sustainable terms as an upgraded A9 route.

The FNL will only be able to fulfil this route if the Dornoch Rail Link and the other necessary modernisation and upgrading is undertaken.

In order to resolve my stated concerns and objections to the local plan, I would ask that a firm commitment to building the Dornoch Rail Link and the other necessary modernisation and upgrades to the FNL is incorporated into section 4.44 of the Sutherland Local Plan. It may be necessary to accept that the Lairg loop may have to close in whole or part as this may have to be recognised in section (b).

Whether the Dornoch link is built or not it is highly unlikely that Lairg will become a 'Hub' for the N-Central highlands. If the Dornoch Rail link is not built then it is unlikely that there will be a FNL in twenty years time given the potential of a Dornoch Rail link (and the recent Corus/MUA report notes that this could be achieved for a list of £97-118 million which represents excellent 'value for money' for such an important scheme delivering so much in the way of benefits both at local and national levels). It is vital that the route of the proposed Dornoch Rail Link is protected from any developments that would prevent, impede or add significantly to the cost of the link. Highland Council is well aware of the proposed route and the local plan should incorporate a firm commitment to protecting the route.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
313 Caithness West Community Council Thurso	<p>The Caithness West Community Council wishes to urge that the future construction of a railway line along a corridor from the Dornoch Firth Bridge, through Dornoch and across Loch Fleet at Littleferry, Golspie, is not compromised and wishes that the proposed route, as currently promoted by Dornoch Rail Link Action Group (DoRLAG) is protected in the new Sutherland Local Plan.</p> <p>Lack of provision for a Dornoch rail link and crossing at Dornoch Firth would increase the costs of the proposed crossing and impact on the economic future of the communities of Caithness, North Sutherland, East Sutherland and Orkney.</p> <p>We believe that protection of the route within the local plan will provide for an opportunity in the future to develop rail transport, both passenger and freight, in response to economic regeneration activities, in mitigation for the loss of employment opportunities as a result of the run down at Dounreay.</p> <p>There is also the desirability of shifting freight from road to rail as a means of significantly reducing carbon emissions and reducing road congestion. It would, we feel, be unbelievably short-sighted and irresponsible to hinder future development by a failure of the local plan to protect the Dornoch rail link route proposed by Howard Pack in 2007.</p>	As above
221 Friends Of The Far North Line Inverness	<p>FoFNL is concerned to ensure that the future construction of a railway line along a corridor from the Dornoch Firth Bridge (A9), through Dornoch and across Loch Fleet at Littleferry, to Golspie is not compromised by planning decisions in the local plan. We are particularly concerned about the suggested outward spread of Dornoch in designated blocks H3, H4, MU1 and the northern block marked LT. No reference is made to the safeguarding of a route through these areas and therefore we must object to the plan as it stands.</p> <p>FoFNL would suggest that the situation at Dornoch is resolved by the designation of a linear corridor (with no sharp bends) through the area which would be primarily for recreational use, but wide enough to support insertion of a railway line at a later date. Such a green corridor would be an asset which could be enjoyed by present townsfolk and by all the future residents of the newly designated blocks of land.</p>	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

The value of a railway to the Dornoch area would be in helping creating prosperity (para 4.29) by improving connectivity and accessibility (4.40), choice in public transport (4.43b), and by helping to justify major new investment (4.42c). It would also be a "key driver in (Dornoch's) economic prospects" just as the plan envisages for Lairg, Ardgay and Bonar Bridge (4.44c). The value of the railway to communities northwards from Golspie into Caithness and Orkney would also be considerably increased by virtue of the shorter route.

FoFNL does not agree that the safeguarding of the route can be left to a future development plan (4.44c). There have been several case in recent years where earlier developments have compromised routes for new or reopened railways (e.g.. The Borders Railway) and made the process more difficult. We believe the route has to be safeguarded now that our suggestion of a recreational corridor would be one very feasible way to do this.

The timing of the new railway is difficult to judge, but we would expect there to be a major shift, of freight in particular, from road to rail when oil scarcity and high prices really begin to bite in about ten years' time. Climate change preventative measures could bring about this change sooner. Another factor which might bring forward construction of this line would be if there was a major regeneration initiative for Caithness to counter the run down in employment at Dounreay.

This emphasis on freight would also underline the increasing importance of Lairg as a freight transshipment point. Such a major modal switch would require some doubling of the single track Highland routes north of Perth and the provision of extra passing loops. A route through Dornoch and one through Lairg would effectively provide such a double track facility.

We therefore ask that the plan should take note of the likelihood of a renaissance for the railway and designate a corridor for a new line from Ardjachie on the Dornoch Firth to Golspie. It would be inexcusable to prevent such an asset being created by failing to protect such a route in the 2008 plan.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
542 Dr I A Glen Lanarkshire	<p>As a geographer/economist I am concerned about some of the statements in this document</p> <p>1. In 4.16, There is a lack of precision in ensuring that the Dornoch Rail Link route corridor is preserved and given protection. This is fundamental to prevent developments encroaching upon such a route corridor. I speak with the experience of seeing past carelessness on the part of a planning authority leading to difficulties for the Airdrie-Bathgate line.</p> <p>2. In 4.30, there was an obvious weakness throughout the HITRANS report with regard to rail. It was consistently sidelined and underestimated. One need only think of Switzerland to sense the differences in approach and outcomes</p> <p>3. In 4.29, this Local Plan slips into the same rut - roads are not enough nor does their traffic flows take sufficient account of climate change requirements which rail could address especially if the Dornoch Rail Link was implemented.</p> <p>4. In 4.44, there should be a concerted effort to push for the Dornoch Rail Link. Thinking of Switzerland again, a thrust of policy there in 'Bahn 2000' was to improve connectivity so that all large settlements and cities would have ease of access to the capital Berne. In step with this was a reduction in peripherally and a speeding up of journey times. This should be the aim for the Far North line. Were it in Norway or Switzerland it would be electrified and if in the latter country might even have tilting trains to give fast line speeds.</p> <p>Only by radical re-thinking will the Highlands get out off the "anything will do here" attitude and hopefully transform the Far North line into the well used trunk route it should be.</p>	As above
568 Golspie Community Council Golspie	<p>On 31st January the chairman received an email from Mr Ken Sutherland of Railfuture Scotland asking the Community Council to submit a letter/email to your department expressing support for consideration of Dornoch Rail Link in the Sutherland Local Plan. The final date for submission of comments on the Deposit Draft was 1 February.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44	Last Monday's meeting of the Community council was the first opportunity that members had to discuss the matter. The unanimous decision was that, using the information we had been given, we could not support the project.	Please note: the follow up to this letter has been inserted on the following page.
559 Sutherland Partnership Lairg	Further to my telephone discussion with Mr David Cowie, of your staff, I would request that you take account of one comment which Sutherland Partnership Transport Group would offer on the Local Plan for Sutherland Deposit Draft. The comment refers to the question of a possible future Dornoch Firth Rail Link. Whilst we note that the Draft paragraph 4.44c acknowledges that future Development Plans should take account of the need to protect such a route, we would observe that there is also a need to reflect on the potential of a future rail link in the development of the current final Plan document.	As above
509 Mr John D Moore Fortrose	Please note that we entirely support the letter sent to you dated 17th June 2008 from Mr Mark W Norton, Covener, Dornoch Rail Link Action Group and we entirely agree with its contents.	As above
254 Dornoch Community Council Dornoch	Dornoch Rail Link Request for assurance that the proposed site & the Tain/Golspie spur Rail link will be protected in the draft plan.	As above
556 Mr Greg MacDonald Dornoch	I write to request that you protect, within the Sutherland Local Plan, the proposed Dornoch rail link. This project has not yet been resolved and requires inclusion in the plan so it is already covered if the link is given clearance.	As above
555 W g Ross Dornoch	I am writing to request that the route of the Tain-Dornoch-Golspie rail link, as proposed in the corus report, be safeguarded by inclusion in the new Sutherland Local Plan.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
568 Golspie Community Council Golspie	<p>I refer to my letter date 17 February 2008.</p> <p>In that letter I mentioned that the Community Council Chairman had received an email from Mr Ken Sutherland of Railfuture Scotland on 31 January 2008. I wish to advise you that this information could possibly be incorrect. I can confirm that Mr Sutherland sent emails to the Chairman on 22 and 23 January 2008. I can also confirm that the Dornoch Rail Link project was discussed at the Community meeting on 11 February 2008 and it was the unanimous decision of members present that, using the information available to the Council, the Council could not support the project.</p>	

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
315 Thurso Community Council Thurso	<p>The Community Council for many years favoured the Dornoch Rail Link. This would link Golspie to Dornoch by way of Loch Fleet and bridge the Dornoch Firth to Tain. We hope that in your plan you will make allowance for this route to be built. When this link is built it will bring great benefit to all residents of North East Sutherland, Caithness and Orkney. It will slash journey times drastically, instead of going via Lairg as at present, a direct route will be available to Inverness, to be used for freight as well as passengers.</p> <p>Good luck in your Local Plan.</p>	As above
323 Railfuture Scotland Glasgow	<p>Railfuture Scotland requests a measure of 'route protection' and also a greater Highland Council Planning recognition of the economic and social benefits of a Dornoch Rail Link, than is currently afforded within the current Deposit Draft of the Sutherland Local Plan (October 2007).</p> <p>The current Deposit Draft is regrettably deficient in those aspects, and in other areas, which will be further discussed below, although it is recognised that the compilation date of this document (October 2007) pre-dates the recent (January 2008) CORUSIMVA Study 'STAG1 Appraisal - Dornoch Rail Link and the Far North of Scotland'.</p> <p>This Consultants investigation, conducted on objective and professionally recognised criteria, identified a broad range of economic and social benefits which would accrue to the north of Scotland in general, and directly applicable to Highland Council's Sutherland Local Plan area, which would arise from availability of a Dornoch Firth Rail link route to Inverness.</p> <p>Given that Highland Council Planning Officials, and its elected Council Members, now have full access to this Report, and ample opportunity to review its findings and recommendations, it is hoped that there will be a willingness to mention the range of positive benefits, arising from a Dornoch Rail Link route, in a subsequently revised lamented version of the Local Plan Written Statement Deposit Draft.</p> <p>In terms of the CORUS/MVA consultants use of 'Accession Modelling' studies, and the implications for social inclusion and reduction of peripherally, the prospect of a Dornoch Rail Link to deliver an Inverness</p>	As above

Chapter 04 V 4.44

arrival time before 9am must rank as a hugely important advance in terms of Sutherland people's expectations and requirements in a modern 21st century society. Particularly when related to improved employment prospects, educational opportunities, easier access to more specialised medical services and other accepted aspects of social mobility from such a radically improved route.

These transport components of a civilised and caring society, are very visibly denied to the majority of Sutherland's population, who reside in notionally 'rail-linked' Golspie, Brora and Helmsdale, on account of the extreme inadequacy of a very poor, slow and uncompetitive rail service available to those sizable townships. The 'negligible' use of the train from those communities, which is disproportionately compared to other commensurately sized communities in Scotland, is a reflection of the public's awareness of an almost 'useless service' for many purposes on most occasions. Rather than any lack of potential business in the immediate catchment areas of these settlement stations.

Experience elsewhere throughout Scotland has invariably demonstrated that the provision of newly reopened lines/stations or significantly improved service, has yielded an upsurge of patronage usually far exceeding the theoretical 'modelling estimates' on which the infrastructure or service investment was based. Reopening the Edinburgh- Bathgate line (1986 - now carrying over 3 times initial estimates) and reopening Larkhall-Hamilton/Anniesland-Maryhill (2005 - now used by 40% more than initial estimates) reveal 'suppressed demand' for new routes and passenger increase on Further deliberations on the Council's Deposit Draft Local Plan could reasonably be expected to reflect on such practical experience of rail infrastructure improvements elsewhere throughout Scotland, and acknowledge the possibility of upsurges in actual rail traffic, being actually Greater than inferred by the CORUS/MVA Consultants, in their recommended-pursuit of the Dornoch Rail link-route modernisation.

The Sutherland Local Plan Deposit Draft, should therefore, in its finalised lamented form should be prepared to acknowledge the relevance and relationship of a Dornoch Rail Link route towards significantly improving the economic and social accessibility benefits to:

Chapter 04 V 4.44

Dornoch, Golspie, Brora and Helmsdale [Paragraph 4.44 c.] These settlements collectively comprise around 60% of Sutherland's total population, whose 'urban clustered form' and proximity of convenient/potentially convenient rail stations being a significant inducement to maximising rail use.

Further justification for referring to the potential value of a Dornoch Rail Link is already contained in the Council's 'Sutherland Futures - Vision and Strategy' (October 2006) where Dornoch/Golspie/Brora are variously referred to as 'Sustainable Growth Centres' (page 3 map 'A Vision Sutherland 2025') and identified as 'Major Development/infrastructure' (page 6 map 'Rising to the Challenge'). In addition, and reinforcing the above point, it is noteworthy that, since publication of this document, the 'classification status' of Helmsdale has now (at the request of a Council member) been upgraded from a 'Key Village' to the status of a 'Main Centre' by virtue of its location adjacent to the North Rail Line1 A9 road).

It is unacceptable and imbalanced therefore, for the Local Plan [Paragraph 4.44 a] to entirely exclude all reference to the existing rail link to significantly sized Dornoch/Golspie/Brora/Helmsdale, all with considerable levels of approved growth [Paragraph 4.251, whilst at the same time making possibly exaggerated claims for the rail link as a major growth stimulator in much smaller centres, with very restricted potential for further utilisation.

Put another way, if it is acceptable for the Plan to refer to the rail link to Ardgay/Bonar Bridge/Lairg and distant, connected places in the north west as being a 'key driver in their economic prospects', then consistency and fairness implies that settlements of significantly greater rail traffic potential such as Dornoch/Golspie/Brora/Helmsdale & be given similar (favourable) recognition in The Sutherland Local (paragraph 4.44 c].

A similar lack of balance (or even-handed approach) is also evident from Paragraph 4.44 b in terms of its rather selective reference to Lairg which is instanced as the example of implementing 'Integrated transport solutions for passengers and freight'. There is no intention here to challenge to the range of rail transport attributes (existing or potential)

Chapter 04 V 4.44

conferred on Lairg as described in this section.

But rather to suggest a more equitable and even handed approach could have reasonably merited some reference to the capability of rail-connected Golspie, Brora and Helmsdale. And their opportunity-potential to meaningfully to contribute to a range of perhaps different, but equally valid and important 'integrated transport solutions to passengers and freight' in their local station hinterland-sewed areas. Paragraph 4.44 c should therefore be modified to make reference, to Golspie, Brora and Helmsdale, as appropriate and relevant, in terms of offering an opportunity to contribute towards the Plan's aim of 'integrated transport solutions to passengers and freight' in their local and wider hinterland catchment areas.

A further criticism of the Deposit Draft's Plan arises from its assertion that there will be . . . 'substantial increases on the Far-North rail line as efficiencies reduce the inverness journey time' [Paragraph 4.44 c]. [The understanding in the context of the Plan's text, is that such 'efficiencies' relate to a series of 'minor improvements' on the inverness-Thurso/Wick line and any reference in this sentence, to the potential of a Dornoch Rail Link].

Yet whilst the this 'claim' [for substantial increases] may be applicable to the southern section of line, from Lairg - Tain to Inverness, it has no relevance, or credibility to rail passenger levels on the northern Golspie - Brora-Helmsdale - Thurso/Wick section of the Far North Line.

The 2006 Halcrow Report : Phase 2, Section 5 'Detailed Projections Split by Line' (paragraph 5.2) notes that on this northern section of the Inverness-Thurso/Wick line . . . 'rail demand is forecast to grow at a lower level [my italics] between 20% and 75%' (as compared to 60% and 125% over 15 years on the southern part of the line). They specifically add however. . . 'that this significantly lower growth is due to large distance and rail journey time involved (and) without major infrastructure improvements, the long journey times relative to road, and the low service frequency, the majority [of] time sensitive commuters [north of Lairg] will continue to use the car or bus' (quote) They also note elsewhere, that even such theoretically 'predicted' future low growth rates of rail travel on the northern section of the Inverness-Thurso/Wick line are likely to be

Chapter 04 V 4.44

substantially wiped-out by any scale A9 road journey time saving improvements, between Dornoch and Caithness which are not accompanied by significant rail line time savings.

Further, more detailed analysis of likely future passenger trends on the Inverness- Thurso/Wick rail line was undertaken by the CORUS/MVA Report January 2008 : Executive Summary, paragraph 1.1.5 which suggested . . 'that without a substantial improvement in the capability of the railway, which a Dornoch Rail Link could provide by shortening transit times and increasing productivity, the line [north of Golspie to Caithness] will remain competitive in the face of quicker links by road'. This Report research also concludes that application of 'Line speed improvements' [minor improvements] taken on their own, (without being accompanied by a Dornoch Rail Link infrastructure improvement), would not yield any meaningful addition to current passenger usage on the northern part of the North Line between Golspie and Caithness (Conclusion: paragraph 1.2.22 Table and 1.2.23).

In view of the evidence/findings of both the Halcrow and CORUS/MVA Consultancy Study Reports, as above, the Sutherland Local Plan's reference to . . 'substantial increase in passenger numbers on the Far-North rail line as efficiencies reduce the Inverness -Wick journey time' is a misleading statement set in the context of Paragraph 4.44 c

This section should therefore be suitably modified to more adequately explain, in summary form, the differing future growth prospects, between the southern (Lairg - Tain - Inverness) and northern (Golspie - Thurso/Wick) sections of the North Line without a Dornoch Rail Link. And also accompanied by specific reference to the potential 45 minute journey time saving, with potential for significantly higher possible growth generated at Dornoch/Golspie/Brora/Helmsdale and Caithness stations with a direct Dornoch Rail Link route.

Paragraph 4.29 (under the heading 'Creating Prosperity') refers to . 'important strands of the "Strategy" aimed at creating prosperity, include strengthening the interaction with the growth to the south and Caithness - particularly in the context of decommissioning of Dounreay, diversifying the employment base . . The A9 regional road network is vital to such prospects . . There may be an opportunity in the future to shorten journey times whilst improving local communities' (quote).

Chapter 04 V 4.44

It is very regrettable, therefore, to note the conspicuous and complete absence of any reference to the existing Inverness - Golspie - Brora - Helmsdale - Caithness rail line, and the potentially significant economic and social gains arising from very significant improvement route improvement as would be delivered by a Dornoch Rail Link route. There is no legitimate reason for excluding reference to the existing rail route, and its potential for improvement, within the context of an integral coherent and balanced land use transport planning overview strategy, such as is the purported purpose of this Local Plan.

Paragraph 4.29 should therefore, on grounds of equity and balance, make adequate reference to the Inverness/Caithness rail line, and the identifiable potential economic and social benefits arising from a Dornoch Rail Link route. Paragraph 4.32 ('Supporting Communities') notes that . . 'The Dornoch - Golspie - Brora axis is well placed to "compete" for larger scale [in a Sutherland context] commercial Development and Leisure provision' (quote). Yet there is a conspicuous and almost irrational exclusion of any reference to the existing and potentially Dornoch Rail Link improved route, in both this section and Paragraph 4.44 c. And particularly where such a reference to the potential contribution of the existing/Dornoch Link improved route would have been entirely relevant to Highland Council's overall Transport Strategy, and a responsive adjunct to the overall objectives of Scottish Government's Transport, Environment and Climate Change Strategy.

Paragraphs 4.32 and 4.44c should therefore be suitably amended to make reference to the potential contribution to the Plan's objectives which could be achieved from a Dornoch Rail Link [infrastructure-improved] Inverness - (Dornoch) - Golspie - Brora -Helmsdale - Thurso/Wick line.

In relation to the required safeguarding of a land reservation for the required [future] Dornoch Rail Link route Paragraph 2.8('Timescale1) indicates that . . 'the Local Sutherland Plan deals with the period up to 2013 (assuming adoption at the end of 2008) . .[and] . It also includes a longer term vision into the 2020s . . References to the longer term mean outwith the current 5 year plan period' (quote). This intention of

Chapter 04 V 4.44

this statement would surely also seem to link coherently into Paragraph 4.16 ('A Strategy for Sustainability') which indicates that . . 'What happens In the next 5-10 years is vital to a sustainable future' (quote).

Such willingness to embrace a longer term societal need beyond the strict 2008-2013 time parameters of the Local Plan &very welcome, particularly where longer term project gestation periods are inevitable, as with major railway infrastructure improvements such as a Dornoch Rail Link route

An amalgamation of Paragraph 2.8 and 4.16 would seem to suggest that their purpose and spirit is a least to attempt some degree of route protection to safeguard the required route of a Dornoch Rail Link (between Golspie and the Dornoch Firth/Tain.

This 'intention' is further strengthened when taken in conjunction with the 2001 Highland Council Structure Plan with its 'indicative reference' to the desirability of improvements to the A91A99 Wick-Dornoch Bridge road 'a& being associated wherever possible by funding for improvements of the complementary railway route (the Inverness-Thurso/Wick rail line)' [TC 5 Multi-modal corridors] (quote).

The Structure Plan very clearly relates the required and beneficial 'complementary improvement of the Inverness-Thurso/Wick rail line as specifically referring to a 'Dornoch Rail Link'. This is contained within its Paragraph 2.16.15 which indicates. . . 'that a direct Golspie - Dornoch - Tain rail link would confer a 'considerable shortening' of the journey time/distance saving for rail passengers between Caithness, East Sutherland and Inverness '(quote).

It is however accepted that PAN 75 (Paragraph 37) of the planning guidelines framework indicates . . 'that schemes, which are not in committed programmes, and/or at an advanced stage of preparation, or expected to commence within the Plan period, should only merit a description in the text, with the level of detail being dependent on the degree of commitment' (quote). Nevertheless, inclusion of a [transport] project in any local plan proposals can include schemes for which the method of funding is uncertain at the outset (quote).

Chapter 04 V 4.44

Railfuture Scotland believes, in view of the further investigation of the Dornoch Rail Link case to Stage 2 STAG level, recommended by the CORUS/MVA Study, and its further pursuit to Scottish Government Ministerial Level, by the Parliament's Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change Committee, there now is a good chance of this project reaching the planning and preparatory works stage within the Plan's 5 year 'statutory period'.

On this basis, and even without agreement on source/s for the requisite capital funding, some strengthened reference and route protection can legitimately be given to future attainment of a Dornoch Rail Link route.

As previously acknowledged, the October 2007 compilation of the Sutherland Local Plan took place before 'new evidence' was available from the January 2007 CORUS/MVA Consultancy Study. And intimation, in late January 2008, of further investigative pursuit of the Dornoch Rail Link route by the Parliamentary Transport Committee procedure process : itself acting in response to the Petition lodged by the Association of Caithness Community Councils, concerned to achieve a 'significant shortening' of the rail journey times between Caithness and Inverness.

Further consideration and response- evaluation relating to the Sutherland Local Plan now offers the opportunity for a more visionary, but legitimately broad interpretation of the planning guidelines framework which can, and should be applied. This should seek to offer greater recognition and necessary route safeguarding of a Dornoch Rail Link route, than has been given within, the relevant Paragraphs referred to in the Local Plan Deposit Draft Written Statement and accompanying Maps.

571 Director of TEC Services
Inverness

Some comments in relation to the Sutherland Local Plan below. In general we would look for road improvements in accordance with the Regional Transport Strategy which undertook a lot of research in to determining route improvement priorities.

4.44 of the written statement which outlines the long term vision is the main section of the Plan which relates to specific transport aspirations.

The Plan will be amended to more closely reflect the recommendations of the HITRANS Strategy, unless it is overtaken by considerations carrying substantial weight (such as significant outcomes from the on-going Strategic Transport Projects Review or National Planning Framework 2). For example, reference will be added to route enhancement of the A838 and also to locally

Chapter 04 V 4.44

[Http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentplans/localplans/the-new-sutherland-local-plan.htm](http://www.highland.gov.uk/yourenvironment/planning/developmentplans/localplans/the-new-sutherland-local-plan.htm)

4.44- c. 'Substantial increase in passenger numbers on the Far North Rail Line as efficiencies reduce the Inv-Wick Journey time. A sustained, full peak-time return Invernet commuter service extending to Lairg..... The possibility of a Dornoch Firth rail crossing may have been explored further through the preparation and review of Highland-wide planning and transportation strategies, with due consideration to the economic social and environmental impacts of such a scheme. In the event of such a scheme being favoured and any formal preferred and programmed route being announced, the Development Plan of the time could protect such a route'

Section 4.44d relates to lifeline routes - 'Maintaining and pursuing the case for twin tracking the 'lifeline routes' or 'locally important roads' to the north and west communities and seeking improvement of other roads which are under stress such as the Dornoch-Embo road'

Should we be making reference to the other locally significant roads within Sutherland that were identified by Hitrans study?

Route enhancement of A838 is identified within RTS as medium term aspiration but no mention made within Plan. This could maybe be added to 4.44a or 4.30 which refer to Brora and Golspie bypasses?

On a more general level the Plan makes reference to the need for sustainable development through focusing growth in existing settlements and 4.6 notes implications of increased care provision for an ageing population.

These two aspects are key and I feel more emphasis could be placed on the need for development to meet accessibility criteria in the approval process with perhaps specific reference for new developments to be accessed conveniently by peds and cyclists, close to public transport services and where appropriate infrastructure and facilities provided by the developer to ensure the most sustainable modes of transport are catered for.

significant roads identified by the study. A new general policy and supporting text on travel will be added to provide a more robust and updated approach to sustainable travel and accessibility in advance of a fuller suite of policies in the Highland Local Development Plan.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
<p>Chapter 04 V 4.44</p> <p>576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh</p>	<p>Transport</p> <p>The Plan recognises the critical task of ensuring that Sutherland is a connected and accessible place. While the principle of this is undoubtedly correct, Transport Scotland has some concerns about the Plan with regard to statements related to potential transport interventions affecting the trunk road and rail networks and a lack of commitment to sustainable transport. These concerns are presented as objections to the Plan, which are detailed in the accompanying appendix.</p> <p>Transport Scotland has engaged with the Council previously through providing input to the Sutherland Futures response. With this in mind, I would suggest that once you have an opportunity to consider these objections, the best way forward is to meet and discuss them as soon as possible with a view to arriving at a mutually acceptable position. Please contact Veronica Allan, Transport Scotland, on 0141 272 7591 at your earliest convenience to arrange a meeting. I would reiterate Transport Scotland's wish to continue consultation and discussion on the matters outlined.</p> <p>Objections, Representations and Comments from Transport Scotland</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>TS Ref.Plan Ref.Site Ref.Objection TS01 The following transport interventions are identified in the Plan:</p> <p>A9 improvement schemes notably the long awaited by-passes of Golspie and Brora</p> <p>Integrated transport solutions for passengers and for freight: a significant increase in rail-freight which consolidates Lairg as a major transit/break-of-bulk and distribution hub for the north-central Highlands as part of a network of strategically located sidings with loading facilities (serving the import and export needs of the forestry, farming, fuel supply, aggregates and renewable industries) which could be underwritten by a consortium.</p> <p>A sustained, full peak-time return Invernet commuter service extending</p>	<p>The Vision is not saying that these 'transport interventions' will happen but rather that they have the potential to come forward and sit well with the strategy of the Plan. The reference to a Dornoch Rail Link in particular is subject to caveats given the scale of such a scheme and the potential effects that would need to be carefully considered. In terms of a rationale for transport interventions referred to, some have already been covered regionally in the HITRANS Strategy and at a local level the Council is reviewing its Local Transport Strategy. The Plan will be amended to more closely reflect the recommendations of the HITRANS Strategy, unless it is overtaken by considerations carrying substantial weight (such as significant outcomes from the on-going Strategic Transport Projects Review or National Planning Framework 2). On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to- Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan as none are committed to. We will add information elsewhere in the document on how the Plan will be implemented and will provide clarity and refer to processes that would be required to be followed for potential projects and schemes referred to in Vision, for example transport projects.</p>

Chapter 04 V 4.44

to Lairg, Ardgay and Bonar Bridge...

The possibility of a Dornoch Firth rail crossing may have been explored further through the preparation and review of Highland-wide planning and transportation strategies, with due consideration given to the economic, social and environmental impacts of such a scheme. In the event of such a scheme being favoured and any formal preferred and programmed route being accounted, the Development Plan of the time could protect such a route.

Maintaining and pursuing the case for twin-tracking the 'lifeline routes' or 'locally important roads' to the north and west coast communities and seeking improvement of other roads which are under stress, such as the Dornoch-Embo road.

SPP 17, paragraph 18, stages:

An appraisal process which may include land use transport modelling should identify issues and seek to resolve them through the iteration of the land use and transport relationships. Appraisal should also address trade-offs between alternative development options and transport impacts and accord with the principle of Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Moreover, SPP 17, paragraph 32, states:

The process of preparing a Local Plan should relate the existing land use development pattern to the capacity of the transport network and appraise the pattern of new land allocations in relation to transport opportunities and constraints.

Transport Scotland objects on the basis that there is a lack of rationale for the above transport interventions. This could be provided through the appropriate transport appraisal. Also, Transport Scotland has not committed to these specific transport interventions.

It is a requirement for any transport intervention for which Scottish Government/Transport Scotland funding, and/or consent is sought, that such intervention has emerged from an appraisal using the Scottish

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44	<p>Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG).</p> <p>Transport Scotland therefore asks that the following statement is included within the Plan: It is a requirement for any transport intervention for which funding, and/or consent is sought, that such an intervention has emerged from an appropriate appraisal process using Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG). In all other circumstances STAG could be used as best practise, as an evidence led process, to find the appropriate transport interventions in order to solve transport problems and to take advantage of potential opportunities.</p>	
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>SNH recommends that the possible corridor for the A9 bypass should be indicated on the Golspie map, despite it not yet being programmed for construction. It should be protected from development as there are no other real options.</p>	<p>For Strategic Transport Projects, we received requests that Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link should be the subjects of route safeguarding in this Local Plan.</p> <p>On the potential Strategic Transport Projects referred to- Golspie bypass, Brora bypass and Dornoch Rail Link- none should be the subject of route safeguarding in this next draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. They are not currently committed to by Transport Scotland and the strategy of this Local Plan is not critically dependent upon them. The importance of the strategic road and rail network to the economic well-being of the region has been voiced by the Council and others in response to the NPF2 consultation. The outcomes of that and of the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) are awaited. In the interim the Local Plan should be amended to provide more information on background and status for each project and to refer to processes that would be required to be followed in order to progress them. The forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan will provide a pan-Highland context for considering transport issues, the outcomes of NPF2 preparation and the STPR.</p> <p>Safeguarding routes which are not committed to (about which there is not sufficient certainty in terms of delivery) could cause significant planning blight for property along</p>

Chapter 04 V 4.44

the route. Government policy advice indicates that such blight should be avoided, by not safeguarding such routes. Settlement Development Boundaries in east Sutherland have been drawn tightly around the existing built up areas and the sites specifically allocated for development. The policy framework for consideration of development proposals within and outwith the SDAs is such that whilst there may in some instances be scope for development outwith, generally that would not be intensive development. Therefore the amount of additional constraint placed on any future transport route selection would be less where it is outwith the SDA rather than within it.

At this time the Local Plan must have regard to the HITRANS Strategy and the priorities identified within it. It must also have regard to the Local Transport Strategy, which is under review, and we have referred to the Sutherland Partnership's Transport Vision. A variety of transport provisions will be appropriate to improve accessibility across the Sutherland area. Preparation of the Highland Local Development Plan will provide opportunity to review current transport policies of the Structure Plan in the light of the STPR, the new Local Transport Strategy, NPF2 and any further evidence on regional issues and specific schemes.

217 Mr D M Macleod
Golspie

Why is Golspie by-pass route not shown on the Local Plan?
Sutherland futures vision strategy, Sutherland local plan off October 2006 has the by-pass shown.

As above

264 Mr John Mackay
Golspie

About six years ago we were assured at a public meeting that the possibility of a Golspie by-pass had been consigned to the annals of history.

As above

Lo and behold it ahs been resurrected! Any such by-pass would have a harmful effect on the village economy - just as in Bonar/Ardgay and even in Tain.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 04 V 4.44		
216 Valerie Scott Golspie	<p>A Golspie by-pass route has been shown on the Sutherland Local Plan for many years. It is not shown on the current draft.</p> <p>Although the paragraphs above give a sense that a by-pass is still on the agenda, 4.44 uses the dreaded words 'could be' Regional Transport Authorities priorities. Many people would be happier if this was changed to 'will be'.</p> <p>I think the current route should be maintained on the plan until a firm agreement is reached.</p>	As above
Chapter 04 V 4.45		
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	We would support the idea of parts of Sutherland being given National Park status with the protection that would give to our environment (page 23 Para 4.45c).	Support noted.
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	<p>Environment.</p> <p>We completely agree with the thrust of para 4.45 and would put even more emphasis on the need to preserve Sutherland's wonderful scenery and environment.</p> <p>But, although not mentioned in the Local Plan (see above), the superquarry project would have a most negative impact on the environment in many different ways - again according to your own study para 8.1 "The character of the area will be significantly altered as it politely puts it.</p> <p>How can you reconcile all the wonderful statements in para 1.45 such as "Sutherland offering a superlative visitor experience" with a proposal which would destroy Loch Eriboll, one of the more scenic parts of Sutherland?</p> <p>Another point is the burying of power cables which we have already referred to. In Laid the power cable goes through the township some fifty to a hundred yards down from the road instead of following the road as one would expect. As a result, most houses, including three B&Bs, have the wonderful view across the loch interrupted by the power line just a few yards from the house.</p> <p>We would suggest that the Environment part of the Plan makes this sort of careless positioning of power lines impossible with them either being buried or following the road.</p>	Comments are noted. However, arrangements for low-flying of aircraft is beyond the scope of the Local Plan. The superquarry issue is dealt with in a separate response. The Plan seeks to put in place a policy framework that enables future development proposals, where they come before the Council for consideration, to be carefully assessed in terms of their impact on landscape and on specific heritage features.

Chapter 04 V 4.45

The same remark applies to digging out quarries by the road side. Laid has several of these gashed out of the hillside by the A838 by the Ministry of Defence to make a road to Farad Head many years ago - and then just left as eyesores. We suggest that the Plan makes this sort of thing impossible in the future since it downgrades the environment and shows just the sort of lack of the "Caring for the Heritage" you are advocating (para 4.43 page 18 and para 3 page 3.8) and with which we totally agree.

Another minus for the environment is the amount of low flying which goes on over Sutherland.

Tourists from England and especially Europe are constantly expressing their surprise that this is allowed as jet aircraft roar overhead, spoiling the very peace and quiet they are here to enjoy. This is in no way "Conserving and promoting the Highland identity" para 3.4.1 page 5.

We suggest that the Plan provides for the phasing out of this low flying which is completely foreign to the sort of environment we want to preserve.

326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	SNH strongly welcomes section 4.45 of the vision under "a place of outstanding heritage: safe in the custody of local people". To be clearer, this could refer to "natural, built and cultural heritage". However with regard to the possibility of National Park status (4.45©), any consideration of a National Park for the whole or part of Sutherland would have to follow the procedures as set out in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 whereby the Scottish Ministers in the first place make a "National Park proposal". This process should be made clearer.	Reject suggested change to title of section 4.45 as the scope of 'heritage' is clear from other references in the Plan. We will add information elsewhere in the document on how the Plan will be implemented and will provide clarity and refer to processes that would be required to be followed for potential projects and schemes referred to in Vision, for example pursuing National Park status. Amend paragraph 4.45e to include reference to landscape in respect of the Dornoch Firth, as suggested.
--	---	---

576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Section 4.45 A Place of Outstanding Heritage Safe in the Custody of Local People includes a reference to national park status. It is not clear whether this is a community-led project to promote national park status or whether this is endorsed by the Council. This should be clarified in the text.</p> <p>Further, there is reference to the Flow Country potential World Heritage Site. Again, I think that this section would benefit from clarification. Scottish Natural Heritage has worked with Highland Council on the Management Plan for the Flow Country and has indicated to the Council that they should not invest further resource in the World</p>	The Vision is not saying that these initiatives will happen but rather that they have the potential to come forward and sit well with the strategy of the Plan. We will add information elsewhere in the document on how the Plan will be implemented and will provide clarity and refer to processes that would be required to be followed for potential projects and schemes referred to in Vision, for example pursuing National Park or World Heritage Site status.
--	--	---

Chapter 04 V 4.45

Heritage Bid until both the process and the timescale for the review of the Tentative List is clear. I would expect the Local Plan to say something along the lines that they will consider the potential for taking forward World Heritage Site status for the Flow Country once the review of the Tentative List has commenced and the requirements are clearer. These comments reiterate those made previously to the Sutherland Futures Issues and Options Paper consultation.

Chapter 05 G General Comment

311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency

Dingwall

Objection Policy and Part of Plan

Omission of Policy on Protection of Water Environment and All Allocations Containing Watercourses

Objection

SEPA objects to the omission of a specific policy on protection of tile water environment. National Planning Policy Guidance I 4 'Natural Heritage' Paragraph 55 states "Lochs, ponds, watercourses and wetlands are often both valuable landscape features and important wildlife habitats, and planning authorities should seek to safeguard their natural heritage value within the context of a wider framework of water catchment management." This is particularly important in this Plan area where allocations in close proximity or enclosing watercourses are common.

SEPA notes that the SEA Environmental Report assesses whether allocations contain watercourses. SEPA also notes that in some instances where an allocation contains a watercourse, the Allocation Developer Requirements states "Requirement to retain and integrate watercourses as natural features within the development." Highland Structure Plan FA11 states "The Council will, in co-operation in partners, use the planning system and voluntary codes of good practice to ensure the proper management of river systems". The Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) (WEWS) Act 2003 implements the EC Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), which is aimed at maintaining and improving the quality of aquatic ecosystems and requires that any ecological risks to the water environment associated with development (including engineering

INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).

REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.

AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS.

A key task of The Water Framework Directive regime is the production of River Basin Management Plans.

Chapter 05 G General Comment

operations) be identified and controlled.
Scottish Planning Policy 1 'The Planning System' Paragraph 22 states "The obligations specified in these Directives have a number of implications for the use of land which should be recognised and reflected in development plans and development control decisions." The reference to "these Directives" includes the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC).
Furthermore under the WEWS Act Local Authorities are Responsible Authorities and therefore must give consideration to the aims of the Water Framework Directive when exercising their functions, including preparation of Development Plans. One of the key tasks of the Water Framework Directive regime is the production of River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) and the land use planning system has an important role to play in installing and enhancing the water environment, particularly prior to River Basin Management Plans being produced. The Highland Council is partner in the production of RBMP covering this area.

Compliance of planning applications with the Water Framework Directive will be picked up in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. In the interim, Structure Plan policy FA11 covers this issue. All allocations containing a watercourse will have a Developer Requirement stating, "Requirement to retain and integrate watercourses as natural features within the development".

Modifications Required to Remove SEPA's Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made.

1. A policy is included in the Plan which states that planning applications will be determined in compliance with the Water Framework Directive. SEPA will be happy to discuss a detailed form of words for this policy with the Planning Authority, incorporating a general recommendation that the Policy states that any development that may have a detrimental impact on the water environment would not be supported unless suitable mitigation can be put in place to ensure compliance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive or SEPA have confirmed that an exemption from Water Framework Directive requirements will apply.
2. For all allocations containing a watercourse the Allocation Developer Requirements should state "Requirement to retain and integrate watercourses as natural features within the development".

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection SEPA objects to the omission of a specific policy on protection of the water environment.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Guidance 14 'Natural Heritage' Paragraph 55 states "Lochs, ponds, watercourses and wetlands are often both valuable landscape features and important wildlife habitats, and planning authorities should seek to safeguard their natural heritage value within the context of a wider framework of water catchment management." This is particularly important in this Plan area where allocations in close proximity or enclosing watercourses are common.</p> <p>SEPA notes that the SEA Environmental Report assesses whether allocations contain watercourses. SEPA also notes that in some instances where an allocation within the Deposit Draft West Highland Local Plan contains a watercourse, the Allocation Developer Requirements states "Requirement to retain and integrate watercourses as natural features within the development." Highland Structure Plan FA11 states "The Council will, in co-operation in partners, use the planning system and voluntary codes of good practice to ensure the proper management of river systems". The Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) (WEWS) Act 2003 implements the EC Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), which is aimed at maintaining and improving the quality of aquatic ecosystems and requires that any ecological risks to the water environment associated with development (including engineering operations) be identified and controlled.</p> <p>Scottish Planning Policy 1 'The Planning System' Paragraph 22 states "The obligations specified in these Directives have a number of implications for the use of land which should be recognised and reflected in development plans and development control decisions. The reference to "these Directives " includes the Water Framework Directive (200/60/EC).</p> <p>Furthermore under the WEWS Act Local Authorities are Responsible Authorities and therefore must give consideration to the aims of the Water Framework Directive when exercising their functions, including preparation of Development Plans.</p>	As above

Chapter 05 G General Comment

One of the key tasks of the Water Framework Directive regime is the production of River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) and the land use planning system has an important role to play in maintaining and enhancing the water environment, particularly prior to River Basin Management Plans being produced. The Highland Council is partner in the production of RBMP covering this area.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection
SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made.

1. A policy is included in the Plan which states that planning applications will be determined in compliance with the Water Framework Directive. SEPA will be happy to discuss a detailed form of words for this policy with the Planning Authority, incorporating a general recommendation that the Policy states that any development that may have a detrimental impact on the water environment would not be supported unless suitable mitigation can be put in place to ensure compliance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive or SEPA have confirmed that an exemption from Water Framework Directive requirements will apply.
2. For all allocations containing a watercourse the Allocation Developer Requirements should state "Requirement to retain and integrate watercourses as natural features within the development".

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency
Dingwall

Objection Policy and Pa@ of Plan
Omission of Policy on Air Quality
Objection

SEPA objects to the omission of an appropriate policy addressing air quality. SEPA notes that Structure Plan Policy W12 requires the Council to adhere to certain principles in considering development proposals, and where appropriate, new developments will be required to submit an environmental assessment which address air pollution.

SEPA draws attention to policy guidance from the Scottish Executive

INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).

REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
<p>Chapter 05 G General Comment</p>	<p>dated March 2004 'Air Quality and Land Use Planning'. It states "It is important that the LAQM process is dealt with in an interdisciplinary way by local authorities if its aims are to be met, with support and endorsement from all relevant departments. The planning system has a particularly important role to play both in efforts to improve air quality and to at least ensure that existing air quality does not deteriorate. The enclosed guidance is being reissued as a separate document to emphasise this."</p> <p>The enclosed guidance within the remainder of the policy guidance document states:</p> <p>"The land use planning system is integral to improving air quality." "Local authorities should integrate air quality considerations within the planning process at the earliest possible stage. To facilitate this they should consider developing supplementary planning guidance or protocols" [It should be noted that in the case of the Sutherland Local Plan, the review of the Local Plan provides the opportunity for such integration of air quality considerations.] "Some issues that should be considered in the preparation of development plans, and may also be material in the consideration of individual planning applications, are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensuring that land use planning makes an appropriate contribution to the achievement of air quality objectives; - the need to identify land, or establish criteria for the location of potentially polluting developments and the availability of alternative sites - inclusion of policies on the appropriate location for new development, including reducing the need to travel and promoting public transport; - the potential effects of particular types of development on existing and likely future air quality, particularly in and around AQMAs; and - the requirements of air quality action plans." <p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection</p> <p>SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made,</p> <p>1. A specific policy is included in the Plan which states that the Planning Authority will take into account the impact of development on air quality in general and the findings of its Local Air Quality Management review and assessment of air quality in particular. In addition the Policy should state that an assessment of the impact on air quality would be required</p>	<p>REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS.</p> <p>There is already a policy on air quality in the Structure Plan, therefore it will be reconsidered in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. Air quality is only one of many important matters and we should not be highlighting it above other relevant planning considerations.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment		
	for all development proposals that are likely to have significant air quality impacts.	
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>3. Marine fish farming SPP 22 Planning for Fish Farming encourages a policy framework, including a spatial strategy, for the development of marine fish farms to be included within development plans. Although this was published after the commencement of this Local Plan there is now an opportunity to include some consideration of marine fish farming in this plan. However, an alternative would be assurance that marine fish farming policy development work would be carried out as part of the imminent Highland-wide Local Development Plan, including classification of the coast in terms of NPPG 13 Coastal Planning.</p> <p>SPP 22 does not mention Marine Consultation Areas (MCAs), but these should be incorporated within the spatial framework. In Sutherland MCAs exist for Loch Eriboll and Loch Laxford. These are identified as deserving particular distinction in respect of the quality and sensitivity of the marine environment within them.</p> <p>4. Tourist routes and scenic viewpoints - Structure Plan Policy T6 Although not an explicit requirement of the Structure Plan, it would be very desirable if the Local Plan identified on the Proposals Map important scenic viewpoints and important tourist routes to build upon Structure Plan Policy T6 and its preamble. The latter could be road, railway or ferry routes. Any important views over open water from these routes should be identified as a "local/regional feature under Policy 4. One scenic viewpoint is from the Struie Road across the Dornoch Firth. Another might be the summit of Ben Bhraggie. SNH would be happy to provide further information on this if required.</p> <p>5. Access and Rights of Way The Deposit Draft Local Plan currently does not meet guidance requirements in its coverage of public access, including core paths, rights of way and other routes. There is no policy on access and recreation and no explicit reference to the protection of rights of way and other important paths, nor to the enhancement of recreational opportunities through the development of further paths. NPPG 14,</p>	<p>INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).</p> <p>REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS.</p> <p>Further work on marine fish farming will be carried out in the Highland Wide Local Development Plan</p>

Chapter 05 G General Comment

paragraph 71 states that Local Plans should identify appropriate opportunities to improve public access for the purposes of enjoying and learning about the natural heritage. SPP 11, paragraph 21 states that the local development plan should cross-refer to the core paths plan, incorporate relevant material and set out policy protection for core and other paths such as long distance routes and rights of way. In addition it states that it may be appropriate to include key information on the proposals map. Because access rights and core paths plans are material considerations in determining applications for planning permission, the Local Plan should contain appropriate policy references for this purpose. SPP 11 also states that new development should incorporate new and enhanced access opportunities where appropriate. Local plan policies relating to outdoor public access can make links to the importance of public access in delivering sustainable health, social, economic and environmental benefits. SNH recommends that the Proposals Map include the key recreational path network, and that the Council should include a further general policy which has regard to the maintenance and enhancement of that network. Accordingly SNH strongly recommends an additional general policy along the lines of -

We will seek to maintain and improve public access and enjoyment throughout the Local Plan area, including upholding access rights and the core paths, and the assertion of rights of way. New development should incorporate new and enhanced access opportunities where appropriate.

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

Policy 1
SNH strongly recommends that this policy (or Policy 2) be augmented by a further policy that takes account of policy advice now contained in SPP 11 Open Space and Physical Activity with regard to (a) a presumption against development on open space as identified in Local Plans, (b) a specific policy for playing fields, whether or not these are also identified as open space in the Local Plan, and c) criteria for the provision of open space within larger new housing developments. The identification and protection of open space as shown on the Proposals Map insets will need to be reviewed, ideally in the light of an Open Space Audit and Strategy as per SPP 11.

INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).

REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment	Open Space will also need to be picked up as a theme for the imminent Highlandwide Local Development Plan.	<p>OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS.</p> <p>Open Space – see answer to policy 1.</p>
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Chapter 3 - Plan Objectives SNH recommends that an additional policy is included to make a clear link to the plan objectives, for example:</p> <p>All development proposals will be assessed for the extent to which they contribute to the achievement of the plan objectives or, Developments will be supported, having regard to the Plan Objectives in Section 3, which promote and enhance the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the people of Sutherland.</p>	<p>INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).</p> <p>REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment		<p>WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS</p> <p>Add to paragraph 2.2 after text, ".....(section 4C).": "All development proposals will be assessed for the extent to which they contribute to the achievement of the plan objectives in Section 3."</p>
250 Mr David Forbes Lairg	<p>2. Building especially foundations, access roads on soft peat, requires local quarrying. New mobile crushers can utilise existing or open up new "borrow pits" at minimal impact if hundreds of environmental damaging road miles from distant quarries. There are thousands of local sites available and could be used. Policy needed for such sites e.g. removing a blind corner of rock improves a local road??</p>	<p>As above</p>
497 RSPB Golspie	<p>The Marine Environment Highland Council has a statutory obligation for managing development associated with the marine environment within its geographical area. The Sutherland coastal and offshore waters are internationally important for populations of seabird, seaduck, wader and wildfowl. The deposit draft lacks guidance in this area, which we believe should be addressed. The UK government is currently considering various sites around the coast as extensions to the Special Protection Area (SPA) network, under the EU Birds Directive (79/409/EU). We suggest that there is a strong likelihood of areas of the Sutherland coast meeting future guidelines for all three types of marine SPA. Notably, colony extensions seaward, inshore aggregations of wintering marine species, and offshore aggregations of seabirds. Additionally, in Sutherland 'Marine Consultation Areas' exist for Loch Eriboll and Loch Laxford. We suggest that this should be taken into consideration regarding development advice, as it will likely be a material consideration for any future application for consent. SPP 22 Planning for Fish Farming encourages a policy framework, including a spatial strategy, for the development of marine fish farms to be included within development plans. Failure to do so as part of the deposit draft is we believe a significant omission.</p>	<p>INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).</p> <p>REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment		OTHER CLARIFICATION
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency	<p>Objection Policy and Part of Plan</p> <p>Water Supply- Each Settlement where the Plan identifies a water capacity deficiency</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>SEPA welcomes the assessment of the capacity of the public water supply network and the detailing of this for each settlement. I-however SEPA objects to the Plan as it stands as it is contrary to Scottish Planning Policy 3 'Planning for housing' (SPP 3) as it is unclear whether water supply network improvements can be implemented.</p> <p>It is SEPA's understanding that "allocations Vs capacity" refers to an assessment of whether the existing water supply network can accommodate the Plan allocations. It is unclear what the deficiency is and if the capacity assessments assess network capacity and ability of the water environment to accommodate further development. SPP 3 Paragraph 85 states "Creating a new settlement or major extension will generally require partnership between the public sector, private developers and other interests. Development plans should be clear about the likely scale of developer contributions, which for some sites may include provision of all or most new infrastructure, road improvements and similar requirements. Such provisions should be drawn up in consultation with the relevant parties, and the cost of providing the necessary infrastructure should be commensurate with the scale of the development proposed ."</p> <p>It? The light of the new role of SEPA and Scottish Water as key agencies in cooperation in the preparation of development plans, SEPA considers that it would be more useful to the public, developers and planners to identify not only the public water supply capacity for each</p>	<p>Aquaculture Framework Plans and Coastal Zone Management Plans deal with the issues raised in the representation. The Highland-wide Local Development Plan will pursue the issue further.</p> <p>INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).</p> <p>REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS</p> <p>A consistent approach for outlining water and waste water capacity for each settlement will be agreed. For water supply we will outline the current position. We will however be dependent upon information supplied from Scottish Water.</p>
Dingwall		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment	<p>settlement, but mechanisms which could be implemented to address capacity constraints. SEPA would be happy to work with Scottish Water and the Council to assist in this process.</p> <p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection</p> <p>SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made 1. Where there are infrastructure issues the settlement descriptions should set out the nature of these issues and how they could be addressed without adverse impact upon the water environment (e.g. network capacity, scale of development that could facilitate upgrades to infrastructure).</p>	
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>SEPA objects to the omission of an appropriate policy addressing air quality. SEPA notes that Structure Plan Policy W12 requires the Council to adhere to certain principles in considering development proposals, and where appropriate, new developments will be required to submit an environmental assessment which address air pollution.</p> <p>SEPA draws attention to policy guidance from the Scottish Executive dated March 2004 'Air Quality and Land Use Planning'. It states "It is important that the LAQM process is dealt with in an interdisciplinary way by local authorities if its aims are to be met, with support and endorsement from all relevant departments. The planning system has a particularly important role to play both in efforts to improve air quality and to at least ensure that existing air quality does not deteriorate. The enclosed guidance is being reissued as a separate document to emphasise this."</p> <p>The enclosed guidance within the remainder of the policy guidance document states:</p> <p>"The land use planning system is integral to improving air quality."</p> <p>"Local authorities should integrate air quality considerations within the planning process at the earliest possible stage. To facilitate this they should consider developing supplementary planning guidance or protocols" [It should be noted that in the case of the Sutherland Local Plan, the review of the Local Plan provides the opportunity for such</p>	<p>INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).</p> <p>REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment	<p>integration of air quality considerations.]</p> <p>"Some issues that should be considered in the preparation of development plans, and may also be material in the consideration of individual planning applications, are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensuring that land use planning makes an appropriate contribution to the achievement of air quality objectives; - the need to identify land, or establish criteria for the location of potentially polluting developments and the availability of alternative sites - inclusion of policies on the appropriate location for new development, including reducing the need to travel and promoting public transport; - the potential effects of particular types of development on existing and likely future air quality, particularly in and around AQMAs; and - the requirements of air quality action plans." <p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made.</p> <p>1.A specific policy is included in the Plan which states that the Planning Authority will take into account the impact of development on air quality in general and the findings of its Local Air Quality Management review and assessment of air quality in particular. In addition the Policy should state that an assessment of the impact on air quality would be required for all development proposals that are likely to have significant air quality impacts.</p>	<p>We will add a sub paragraph to GP10.</p>
496 Sport Scotland Edinburgh	<p>There is an allocation for Open Space however there is no Open Space policy or justification. In sport Scotland's letter of 12 December 2006 the need to incorporate such a policy was raised (copy attached). In November 2007 the Scottish Government published SPP 11 Open Space and Physical Activity which sets out national planning policy on the provision and protection of open space. The local plan needs to address the SPP 11 objectives. There is no evidence that the local plan is based on an open space audit and strategy which would include one for playing fields and sports pitches.</p> <p>The local plan does identify areas of open space within settlement proposal maps. However there are some inconsistencies for example in</p>	<p>INSERT GENERAL POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT ON TRAVEL TO PROVIDE MORE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY IN ADVANCE OF FULLER SUITE OF POLICIES IN HIGHLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (HLDP).</p> <p>REJECT SUGGESTION OF NEED FOR POLICIES ON TOURISM, WATER FRAMEWORK, AIR QUALITY, FISH FARMING, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, AQUACULTURE AND COASTAL ZONE, RENEWABLE ENERGY AS COVERED BY STRUCTURE PLAN, DPPG/SPG AND</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment	<p>Brora and Kinlochbervie where the school playing fields are designated as open space whereas the adjoining football grounds are not. Under SPP 11 all playing fields would be covered by paragraphs 45-47 and the criteria of paragraph 46 if subject to any proposal for redevelopment came forward.</p> <p>Therefore sportsScotland recommends that the local plan addresses the need to comply with SPP 11 and specific open space policies.</p>	<p>OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES AND/OR WILL BE REVIEWED HIGHLAND-WIDE AS WE IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCHEME THROUGH NEW HLDP/SPG. DETAIL OF CORE PATH PLANS, ONCE FINALISED, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.</p> <p>AMEND TEXT TO ADDRESS CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES INCLUDING WATERCOURSES WITHIN SITE ALLOCATIONS, REGARD TO BE HAD TO THE PLAN OBJECTIVES, CONSISTENCY OF WATER AND WASTE WATER CAPACITY INFORMATION AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS</p> <p>Open Space – see answer to policy 1.</p>
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection Policy and Part of Plan</p> <p>Omission of Policy on Contaminated Land</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>While Policy 10 refers to land with possible contamination issues, it does not provide clear guidance to developers on how contaminated land needs to be risk-assessed, remediated and redeveloped. SEPA therefore objects to the omission of clear policy on contaminated land. Land subject to contaminative uses is an important issue in the Highland Council area, as it contains a significant area of such land. Planning Advice Note 33 'Development of Contaminated Land' (PAN 33) Paragraph 27 states "In preparing development plans, planning authorities are expected to encourage and promote the reuse of Brownfield land, including contaminated sites. Development plans provide an opportunity for authorities to set out their priorities for the reclamation and re-use of contaminated land, and to inform developers of the availability of sites, and the potential constraints attached to them."</p> <p>In addition PAN 33 states that "Planning authorities should therefore require that applications include suitable remediation measures. If they</p>	<p>We will add a sub paragraph to general policy 10 saying, "where the past history of land/use management indicates that contamination may have occurred, developers will be required to undertake a risk assessment to establish the level of contamination if any; provide an assessment of the impact of contamination including any contaminative migration and effect on controlled waters together with provisions for treatment/amelioration; and decontaminate the site prior to any further occupation".</p>

Chapter 05 G General Comment

do not, then there are grounds for refusal. Where applications are approved, conditions should be put in place to ensure that land is re-mediated before the commencement of any new use."

PAN 33 Paragraph 27 states "The planning authority must consider whether a developer's restoration plan is adequate to avoid unacceptable risks to human health and the wider environment from the contamination on the site, both during the restoration period and for the final end use. The end use of the site is a crucial consideration when determining whether a restoration plan is adequate".

SEPA considers that the Planning Authority should satisfy itself that the potential for contamination is properly investigated, that risks associated with any contamination are assessed and that any necessary remediation is undertaken to ensure that the land is suitable for its proposed new use and does not represent a risk to the wider environment.

SEPA wishes to highlight that SEPA's role is to provide advice to Local Authorities primarily with respect to the water environment aspects of the identification and treatment of contaminated sites.

Further guidance on this policy should be sought from your contaminated land colleagues.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA9s Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made
1. A separate policy is inserted into the Plan to the following effect:
"Where development is to take place on land that has been subject to contaminative uses, the developer is required to undertake an adequate risk assessment of the site, and to propose measures to avoid unacceptable risks to human health and the wider environment both during the restoration period and for the final end use."

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>While Policy 10 refers to land with possible contamination issues, it does not provide clear guidance to developers on how contaminated land needs to be risk-assessed, remediated and re-developed. SEPA therefore objects to the omission of clear policy on contaminated land. Land subject to contaminated uses is an important issue in the Highland Council area, as it contains a significant area of such land.</p> <p>Planning Advice Note 33 'Development of Contaminated Land' (PAN 33) Paragraph 27 states "In preparing development plans, planning authorities are expected to encourage and promote the re-use of brownfield land, including contaminated sites. Development plans provide an opportunity for authorities to set out their priorities for the reclamation and re-use of contaminated land, and to inform developers of the availability of sites, and the potential constraints attached to them."</p> <p>In addition PAN 33 states that "Planning authorities should therefore require that applications include suitable remediation measures. If they do not, then there are grounds for refusal. Where applications are approved, conditions should be put in place to ensure that land is re-mediated before the commencement of any new use."</p> <p>PAN 33 paragraph 27 states "The planning authority must consider whether a developers restoration plan is adequate to avoid unacceptable risks to human health and the wider environment from the contamination on the site, both during the restoration period and for the final end use. The end use of the site is a crucial consideration when determining whether a restoration plan is adequate.</p> <p>SEPA considers that the Planning Authority should satisfy itself that the potential for contamination is properly investigated, that risks associated with any contamination are assessed and that any necessary remediation is undertaken to ensure that the land is suitable for its proposed new use and does not represent a risk to the wider environment.</p> <p>SEPA wishes to highlight that SEPA's role is to provide advice to Local Authorities primarily with respect to the water environment aspects of the identification and treatment of contaminated sites. Further guidance on this policy should be sought from your contaminated land colleagues.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment	<p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made.</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> A separate policy is inserted into the Plan to the following effect:</p> <p>"Where development is to take place on land that has been subject to contaminative uses, the developer is required to undertake an adequate risk assessment of the site, and to propose measures to avoid unacceptable risks to human health and the wider environment both during the restoration period and for the final end use.</p>	
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Please note that whilst SEPA has concerns regarding Policies 4, 11-13, SEPA has not made representations on these policies as SEPA would direct you to SNH's representations on these matters.</p> <p>SEPA would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Planning Authority to discuss the attached representations and to provide any other assistance to the Development Plan process.</p>	See answer to General Policies 4, 11, 12 and 13.
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection</p> <p>SEPA welcomes the assessment of the capacity of the public water supply network and the detailing of this for each settlement. However SEPA objects to the Plan as it stands as it is contrary to Scottish Planning Policy 3 'Planning for Housing' (SPP 3) as it is unclear whether water supply network improvements can be implemented.</p> <p>It is SEPA's understanding that "allocations Vs capacity" refers to an assessment of whether the existing water supply network can accommodate the Plan allocations. It is unclear what the deficiency is and if the capacity assessments assess network capacity and ability of the water environment to accommodate further development. SPP 3 Paragraph 85 states "Creating a new settlement or major extension will generally require partnership between the public sector, private developers and other interests. Development plans should be clear about the likely scale of developer contributions, which for some sites may include provision of all or most new infrastructure, road improvements and similar requirements. Such provisions should be</p>	A consistent approach for outlining water and waste water capacity for each settlement will be agreed. We will however be dependent upon information supplied from Scottish Water.

Chapter 05 G General Comment

drawn up in consultation with the relevant parties, and the cost of providing the necessary infrastructure should be commensurate with the scale of the development proposed.”
 In the light of the new role of SEPA and Scottish Water as key agencies in cooperation in the preparation of development plans, SEPA considers that it would be more useful to the public, developers and planners to identify not only the public water supply capacity for each settlement, but mechanisms which could be implemented to address capacity constraints. SEPA would be happy to work with Scottish Water and the Council to assist in this process.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA’s Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made.

1. □ Where there are infrastructure issues the settlement descriptions should set out the nature of these issues and how they could be addressed without adverse impact upon the water environment (e.g. network capacity, scale of development that could facilitate upgrades to infrastructure).

311 Scottish Environment
 Protection Agency
 Dingwall

SEPA notes that several policies (for example, Policies 3 and 16) contain a requirement for consistency "with other policies in the Highland Structure Plan and this Local Plan" whilst other policies (for example, Policies 1, 10, 14, 17) do not. SEPA considers that there is a danger from this approach that the general public and developers may mistakenly assume that Structure Plan and other Local Plan policies do not apply where this is not specifically stated. SEPA objects to this inconsistency as the Local Plan does not provide clear guidance to developers and the public as to which policies apply and therefore the Local Plan does not appear to have due regard for impacts upon the environment.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA’s Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if either of the following amendment is made.

1. The wording is removed from specific policies and clarified at the beginning of the Local Plan as a general requirement for all

An explanation of how to use the General Policies is available in the Introduction and Context chapter and in the introduction of the General Policies Chapter.

Chapter 05 G General Comment

development, or

2. The following wording is inserted into all policies: "All proposals should be consistent with other policies in the Highland Structure Plan and this Local Plan."

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency
Dingwall

The following 11 comments were from the objection from SEPA dated 9th June 2008
Please see file copy for the differences from the deposit draft flagged in red

As above

Objection/Policy Part of Plan
General Policy Inconsistency - All Policies
Objection
SEPA notes that several policies (for example, Policies 3 and 16) contain a requirement for consistency "with other policies in the Highland Structure Plan and this Local Plan" whilst other policies (for example, Policies 1, 10, 14, 17) do not. SEPA considers that there is a danger from this approach that the general public and developers may mistakenly assume that Structure Plan and other Local Plan policies do not apply where this is not specifically stated. SEPA objects to this inconsistency as the Local Plan does not provide clear guidance to developers and the public as to which policies apply and therefore the Local Plan does not appear to have due regard for impacts upon the environment.
Modifications Required to Remove SEPA's Objection SEPA would remove its objection if either of the following amendments is made.
1. The wording is removed from specific policies and clarified at the beginning of the Local Plan as a general requirement for all development, or
2. The following wording is inserted into all policies: "All proposals should be consistent with other policies in N7e Highland Structure Plan and this Local Plan. "

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 G General Comment		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Additional policy required</p> <p>SNH strongly recommends the inclusion of an additional policy to safeguard important habitats in the wider countryside. NPPG 14 refers specifically to the need for planning authorities to take particular care to avoid damage to habitats protected under the European Directives. The Inverness Local Plan (adopted March 2006) includes protection for important habitats under Policy GP23 and so it would be inconsistent if there was no equivalent policy for Sutherland. An additional policy is therefore required and we would suggest the following wording:</p> <p>Full consideration will be given to habitats listed in Annex 1 of the EC Habitats Directive and the habitats of species protected under Annex 1 of the EC Birds Directive outwith designated nature conservation areas in the assessment of any development proposal which may affect them. Consent will not normally be granted where any adverse effects are judged to be significantly detrimental. Where we judge that the reasons in favour of a development clearly outweigh the desirability of retaining such a habitat, we will seek mitigation measures including habitat creation or enhancement of retained habitat.</p>	See answers for General Policies 11, 12 and 13.
494 Mono Consultants Glasgow	<p>We write to your planning authority on behalf of the Mobile Operators Association (MOA), which consists of: - . Hutchison 3G UK Limited ("3), 02 (UK) Limited ("O;), Orange PCS Limited ("Orange"), T-Mobile UK Limited ("T-Mobile"); and Vodafone Limited ("Vodafone").</p> <p>The MOA monitors all emerging development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance that relate to telecommunications development and those which would have an impact on their member's agreements to supply a mobile telecommunications service in the UK. Mono Consultants undertake this project on behalf of the MOA.</p> <p>Whilst we have no objections to the draft plan we note that Section 5: General Policies does not appear to include any generic policy relating to telecommunications development. It is noted that the approved Highland Structure Plan contains Policy U4 relating to telecommunications development and NPPGIQ: Radio Telecommunications recommends that Local Plans contain policies to facilitate telecommunications development.</p>	Structure Plan Policy U4 deals with telecommunications and therefore it will be dealt with via the imminent Highland-wide Local Development Plan.

Chapter 05 G General Comment

Given the above we would consider it important that the Sutherland Local Plan contains such a generic policy which would be broadly in accordance with the current Structure Plan Policy and the national planning guidance in NPPGIQ. On this basis we would suggest that within the Local Plan there should be a concise and flexible telecommunications policy which should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues which development will be assessed against. We would suggest a policy which reads;

Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -

(i) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area;

(ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building;

(iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority.

(iv) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.

When considering applications for telecommunications development, the Council will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology. We would consider it appropriate to introduce the policy and we would suggest the following;

Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of

Chapter 05 G General Comment

the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The Council are keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and location on existing tall structures and buildings.

We trust the Council give due consideration to the inclusion of a policy facilitating telecommunications development as suggested above being incorporated in the Sutherland Local Plan, and look forward to receive consultation on the finalised draft plan in due course.

Chapter 05 GP 02 Land Allocations 5.04

4 Mrs J Harrison
Ardgay

Water supply is not adequate for any new houses to be added. I appreciate that investment has to be made for this and investment cash is difficult to find. Sutherland has been starved of such investment for many years. Perhaps if the planning permission were held up until the water schemes were completed, it might just give more weight to getting investment cash forward.

CONFIRM POLICY.

The granting of planning permission does not secure connection to the public water supply, but applicants are advised by the Council that they must seek consent from Scottish Water for a water connection. Scottish Water will not, other than in exceptional circumstances, object to a planning application. The absence of an objection should not be interpreted as acceptance that the proposed development can currently be serviced. Scottish Water takes into consideration the views and development priorities expressed by the Planning Authority, and planning permissions that have been granted, when preparing its investment programme. They have been consulted on the Local Plan and are aware of the allocations and they will use this when programming their investment priorities. Scottish Water advises the Council on the current and programmed capability to accommodate development.

General Policies 1 and 2 allow acceptable and appropriate infill development within Settlement Development Areas to come forward. General Policies 3 and 16 allow for appropriate development outwith Settlement Development Areas. National Policy seeks to

Chapter 05 GP 02 Land Allocations 5.04

concentrate most new development within existing settlements.

The housing capacities in the Local Plan are purely indicative. At planning application stage a more detailed appraisal will be undertaken of the actual site capacity.

243 HSCHT
Dornoch

As you know the HSCHT work across Sutherland and work closely with community Representative bodies in each area (normally Community Councils).

As above

In general we are getting the same feedback from all the CC's in the smaller rural areas regarding the draft LP. These comments are on the whole supportive of the proposal but they are concerned that the allocations in the LP are not to the detriment of gap sites locally also and more importantly that the sites allocated do not rule out future development outwith the settlement boundary when a realistic need arises (especially for younger local families).

Given the proposed current changes in the funding of affordable housing it has become even more critical that any land allocated in the LP is realistically and economically developable. If in the future it proves that some of the sites prove to be unviable it is essential that some flexibility is built into the plan to allow provision of suitable replacement sites.

As discussed at previous meetings it is very important that it is made clear and emphasised in the Plan that the proposed housing capacity on each site is indicative only.

These comments apply to all submissions made by HSCHT.

Chapter 05 GP 03 Wider Countryside 5.06

Chapter 05 GP 03 Wider Countryside 5.06

240 Peter Polson & Angela Ogilvie
Golspie

Since 1983 local plans covering the Golspie area have consistently identified the development constraints in Backies necessitating a policy presuming against house building that is not essential to the management of the land. In particular, the narrow single track access roads to Backies from Golspie via low railway bridges and water supply to properties above a certain elevation continue to remain as development constraints.

The low bridge access constraint will not be removed in the lifetime of the new plan, if ever, particularly as this depends upon the construction of a Trunk road bypass of the village. The residential amenity of the Backies area has also been affected by additional traffic arising from visitors to the mountain bike tracks and construction workers travelling to and from the Kilbraur wind farm development. The latter is happening despite an undertaking from the developer to instruct contractors not to follow a route through Backies. The low bridge access constraint also restricts the serving of Backies by emergency vehicles. More significant housing development would increase traffic and consequently the risk of accidents on the road and potential road closures with the resultant detrimental impact upon residential amenity.

We therefore ask that the plan be modified to identify areas where development constraints clearly exist rather than just rely upon the broad provisions or criterion of General Policies 3 and 4.

AMEND POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT WHERE RELEVANT TO MORE CLEARLY REFER TO SUPPORTING FRAGILE COMMUNITIES AND CONSIDERING LANDSCAPE CHARACTER, INCLUDING SETTLEMENT SETTING

General Policy 3 states that it must be read in conjunction with general policies 4 and 16. General Policy 4 highlights the natural and cultural heritage features which will be taken account of when making decisions on development proposals. General Policy 16 deals with housing development within the hinterland of towns where there is generally tighter restraint than in other parts of the countryside.

General Policy 16 refers to the conversion or reuse of traditional buildings and the redevelopment of derelict land. The Council also has a Development Planning Policy Guideline on "Housing in the Countryside" (referred to in General Policy 16) which gives further information.

The SHLCS is one of a number of considerations as background material to the Plan.

Change 2nd bullet point to "are in accordance with the existing settlement pattern and landscape character...".

In second paragraph add "as" to the following sentence, ...and where there is generally less intensive development already as part of the landscape....".

Road access, upgrade and maintenance during construction are all issues dealt with via planning conditions to a planning permission.

The Council is currently preparing Supplementary Planning Guidance for On-Shore Wind Energy Development. Once finalised it will be used when assessing renewable energy developments. SPP15 Planning for Rural Development and PAN 73 Rural

Chapter 05 GP 03 Wider Countryside 5.06

Diversification want a prosperous rural economy in sustainable locations wherever appropriate. General Policy 3 in the supporting text recognises the countryside as an economic resource. It would be unfair to specifically mention renewable energy development in the policy as it is not the only economic development than can help rural economies.

A cross-reference to Landscape Character Assessments will be made in WHILP.

The Council may make additional information available on development constraints from time-to-time.

The supporting text of the general policy will be amended to include advice on the importance of or sensitivity of some settlement settings. In those areas of the wider countryside development will only be supported if it does not harm the settlement setting.

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

Policy 3
SNH strongly recommends that the second bullet point should start - "are in accordance with the existing settlement pattern and landscape character"

As above

575 Mr or Ms W G Murray
Golspie

I wish to comment on the proposed local plans for Sutherland.

As above

My concern is that in the hinterland of towns and villages planning permission for further housing is being denied. I would suggest that there is certainly a demand for accommodation in rural areas, because not everyone would want to live cheek by jowl with their neighbours in urban housing estates.

It is also true to say that people living in small communities in the countryside , although they may wish to see their communities develop and increase in size, because of the currently planning restrictions, they cannot visualise this ever happening.

I shall be obliged if you will give consideration to the above points

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP 03 Wider Countryside 5.06		
	before coming to a final decision in regard to local plans.	
250 Mr David Forbes Lairg	1. The open countryside/housing policy is vague if settlement maps. The overall policy supports youth and people first. Perhaps mention could be made of the many deserted settlements/housing foundations circa post clearances as being potential new rural reinhabite house sites? Some of these still show gable ends and fireplaces, doorways etc.	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	As well as the LCA, the supporting text should make cross-reference to the SHLCS as a possible material consideration. Once again however the qualification should be made in the text that the LCA may need to be augmented by finer-grained analysis at a smaller scale. (NB: in the preamble the text should be amended to read - "..... And where there is generally less intensive development already as part of the landscape")	As above
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	Wider Countryside Although there is no direct reference to SPP 15 Planning for Rural Development, its themes appear to be broadly incorporated in the Plan, particularly through the objectives identified in relation to consolidating the settlement hierarchy and creating an improved business environment and in policy defining settlement development areas.	As above
307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll	Another general comment is that there is little attention given to small settlements. Over recent years the population of Laid has not only increased but also several small businesses have been set up. We feel that this is a trend which will continue as more people opt for the sort of quality of life we have here - and this is not something which is looked at in the Plan which concentrates on places higher up in the "settlement hierarchy". Housing The Plan as it stands reads as a housing plan but does little to suggest how the 1,300 new houses are going to be filled. For the record, we were happy with the map showing the possible housing development area (which was in line with a resolution passed at a recent AGM by the	NO CHANGE The larger settlements have allocations because this is where most of the future growth and larger developments will occur, where the main services are and greater development pressure exists. These therefore have land allocated for larger development and an SDA which promotes development which makes best use of infrastructure and services whilst protecting the character of the surrounding countryside. However within the wider countryside there is opportunity for smaller scale development. A site by site assessment

Chapter 05 GP 03 Wider Countryside 5.06

shareholders) which was in the Sutherland Futures document but which no longer appears in the Map Booklet.

against the natural and cultural heritage features, considering settlement pattern, loss of locally important croft land and any infrastructure constraints is considered the most appropriate approach. Particularly when you consider the comparatively low build rate.

The site identified in Laid in the consultation document Sutherland Futures was identified before we had formed the general policy framework and when we did so we felt it was best to maintain the flexibility for these small settlements and deal with proposals for them on a case by case basis.

Chapter 05 GP 05 Affordable housing 5.14

197 Director of Housing & Property Services
Inverness

Affordable Housing Policy 5
I'd be very grateful if you could please make the following to affordable housing policy 5

1st sentence - delete 'area' - to read "delivery plan"
2nd para - delete - 'local action plan' to read " The housing strategy will indicate any areas"

Based on the previous housing needs assessment and recent work by Bramley, it may be challenging to justify a contribution towards affordable housing more than 25% in Sutherland communities. However I've not looked at the data, including community needs surveys, in enough depth to confirm this. I would welcome some discussion with you on community needs and Local Plan expectations.

To date we have not identified communities where it may be appropriate for a >25% contribution. Nor have we identified the tenure split expected at a sub-highland level -although identified for highland (2/3rd rent;1/3 LCHO). If you could let me know when this work/evidence is required by, we can discuss it further and programme it in.

5. Definition of affordable housing
Please add 'shared equity' to the low cost housing for sale.

AMEND POLICY TO CLARIFY THAT AFFORDABLE HOMES SHOULD BE OF THE SAME STANDARDS AS GENERAL MARKET HOMES.

Key forecasts for Skye and Lochalsh show an additional 988 houses required between 2008 and 2018. The Local Plan needs to identify land for enough housing to meet these anticipated changes. This will include an adequate supply of land for both affordable and private housing for existing residents and those moving into the area. There continues to be a demand for second/holiday homes and this pattern has been taken into account in drawing up the plan.

The threshold of 4 dwellings triggering the need for affordable housing is already in place in Wester Ross via policy in the local plan.

The revised Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing clarifies the operation of the Council's policy in practice. If the viability of a scheme is questioned, open book accounting will encouraged.

Applicants to the housing waiting list should not be debarred because they have no local connection to an

Chapter 05 GP 05 Affordable housing 5.14

The glossary definition of private rented housing is misleading in relation to the policy guidance note which defines it as:
 Approved private rented accommodation - owned and/or managed by a private sector landlord to approved management and maintenance standards with equivalent to Registered Social Landlord rents.

area, but it can determine priority. Highland Council waiting list policy is that anyone can apply to be on the list but priority is given to people who need to reside in an area.

The penultimate paragraph of the policy will not make reference to Structure Plan Policy G2 as the introduction to the general policies section clearly states that all policies and legislation are relevant to all proposals.

In the first sentence of the supporting text we will delete "Area" before Delivery Plan. In Appendix 1 we will add "shared equity" to the definition for low cost housing for sale and we will change the third bullet point in the affordable housing definition to, "approved private rented accommodation - owned and/or managed by a private sector landlord to approved management and maintenance standards with equivalent to Registered Social Landlord rents."

The Local plan aspirations and allocations will feed into the next round of the Local Housing Strategy.

In WHILP we will add a sentence to the end of the final paragraph, "However, equivalent contribution/provision within any neighbouring settlement will also be acceptable"

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
 Golspie

Policy 5
 The penultimate paragraph of this policy should make reference to Structure Plan Policy G2, i.e. "Proposals which include affordable housing should accord with Structure Plan Policy G2 and should be carefully designed ", to reinforce the need for sustainable design.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP 05 Affordable housing 5.14		
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	Affordable Housing In General Policy 5 Affordable Housing (page 31), the Local Plan emphasises the strong links to the Council's LHS. If the Local Plan's strategy is towards population growth, will the LHS then reflect this?	As above
<hr/>		
Chapter 05 GP 11 Protected Species and Habitats 5.26		
497 RSPB Golspie	Policies 11 'Protected Species & Habitats', 12 'Article 10 Features' & 13 'Scheduled Species'. These policies should refer to relevant species contained in the EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds 79/409/EEC, The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 in addition to the animals and plants already cited. Again, we believe they should be cross-referenced with the existing strategies and plans that consider these interests. For example, the Peatlands Management Strategy is directly relevant to Policy 12. The Local Plan should make developers aware of the need to consider the presence or absence of European Protected Species (including their breeding and resting sites) at the time of submitting a planning application. It should be clear that these species are not restricted to the designated sites, mapped within the deposit draft. Adequate survey, assessment and appropriate mitigation should be a minimum requirement for inclusion in any relevant application.	See the answers to General Policies 11, 12 and 13.
<hr/>		
Chapter 05 GP 15 Developer Contributions 5.32		
325 HIE Caithness & Sutherland Thurso	Developer contribution - we would welcome further discussion on your proposals for developer contribution particularly in more peripheral areas as we have some concerns regarding the effect of this on what are in the main marginal developments.	CONFIRM POLICY BUT AMEND SUPPORTING TEXT. To the list of potential developer contributions we will add the following, "Infrastructure: The need for improvement of road, water and sewerage infrastructure." A table of developer requirements will be developed for Fort William. There are normal on-site developer costs e.g.

Chapter 05 GP 15 Developer Contributions 5.32

Sustainable Drainage Systems, Access etc that we will not negotiate on. However, if through open-book accounting a developer can show us that a site would be unviable, then we would adjust/reduce developer requirements.

Community facilities do cover some leisure facilities such as village halls. Commercial projects would not be included as a community facility in developer contributions. The local plan does not want to be prescriptive about what would be considered community facilities.

It is recognised that Highland-wide we need to do further work on developer contributions and hence work is being progressed separately on Supplementary Planning Guidance for Developer Contributions. The supporting text of the general policy states that, "The principle of proportionate developer contributions is underpinned by the general policy below and may be secured through a Section 75 Agreement where necessary". This would be subject to negotiation and therefore it is unnecessary to add additional text to the policy. The supporting text also highlights that applicants should discuss developer contributions prior to submission of applications. For allocations, developer requirements are set out on the basis of the information that we have.

490 The Theatres Trust
London

Sutherland Local Plan Pre-Deposit Draft

As above

Thank you for your letter dated May 2008 consulting The Theatres Trust on the Pre-Deposit Draft May 2008 for the Sutherland Local Plan.

The Theatres Trust is a statutory body established by the Theatres Trust Act 1976 and The Theatres Trust (Scotland) Act 1978 'to promote the better protection of theatres for the benefit of the nation'. The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992, Article 15, Para 1(k) sets out the requirement of all local

Chapter 05 GP 15 Developer Contributions 5.32

authorities to consult the Trust before they issue a decision on any planning application involving land on which there is a theatre.

Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use in the UK, or the potential for such use but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies. Due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and therefore anticipate policies relating to cultural facilities.

We have read the document and have one comment make regarding community facilities.

Policy 15 Developer Contributions

We note there are references to community facilities throughout the document but for clarity and especially for this particular policy we request a definition of the term 'community facilities' either in the text or within a Glossary and suggest community facilities provide for the health, welfare, social, educational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.

We look forward to being consulted on further local plan documents in due course

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Dingwall

Whilst SEPA welcomes the inclusion of a policy considering developer contributions, SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it does not provide a clear guide as to what is required of developers.

As above

Policy 15 does not refer to water and sewerage infrastructure improvements. Given the importance of this issue in the area covered by Highland Council SEPA considers it important to advise developers of these possible developer requirements

Modification Required to Remove SEPAs Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made.

1. The supporting text for Policy 15 includes reference to the need for water and sewerage improvements.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP 15 Developer Contributions 5.32		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Objection Policy and Part of Plan Developer Contributions - Policy 15 Objection Whilst SEPA welcomes the inclusion of a policy considering developer contributions, SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it does not provide clear guidance as to what is required of developers. Policy 15 does not refer to water and sewerage infrastructure improvements. Given the importance of this issue in the area covered by Highland Council SEPA considers it important to advise developers of these possible developer requirements Modifications required to Remove SEPA'S objection SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment's made. 1. The supporting text for Policy 15 includes reference to the need for water and sewerage improvements.	As above
Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34		
254 Dornoch Commnuity Council Dornoch	Hinterland Policy. In order to encourage the younger generation to stay on existing crofts, a request for greater flexibility towards individual planning applications, particularly on existing crofts where the older generation wish to remain but would like to encourage younger members of the family to build a new home there. However we are opposed to major developments in the hinterland.	AMEND POLICY TO CLARIFY MEANING AND UPDATE TERMINOLOGY. AMEND SUPPORTING TEXT TO PROVIDE CLARITY AND TO REFER TO PAN72. General Policy 16 allows for housing on crofts if it can be shown that the house is essential for land management or family purposes related to the management of the land (retired farmers and their spouses). The policy presumes against housing in the open countryside around towns as defined in the local plan. The policy only affects certain areas of Sutherland and the general policy lists a number of exceptions to the policy. One of the exceptions is where a proposal involves conversion or reuse of traditional buildings or the redevelopment of derelict land. Policy 3 Wider

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

Countryside outlines when proposals will be supported in the wider countryside, outwith the hinterland around towns.

The local plan does not identify and allocate sites for single houses in the open countryside or for new ad-hoc groups of houses. Settlement Development Areas (SDAs) are the preferred areas for most types of development, including housing. This is to make best use of existing infrastructure and services and to protect the character of the surrounding countryside. For housing proposals outwith SDAs (in the countryside) the general policies of the local plan will be used to assess the proposal.

The second bullet point in the policy box will now read, "Affordable housing is required to meet a demonstrable local affordable housing need". A definition of affordable housing is provided in Appendix 2 of the local plan.

The penultimate paragraph of the policy will not be changed to include reference to PAN 72 Housing in the Countryside; however the final paragraph of the supporting text will be amended to include reference to it.

A detailed hinterland map around Fort William will be produced.

In WHILP we will delete the final paragraph of the policy but add/retain SDAs and associated developer requirements/objectives for Achabeag, Kinlochmoidart, Stronchreggan, Garbhan, Blaich, Erracht, Roshven, Achnacarry, Inverroy, Bunarkaig, Drimnin/Bunavullin, Muirshearlich and Kinlocheil. Achabeag to include objectives for developer master plan, phasing, contributions for retaining wall improvements, protection of public seaward views. Erracht to include objectives to support development which is appropriate to the existing dispersed settlement pattern, to safeguard the existing natural and built environment, to protect features of

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

historical value and important recognised views and to protect any recreation areas and footpaths within the settlement. Achnacarry & Bunarkaig to include historic environment protection objectives. We will reject suggested restrictive housing in the countryside policy for Glencripesdale. We will Add more definitive housing in the countryside hinterland boundary to Proposals Map and amend the Strategy Map accordingly.

The Housing in the Countryside DPPG is currently being reviewed and gives further details of where opportunities for development can be progressed. There is also the link to the Highland wide Local Development Plan, which will include further policy on housing in the countryside. General Policy 3 Wider Countryside seeks to take account of viability, need and infrastructure consequences.

In order to make clear that a proposal would need to fit one of the scenarios set out in the policy we will add, "at least one of the following apply" before the beginning of the bullet points.

It is stated at the beginning of the general policies chapter and at the beginning of the introduction and context chapter that all policies must be read together. General Policies 3, 4 and 16 also state that they are related and should be read together.

276 Audrey MacKay
Dornoch

The present crofting townships have developed by careful management of the land and the gradual increase in the housing stock by younger families coming and living in the community but given this proposed policy they will have to wait for the older generation to die out, so how does this match the governments policy of care in the community.

While I understand the need for guidance over how an area is developed I have found that the local planning officials are not prepared to relax the local plan although I don't know how some houses have obtained permission and I would hope that the excessive area covered

As above

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

by the Dornoch hinterland can be changed to permit limited development.

I would also raise the issue of development on the outskirts of Dornoch which I have watched over the years as the water table has risen and I understand that even the basement of the council offices is quite often under water and that the new houses are to be built of pile foundations because of this rise in the water levels.

The proposed extent of the hinterland around Dornoch is excessive and restrictive.

The proposal restricts the use of my croft grounds to agricultural use only and given the current situation within farming without having the potential to diversify or sell the occasional small site may see my management of the land cease due to financial restraints.

The crofting townships have grown up by the development of the ground for residential use either by tile sub-division of the croft to family members or by being developed to introduce young families into the area, these are lacking in this area the majority of the crofting community being well into middle age which does not show up in your report.

303 Mr Peter Harrison
Golspie

Thank you for sending the CD giving the details of the proposed Local Plan and I am writing to object to certain elements within it that cover restrictive aspect of it as follows.

As above

The proposed area of hinterland proposed for the Dornoch area is excessive and stifles development within this large area. It is my understanding that the hinterland is considered the surrounding area of Tain and not Dornoch and as such the distance should be taken from the centre of Tain to the boundary of this area which I believe is taken as being seven miles by road.

The present arrangement is similar to that proposed and I have had three applications refused by the local planning office. The applications were for the conversion of an existing building to a dwelling house and the proposed erection of a house for a member of the crofter's family

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

both of which appear to meet your guidelines in the new plan but were refused under the old.

This increase in the area of hinterland except for some reason an area East of the Achu road means that the present crofters or farmers are severely restricted in the development of their land, with the difficulties being experienced by this sector some form of compensation should at least be offered if the present restrictive requirements are to be extended or the proposed restrictions eased.

A large area of the land to be incorporated within the hinterland is classed as "wider countryside" or of "local regional importance" and only some parts of being of "national importance" and as such should be considered as areas for possible development rather than be stifled by being classed as hinterland.

In the written statement [strategic objectives] it mentions the need to put people first and develop thriving settlements which I also assumes to also mean crofting communities and this is the last thing the proposals will address as it basically restricts any development to the main villages.

In support of this I had a application for a house on the family croft refused even though the local community council, crofters commission, and all other interested parties except for the planning department as the proposed house was marginally out of the envelope although this had not applied to other applications in the area.

In the Dornoch area this has already allowed development on a well known flood plain in the area and which I believe will come back to haunt the council in the years to come. In other villages the restrictive envelope enclosing them means that any development is effectively stifled as the document presumes that the landowner will make the sites shown on the plan available.

While I quite understand that development in Sutherland over recent years leaves a lot to be desired and in certain parts appears not to meet the councils own guidelines. However it appears to me that reasonable design and positioning of buildings can enhance an area without spoiling the environment and this should be by guidelines which allow

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

for individual development in conjunction with the planning department rather than a blanket ban.

In your written statement 443 [a competitive place] it is made quite clear that crofting and development by the sporting estates should be encouraged in the seaboard area of the county but with the restrictions shown on the proposed plan this is not possible.

In conclusion I feel that the proposed local plan ignores the needs of local people, crofting and farming Communities and fails to address the need of the local more rural communities by restricting any building basically to limited sites in the villages I hope my views will be made to the relevant committee.

296 Mrs Margaret Brydone
Ardgay

I did what you said on the phone and I looked at the plans in the Bonar Bridge library.

As above

On looking at them I see no reason why I should not be allowed to give my daughter my side garden to build a small house on.

Her health is at stake Mr Cowie as she has C.O.P.D which s Crucial Objective Pulmonary Disorder. This means she must have clear fresh air to breathe properly and there's no better air than in Spinningdale. At the moment she has to use an inhaler most of the time.

She was a carer before she left this country and her partner was a tree surgeon, so everything will be kept in tip-top condition. They have always been good workers and do not claim social security!

She can afford to have a house built but cannot afford the land, so she can have my land free of charge, also I will be at hand if she needs help.

I'm sure no villagers will object as my house is on the perimeter of the village, and it is for health reasons!

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34		
306 Mr Hugh Murray Golspie	<p>I understand that the plan as it stands is almost completely opposed to house building in the hinterland of towns or villages (for example Dornoch). This would appear to be the case even where a house has stood hitherto on the site and where part of the original building is still standing. I would suggest that in those situations the rules should certainly be relaxed.</p> <p>It is not everyone's wish to live in a housing estate cheek by jowl with their neighbours, and there certainly is a demand for housing out-with the areas currently laid down for housing development. I would, therefore, further suggest that in the Local Plan Planning Officers should be given discretion to allow development to proceed on sites in the hinterland of towns and villages, so long as the development would not encroach on good agricultural land.</p>	As above
364 Mr David MacKay Dornoch	<p>I have looked at your CD giving the details of the proposed Local Plan and I am writing to object to the proposal for the hinterland around Dornoch.</p> <p>The area of hinterland proposed for the Dornoch area affects my crofts which lie inside the marked boundary shown on the maps on the disk but which are also shown as being an area of low regional importance and marsh with the wider countryside areas.</p> <p>Due to the present financial constraints on farming I am objecting to the extent of the hinterland which is strangling this area as I can not develop or sell any ground or find an alternative source of income to help finance the upkeep of these crofts and those of my neighbours.</p> <p>I would also say that the restrictions mean that should my family wish to build a house on a bare land croft or if I pass a croft onto a young couple they will be unable to obtain planning permission for a house and I find this totally unacceptable and not in line with what I had thought was the councils policy to encourage young people to come to the county.</p> <p>'The present crofting townships have developed by careful management of the land and the gradual increase in the housing stock</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34	<p>by younger families coming and living in the community but given this proposed policy they will have to wait for the older generation to die out, so how does this match the governments policy of care in the community.</p> <p>While I understand the need for guidance over how an area is developed I have found that the local planning officials are not prepared to relax the local plan although I don't know how some houses have obtained permission and I would hope that the excessive area covered by the Dornoch hinterland can be changed to permit limited development.</p> <p>I would also raise the issue of development on the outskirts of Dornoch which I have watched over the years as the water table has risen and I understand that even the basement of the council offices is quite often under water and that the new houses are to be built of pile foundations because of this rise in the water levels.</p>	
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Policy 16 In the penultimate paragraph of this policy, as well as reference to Structure Plan Policy G2, there should also be reference to PAN 72 Housing in the Countryside.</p>	As above
355 Mr Ian Robichaud Inverness	<p>Following the release of the draft local plan for Sutherland I would like to make the following objection.</p> <p>During the consultation process I highlighted an area at Clashnagrave for development. I would like to see this area included in the Sutherland local plan as I believe it is a suitable area for development as there is a pent up and unmet demand in the Dornoch and surrounding area for housing. I would develop the area to include a house and garden grounc</p>	As above
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Policy 16: Housing in the Countryside states a presumption against housing in the open countryside around towns and sets out clearly the circumstances where exceptions to the policy will be made. I note that this includes where housing is essential in association with an existing or new rural business this is key in terms of the approach to housing development in rural areas set out in SPP 15. It would, however, be helpful to make clear in the policy that a proposal would need to fit one</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34	<p>of the scenarios set out in Policy 16 simply inserting or after derelict land" penultimate bullet) would achieve this.</p> <p>It would be logical to locate Policy 16 with Policies 3 and 4 given the importance afforded to reading these together.</p>	
355 Mr Ian Robichaud Inverness	<p>Following the release of the draft local plan for Sutherland I would like to make the following objection. I would like to see the area outlined in red on the accompanying map included in the Sutherland Local Plan. The area, which I own, lies at Balnapolaig, just outside Dornoch.</p> <p>I think it would be a suitable location for a dwelling house for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) it would help meet the demand for housing in the Dornoch area ii) there is an access road in place from the "Poles Road" and from that access road there is a strip of land between two existing houses which could form a "road" to the proposed house iii) the house would not be in an isolated rural location as a housing cluster already exists with further housing activity currently taking place. It would, in my opinion, be filling a gap. iv) The location would be levelled to accommodate, comfortably, a dwelling house and garden 	As above
355 Mr Ian Robichaud Inverness	<p>Following the release of the draft local plan for Sutherland I would like to make the following objection. I would like to see the area outlined in red on the accompanying map included in the Sutherland Local Plan. The area, which I own, lies at Balnapolaig, just outside Dornoch.</p> <p>This area is situated in the garden of "Balnapolaig Farmhouse" which I own and which has a sitting tenant. I would like to build a new dwelling house at Balnapolaig which would be suitable for my sitting tenant to move into, thus allowing me to upgrade the existing "Balnapolaig Farmhouse". As I write, I have an appointment with the Scottish Rental Housing Panel to discuss the current living standard of "Balnapolaig Farmhouse".</p>	As above

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

The "upgraded" property could then be used to meet the demand for housing within the Dornoch area. The site itself is not in an isolated, rural location, as there is other housing in the surrounding area of Balnapolaig.

The existing septic tank and soak away could be used to accommodate the "new" house as well as continuing to serve what would be the "upgraded" house. The access road for the new house would be the same road as used by "Balnapolaig Farmhouse".

295 Edderton Community Council
Edderton

Edderton Community Council welcomes the flexibility in the deposit draft Sutherland local plan regarding the settlement of Edderton in contrast to earlier plans. In particular it appreciates that area along Manse Road that is designated for mixed business/ housing development.

As above

We wish the following matters be taken into consideration in compiling the final draft:

That the areas around Ardmore and Balleigh be removed from hinterland restrictions since they already have such a concentration of building that they no longer resemble the landscape Highland Council's hinterland policy is designed to protect.

535 Anne Roden
Dornoch

At present I own the croft at 45 Astle, Dornoch. My husband and I build a one and a half storey house in 1995 and decrofted the building area.

As above

Approaching retirement, my plan was to build a bungalow in the scrub land. We have spent a fair amount on this area (drainage/fencing) from our own funds as crofting community did not consider this as agricultural ground.

When I investigated into outline planning permission, I was told this area is now considered as Hinterland (albeit on the very edge) and therefore could not build a smaller house on my own land.

If I have to sell my croft, I would have to sell or euphonize my own

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

livestock and poultry.

I also allow the use of 8 acres of arable ground to a crofter friend and look after his cattle and sheep for him. Obviously, if I have to leave the croft and sell privately, the land would be lost to livestock.

We have turned the land from neglected, weed infested ground into arable land to support animals and the crofting environment.

I feel it's in the interest of the crofting community that I can stay here and continue to improve the land.

I would be grateful if you could consider more flexibility in the Hinterland policy in S.E. Sutherland area.

I would welcome your comments and hopefully support.

353 Mr Patrick Porteous MICFor
For: Otger Merckelbach, Fearn

Our objection is with reference to the category of Hinterland covering all areas of commercial woodland, irrespective of the location and potential to permit development of discrete and sensitively designed rural housing.

As above

The attached plan of Clashmore Forest, highlights two areas that are categorised as Hinterland (Policy 16) within the present local plan. The draft plan has identified limited potential (up to 6 units) for suitably sited and designed housing which is welcomed. However there is further scope to create an expansion area adjacent to the AS, west of Rose Cottage. Suitable access could be taken from the Trunk road in consultation with TEC services to allow creation of a small settlement or low density housing.

To the west of the forest there is potential to accommodate up to 6 units to the north of Clashmore village in an area that would not have any impact on landscape, habitat or productive farmland. Low density development is already taking place and with the mains water line adjacent there would be adequate scope to create expansion on the margins of the village. Allowing locals or those relocating the opportunity to stay in the area.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34		
353 Mr Patrick Porteous MICFor For: Otger Merckelbach, Fearn	<p>Our main concern is with the allocation of Hinterland surrounding the small settlement of Whiteface.</p> <p>I attach a plan highlighting the area adjacent to the Whiteface settlement that should not be categorised as Hinterland (Policy 16) as there is adequate scope and potential to identify at least 3 units to be sensitively positioned. This would enhance the small community, utilising existing bare ground with little impact on the landscape character or woodland habitat.</p> <p>The infrastructure can be adjusted to accommodate this along with water supplies with the use of private bore holes. The plan needs to be more accommodating with respect to settlement development areas, as there are several areas that are already being given approval (East Spinningdale, west of Larachan house) that are not linked to existing settlements. There has to be some flexibility on the margins of Hinterland and settlements to allow low density housing in order to maintain small communities. Giving locals or those wishing to move in to the area the choice to inhabit a rural location.</p>	As above
296 Mrs Margaret Brydone Ardgay	<p>I must object to this "Housing Policy H3" of the draft Sutherland Local Plan at Spinningdale as I have a plot in my side garden which has ample space for a house plus parking, also septic tank. My daughter needs to return from France to build a small house here as she has Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disorder C.O.P.D and needs as much clean air as possible and this is the ideal spot for that! Please see what you can do Mr MacKenzie and give us some hope for the future.</p>	As above
351 Mr David C Laird Dornoch	<p>I have looked at your CD giving the details of the proposed Local Plan and I am writing to object to the proposal for the hinterland around Dornoch.</p> <p>The area of hinterland proposed for the Dornoch area affects my crofts which lie inside the marked boundary shown on the maps on the disk but which are also shown as being an area of low regional importance and marsh with the wider countryside areas.</p> <p>Due to the present financial constraints on farming I am objecting to the extent of the hinterland which is</p>	As above

Chapter 05 GP 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.34

strangling this area as I can not develop or sell any ground or find an alternative source of income to help finance the upkeep of these crofts and those of my neighbours.

I would also say that the restrictions mean that should my family wish to build a house on a bare land croft or if I pass a croft onto a young couple they will be unable to obtain planning permission for a house and I find this totally unacceptable and not in line with what I had thought was the councils policy to encourage young people to come to the county.

The present crofting townships have developed by careful management of the land and the gradual increase in the housing stock by younger families coming and living in the community but given this proposed policy they will have to wait for the older generation to die out, so how does this match the governments policy of care in the community.

While I understand the need for guidance over how an area is developed I have found that the local planning officials are not prepared to relax the local plan although I don't know how some houses have obtained permission and I would hope that the excessive area covered by the Dornoch hinterland can be changed to permit limited development.

I would also raise the issue of development on the outskirts of Dornoch which I have watched over the years as the water table has risen and I understand that even the basement of the council offices is quite often under water and that the new houses are to be built on pile foundations because of this rise in the water levels.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 1 Settlement Development Areas 5.03

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

The third bullet point in the supporting text states that Settlement Development Areas have been defined taking into account the ability of the landscape to allow for development. It is assumed this includes reference to the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) and the SHLCS, but for the avoidance of doubt this should be clarified here. A further cross-reference to these background documents should be given here, stating however that the LCA may need to be augmented by fine-grained analysis at a smaller scale.

CONFIRM POLICY BUT AMEND SUPPORTING TEXT TO EXPLAIN THAT REGARD HAS BEEN HAD TO THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT (AND TO LANDSCAPE CAPACITY STUDY WHERE AVAILABLE).

The Landscape Character Assessment and the Sutherland Landscape Capacity Study are both used in the creation of the Local Plan and are cross-referenced in

Chapter 05 GP Policy 1 Settlement Development Areas 5.03

the supporting text of general policy 1. "Box 1" will be changed to read, "Appendix 1".

The introduction to the section on General Policies also states that all policies are relevant to all proposals.

Structure Plan Policy G2 will be included in the local plan; it is also available via the Structure plan which is in paper format and on-line.

We will not put a standard comment into each settlement text stating that cultural and natural heritage features may be present within the SDA. However we will ensure that where a natural or cultural heritage feature is present within a Settlement Development Area, that this is mentioned within the "Development Factor" list.

General Policy 2 has an allocation for Public Open Space (OS). This is for areas where the open space is a valuable community space and we would not wish to see any development take place on it. Not all playing fields are covered by the Public Open Space allocation. An Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is being prepared for the Council and will address the issues raised by SPP11. The work resulting from this SPG will not be available for the current round of local plans; however it will be carried forward via the Highland Wide Local Development Plan and in subsequent local plans.

It is not appropriate to have a policy referring to areas outwith SDAs in the General Policy for SDAs. Settlement setting is mapped for some areas of Sutherland, but not for every settlement as it was not always a suitable approach to take. In the cases where it is shown it is trying to prevent settlement coalescence and protect the landscape setting of a settlement. It is shown as a local/regional feature on the background maps and where appropriate on the settlement inset maps. General Policy 3 mentions settlement pattern and general policy 4 lists

Chapter 05 GP Policy 1 Settlement Development Areas 5.03

settlement setting as a local/regional important feature. The approach taken in the Sutherland Local Plan (only applying mapped settlement setting where appropriate/needed) was discussed with SNH and supported by them.

A decision was taken by the Syke and Lochalsh Area Committee to remove the 50 metre spacing between houses as it was felt to be too arbitrary. A 50 metre spacing can be perceived as too rigid a formula for deciding where it is appropriate to site a house. In some cases 50 metres from another house would mean that a new house was sited in an inappropriate site when perhaps a site slightly closer to the existing house, may have been a better site e.g. poorer croft land. All of the general policies will be taken into account when assessing a proposed development to ensure that inappropriate sites are not given planning permission. General policy 18 Design Quality and Place-Making states that proposals should have regard to the historic pattern of development in a locality.

A decision was taken by the Skye and Lochalsh Area Committee to remove this policy of a maximum of 2 houses on a croft as it was felt to be too arbitrary.

We recognise the importance of the issue of the best croft land. When we are defining a SDA we try to take into account the importance of certain areas of croft land. We have tried to ensure that the better in-bye land is not an allocated site; however it may fall within the SDA. With land inside the SDA, proposals will be supported but they will be judged against how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development, how they conform to existing and approved adjacent land uses and the effect on any natural and cultural heritage features within the area as outlined in general policy 4. In General Policy 4 locally important croft land is identified as a local/regional feature and has to be taken into account when making decisions on development proposals. These areas are

Chapter 05 GP Policy 1 Settlement Development Areas 5.03

presently not mapped as the information is unreliable/incomplete. General Policies 3 and 16 also give protection to locally important croft land. The Crofters Commission is now commenting at planning application stage which should give another opportunity to ensure that the best croft land is protected.

The supporting text of the General Policy has been amended to include reference to the regard we had to the Landscape Character Assessments in preparing the Plan. WHILP will also be augmented to include the key principles from the Landscape Character Assessments.

496 Sport Scotland
Edinburgh

There is an allocation for Open Space however there is no Open Space policy or justification. In sport Scotland's letter of 12 December 2006 the need to incorporate such a policy was raised (copy attached). In November 2007 the Scottish Government published SPP 11 Open Space and Physical Activity which sets out national planning policy on the provision and protection of open space. The local plan needs to address the SPP 11 objectives. There is no evidence that the local plan is based on an open space audit and strategy which would include one for playing fields and sports pitches.

As above

The local plan does identify areas of open space within settlement proposal maps. However there are some inconsistencies for example in Brora and Kinlochbervie where the school playing fields are designated as open space whereas the adjoining football grounds are not. Under SPP 11 all playing fields would be covered by paragraphs 45-47 and the criteria of paragraph 46 if subject to any proposal for redevelopment came forward.

Therefore sportscotland recommends that the local plan addresses the need to comply with SPP 11 and specific open space policies.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 1 Settlement Development Areas 5.03		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	It is recommended that the first part of the policy reads: "We will support proposals within Settlement Development Areas (as shown on the Proposals Map insets) as long as they meet the requirements of Structure Plan Policy G2 Design for Sustainability (see Appendix x) in addition to other policies in this plan". This emphasises that Policy G2 is not the only control over development within SDAs and avoids the presently-worded confusion with Policy 6. SNH recommends that Policy G2 be included as an additional Appendix to the Local Plan.	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Features of natural and cultural heritage importance occur within the SDAs but do not appear on the inset maps. This fact is recognised in the text of Policy 1 with its cross-reference there to Policy 4. However, SNH recommends that this would be made stronger if each "Development Factor" list for the settlements on the Proposals Map insets included words along the lines of - "Features of natural and cultural heritage importance (Appendix I) may occur within the SDA boundary and reference should be made to the Background Maps and Policy 4':</p> <p>In the text of Policy 1 there is reference in the second paragraph to a Box 1 in association with Policy 4 but the location of this is unclear. Perhaps this refers instead to Appendix 1 (Definition of Natural and Cultural Heritage Features), in which case the text should be amended accordingly.</p>	As above
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Housing</p> <p>Under Settlement Development Areas (p26), Developer Contributions are defined in the Glossary but Development Requirements are not. This could be clarified to avoid confusion.</p>	As above
Chapter 05 GP Policy 10 Physical constraints 5.25		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 10 Physical constraints 5.25		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>SEPA supports the inclusion of a policy in the Local Plan which considers possible physical constraints to development. However SEPA objects as SEPA considers the Policy does not provide guidance in accordance with national planning policy on appropriate safeguards required for some the sites listed.</p> <p>Scottish Planning Policy 10 'Planning for Waste Management' (SPP 10) states "Existing waste handling installations should be protected by development plan policy and care should be taken to ensure that future allocations for other adjacent uses do not compromise waste handling operations". SPP 10 provides further guidance on how to approach consideration of the case for buffer zones and should be referred to in the policy in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Planning Advice Note 50 'Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings' Paragraph 14 states that distances should be "reasonable, taking into account the nature of the mineral extraction activity (including its duration), location and topography, the characteristics of the various environmental effects likely to arise and the various amelioration measures that can be achieved". Whilst SEPA welcomes the proposed buffer of 400 m there may be situations where a greater buffer is required and therefore the Policy as it stands precludes the opportunity for further assessment and requiring greater buffer distances.</p> <p>Planning Advice Note 79 'Water and Drainage' Annex A sets out a number of additional waters to the ones listed in the Policy which EU Directives protect including Recreational Waters, Shoreline Waters and Freshwater Fish Waters.</p> <p>In addition the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 1999 (COMAH) are currently being reviewed which may have implications for hazardous sites. SEPA would be happy to discuss these implications once this review is complete.</p> <p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection</p> <p>SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.</p>	<p>AMEND POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT TO REFLECT BACKGROUND MAPPING, PROVIDE FOR UPDATING, INCLUDE REGARD TO BE HAD TO CONSTRAINT FEATURES CONSENTED BUT NOT YET BUILT AND PROVIDE EXPLANATION OF RISK ASSESSMENT REQUIRED IN THE CASE OF POSSIBLE LAND CONTAMINATION.</p> <p>The general policy has been amended to state that where relevant developers will need to have regard to both existing constraint features and to those consented but not yet built.</p> <p>The quarry buffer is a guide and is a historic policy that has been used in local plans. After, "where appropriate these are shown on the background maps", we will add, "Which may be updated with further information". In the bullet points add, "Hazardous Sites as shown on the Hazard Sites consultation area map". The bullet point on waste management sites will be changed to, "New, existing or former waste management sites in accordance with SPP10". The final three bullet points on waters will be deleted, and replaced with, "Any waters that an EU Directive applies to in accordance with PAN79". Therefore footnotes 3 and 4 will be deleted.</p> <p>The background maps will have cross-referring to the relevant policies.</p> <p>All proposals have to be assessed against all policies before a decision can be taken. We will amend text after "appropriate mitigation" to include "to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority...."</p> <p>Radon Gas will be added to the list of Physical Constraints.</p> <p>We will add "HSE Notifiable Hazardous Sites" to the list of physical constraints. There is a background map showing Hazardous Sites. The Inverhouse Distillers at</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 10 Physical constraints 5.25	<p>1. The Policy is modified to the following effect:</p> <p>Subject to the principle of development, developers will be expected to demonstrate appropriate mitigation if their proposals affect or are affected by the constraints below (where appropriate these are shown on the background maps which may be updated with further information).</p> <p>Poorly drained areas Within 1,000m of large wind generators ENA Standards 43-8: "Overhead Line Clearances" (distance from power lines) Areas of excessive slope (with a gradient of over 1 in 7) Hazardous Sites as shown on Hazard Sites consultation Area map and New, existing or former waste management sites in accordance with SPP10 Land with possible contamination issues Areas that could erode or subside Safeguard areas around sewage treatment works2 Safeguard areas around active quarries in accordance with PAN50 Any waters that an EU Directive applies to in accordance with PAN79."</p> <p>Other Modification SEPA Would Welcome SEPA recommends that the maps entitled 'Consultation Area Hazardous Sites', 'Physical Constraints EU Shellfish Directive Waters' 'Physical Constraints Existing or Former Waste Management Facility' and 'Physical Constraint: Sewage Treatment Works.' should refer to the relevant policies to provide further guidance as to what is meant by the terms 'consultation area' or 'physical constraint' as per the map title.</p>	Balblair Distillery will be mentioned in the settlement text for Edderton.
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection Policy and Part of Plan</p> <p>Physical Constraints - Policy 10</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>SEPA supports the inclusion of a policy in the Local Plan which considers possible Physical constraints to development. However SEPA objects as SEPA considers the Policy does not provide guidance</p>	As above

Chapter 05 GP Policy 10 Physical constraints 5.25

in accordance with national planning policy on appropriate safeguards required for some the sites listed.

Scottish Planning Policy 10 'Paining for Waste Management? (SPP 10) states "Existing waste handling installations should be protected by development plan policy and care should be taken to ensure that future allocations for other adjacent uses do not compromise waste handling operations". SPP 10 provides further guidance on how to approach consideration of the case for buffer zones and should be referred to in the policy in the Local Plan.

Planning Advice Note 50 'Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings' Paragraph 14 states that distances should be "reasonable, taking into account the nature of the mineral extraction activity (including its duration), location and topography, the characteristics of the various environmental effects likely to arise and the various amelioration measures that can be achieved". Whilst SEPA welcomes the proposed buffer of 400 m there may be situations where a greater buffer is required and therefore the Policy as it stands precludes the opportunity for further assessment and requiring greater buffer distances.

Planning Advice Note 79 'Water and Drainage' Annex A sets out a number of additional waters to the ones listed in the Policy which EU Directives protect.

In addition the Control of Major Accident hazards Regulations 1999 (CONIAIH) are currently being reviewed which may have implications for hazardous sites. SEPA would be happy to discuss these implications once this review is complete.

Modifications Required to Remove SEPRs Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.

1. 'The Policy is modified to the following effect:

"Subject to the principle of development, developers will be expected to demonstrate appropriate mitigation if their proposals affect or are affected by the constraints below (where appropriate these are shown on the background maps which may be updated with further information) Poorly drained areas

Within 1,000m of large wind generators ENA Standards 43-8:

"Overhead Line Clearances" (distance from power lines) Areas of

Chapter 05 GP Policy 10 Physical constraints 5.25

excessive slope (with a gradient of over 1 in 7) Hazardous Sites as shown on Hazard Sites consultation Area map
 New, existing or former waste management sites in accordance with SPPIO Land with possible contamination issues Areas that could erode or subside
 Safeguard areas around sewage treatment works2
 Safeguard areas around active quarries in accordance with PAN50
 Any waters that an EU Directive applies to in accordance with PAN79. "

Other Modification SEPA Would Welcome

SEPA recommends that the maps entitled 'Consultation Area Hazardous Sites', 'Physical Constraint EU Shellfish Directive Waters' 'Physical Constraints Existing or Fernier Waste Management Facility' and 'Physical Constraint: Sewage Treatment Works.' should refer to the relevant policies to provide further guidance as to what is meant by the terms 'consultation area' or 'physical constraint' as per the map title.

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
 Golspie

Policy 10
 To make the policy effective it is suggested that the first paragraph should end with - " ... and proposals will not be permitted if effects are judged to be significantly detrimental":

 Radon Gas Areas need to be added to this list of physical constraints. A Background Map already exists for this.

As above

12 Health and Safety Executive
 Edinburgh

I would recommend that you highlight the presence of Inverhouse Distillers at Balblair Distillery, Edderton, as certain types of development may be restricted within the consultation distance of the site. At the present time, it appears that development will not encroach on the site but it would be helpful to identify its presence by reference on page 36 in Policy 10 Physical Constraints.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 10 Physical constraints 5.25		
214 Scottish Water Glasgow	We support the acknowledgement made within 'Policy 10 – Physical Constraints' for applications to demonstrate that the affect of the proposed development on, or the affect on the proposed development of 'constraints', such as sewerage treatment works, should be fully taken account of and where appropriate mitigation put in place to protect the existing and proposed uses. Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) are essential infrastructure required to facilitate existing and proposed development and WWTW should be protected from development which may lead to complaints.	As above
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	In addition, the Scottish Government policy of a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road network should be added as another physical constraint in Policy 10.	This will be added to the list in General Policy 10.
Chapter 05 GP Policy 11 European Protected Species 5.27		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Policy 11 This policy should be compatible with the Conservation (Natural Habitats & co) Regulations 1994 as amended, "European Protected Species, Development Sites and the Planning System" (2001), and the letter from the Scottish Executive to all Planning Authorities dated 16 May 2006. At present it fails to be so. The Local Plan should make developers aware of the need to consider the presence or absence of European Protected Species (including their breeding and resting sites) at the time of submitting a planning application. The preamble to this policy could set out where information could be obtained from by prospective applicants on say bat distribution, e.g. SNH and local Countryside Rangers. SNH objects to the current wording and wishes an amendment to read as follows:</p> <p>Applications must be accompanied with sufficient information (including desk/field survey if necessary) and details of the development to enable us to assess whether or not any European Protected Species or their breeding sites or resting places are present and would be affected in any way set out in Regulations 39 and 43 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended). Where a potential adverse effect is identified, applications must demonstrate how this would be overcome by mitigation that would be incorporated into any approval. We will only approve any application which would result in an</p>	<p>DELETE POLICY BUT REPLACE WITH PROTECTED SPECIES</p> <p>Policies 11, 12 and 13 have been reworded and are now Protected Species (11), Other Important Species (12) and Important Habitats (13), to take account of the issues raised.</p> <p>There is now a stronger cross-reference to the protection of birds and their habitats. Rather than listing species, we now include links to various lists which are updated as necessary. For Article 10 Features the policy now goes further, ensuring that such features can be protected, enhanced and created.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Chapter 05 GP Policy 11 European Protected Species 5.27

action contrary to Regulation 39 or 43 if we are satisfied that all three tests necessary for the later grant of a licence from the Scottish Government under Regulation 44 are likely to be satisfied. These are that -

1. The purpose of the development is for preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reason of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment; and
2. There is no satisfactory alternative (to the granting of a licence); and
3. The development will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population at a favourable conservation status in their natural range (on which we shall if necessary consult with Scottish Natural Heritage as appropriate).

576 The Scottish Government
Edinburgh

It would be helpful to have Policies 11, 12 and 13 next to Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage as these address related issues.

As above

Policy 11 European Protected Species probably needs to go further than it does at present: the planning authority must follow the Regulations when reaching a decision on a planning application (it is not sufficient to rely on the licensing regime), so it would make sense and be more transparent to set out in this policy how this will be done. Is the list of species exhaustive? Again there may be merit in including text that allows for updating of the categories should circumstances change during the Plan period.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 12 Article 10 features 5.28

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

Policy 12
The present policy wording is weak. SNH strongly recommends that to the end should be added - "and we will not grant consent where such adverse effects are judged to be significantly detrimental". However, to comply more thoroughly with Regulation 37 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended), the following alternative policy should be considered:

DELETE POLICY BUT REPLACE WITH WIDER SPECIES

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 12 Article 10 features 5.28		
	<p>We will seek to safeguard the integrity of features of the landscape which are of major importance for wild fauna and flora, including river and estuary corridors, coastal habitats, lochs, wetlands, peatland, woodlands, heathland and traditional field boundaries, and other important habitats identified in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan. Where we judge that the reasons in favour of a development clearly outweigh the desirability of retaining such a feature, we will seek mitigation measures including habitat creation or enhancement of retained habitat.</p>	
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Policy 12 Article 10 Features: Article 10 is about the management of such features conducive to healthy ecosystems, the implication being that planning authorities should seek to protect, enhance and even create them. The policy should therefore ideally go further than noting that adverse affects will be assessed and be worded to ensure that such features can indeed be protected, enhanced and created anew.</p>	As above
Chapter 05 GP Policy 13 Scheduled Species 5.29		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Policy 13 To strengthen this policy it is strongly recommended that the wording is changed in line with the following text which reflects the adopted policy GP23 in the Inverness Local Plan (2006): Development proposals should avoid harm to species protected under Annex 1 of the EC Birds Directive, Schedules I, 5 and 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Annexes 11, Iv and V of the EC Habitats Directive. We will not grant consent where impacts on any of these species are judged to be significantly adverse.</p>	DELETE POLICY BUT REPLACE WITH HABITATS
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Policy 13 Scheduled Species. Again, this should go further and state that development that would not be in compliance with this Act (e.g. by destroying a nest) shall not be permitted. There is also the Badgers Act offering similar protection.</p>	As above
Chapter 05 GP Policy 14 Surface Water Drainage 5.31		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 14 Surface Water Drainage 5.31		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection</p> <p>While SEPA supports the inclusion of a policy in the Plan which promotes sustainable surface water drainage, SEPA objects to the current wording of the Policy as it does not provide clear guidance on how surface water drainage should be dealt with in a sustainable way or provide clear guidance to developers on the information that needs to be submitted in support of a planning application.</p> <p>Planning Advice Note 79 'Water and Drainage' (PAN 79) (paragraph 5) states "For all new developments sustainable drainage schemes (SuDS) are now required for surface water systems which provides attenuation and treatment prior to return, by natural dissipation where possible, to the water environment."</p> <p>SEPA considers that not all the key documents are referenced in the supporting text and in addition the references to redrafting of "Sewers For Scotland" or its title in the Policy and reasoned justification are no longer accurate as it has now been published.</p> <p>SEPA notes that the Developer Requirements for some allocations make reference to the requirement for SuDS whereas others do not. It would make the Plan more concise and consistent for all SuDS references in allocations to be removed as this SuDS policy applies to all allocations.</p> <p>SEPA considers that the SuDS definition in Appendix 2 does not provide a clear definition of SuDS as it does not refer to the water environment as a whole and does not highlight the range of SuDS devices which may be used.</p> <p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/>The Policy is modified to the following effect:</p> <p>"All proposed development must be drained by Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) designed in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual and where appropriate, the Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition. Planning applications should be submitted with information</p>	<p>AMEND POLICY AND AMEND SUPPORTING TEXT.</p> <p>Policy text will be changed to read, "All proposed development must be drained by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) designed in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual and, where appropriate, the Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition. Planning applications should be submitted with information in accordance with PAN 69 paragraphs 23 and 24". An additional sentence will be added after first sentence of supporting text. In supporting text we will change the reference from "... Sewers for Scotland which is currently being redrafted to incorporate SuDS" to "Sewers for Scotland 2". In the policy we will change the reference from "Sewers for Scotland" to "Sewers for Scotland 2".</p> <p>All references to SuDS in the Developer Requirements will be removed as the requirement is covered by the General Policy, unless net betterment is sought e.g. where an existing problem needs sorting.</p> <p>The SuDS definition in appendix 2 will be changed to, "Drainage techniques used to treat and return surface water run-off from developments (roof water, road run-off, hard standing areas) to the water environment (rivers, groundwater, lochs) without adverse impact upon people or the environment. Further guidance can be found in CIRIA's SuDS Manual C697 or Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition".</p> <p>The supporting text will be amended to include the following, "The following documents are relevant to this policy: Scottish Planning Policy 7 Planning and Flooding; The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C697); Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition; PAN 69."</p>

Chapter 05 GP Policy 14 Surface Water Drainage 5.31

in accordance with PAN 69 Paragraphs 23 and 24."

2.The following sentence is inserted after the first sentence of the Policy supporting text "SuDS provide control over quality and quantity of surface water drainage and provide opportunities for amenity and ecological enhancement."

3.The reference to "Sewers for Scotland which is currently being redrafted to incorporate SuDS" is amended to "Sewers for Scotland 2".

4.The definition of SuDS in Appendix 2 is reworded to the following effect:

Drainage techniques used to treat and return surface water run-off from developments (roof water, road run-off, hard standing areas) to the water environment (rivers, groundwater, lochs) without adverse impact upon people or the environment. Further guidance can be found in CIRIA's SuDS manual C697 or Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition.

5.The Policy supporting text is amended to include reference to the following relevant documents:
 Scottish Planning Policy 7: Planning and Flooding;
 The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C697);
 Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition;
 PAN 69.

311 Scottish Environment
 Protection Agency

Objection Policy and Part of Plan

As above

Dingwall

Surface Water Drainage - Policy 14 and Appendix 2: SuDS Definition

Objection

While SEPA supports the inclusion of a policy in the Plan which promotes sustainable surface water drainage, SEPA objects to the current wording of the Policy as it does not provide clear guidance on how surface water drainage should be dealt with in a sustainable way or provide clear guidance to developers on the information that needs to be submitted in support of a planning application.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 14 Surface Water Drainage 5.31

Planning Advice Note 79 'Water and Drainage' (PAN 79) (paragraph 5) states "For all new developments sustainable drainage schemes (SuDS) are now required for surface water systems which provides attenuation and treatment prior to return, by natural dissipation where possible, to the water environment".

SEPA considers that not all the key documents are referenced in the supporting text and in addition the references to redrafting of "Sewers For Scotland" or its title in the Policy and reasoned justification are no longer accurate as it has now been published.

SEPA notes that the Developer Requirements for some allocations make reference to the requirement for SuDS whereas others do not. It would make the Plan more concise and consistent for all SuDS references in allocations to be removed as the SuDS policy applies to all allocations.

SEPA considers that the SuDS definition in Appendix 2 does not provide a clear definition of SuDS as it does not refer to the water environment as a whole and does not highlight the range of SuDS devices which may be used.

Modifications required to remove SEPA's Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.

1. The Policy is modified to the following effect:

"All proposed development must be drained by Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) designed in accordance with The CIRA SUDS Manual and, where appropriate, the Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition. Planning applications should be submitted with information in accordance with PAM 69 Paragraphs 23 and 24. "

2. The following sentence is inserted after the first sentence of the Policy supporting text "SUDS provide control over quality and quantity of surface water drainage and provide opportunities for amenity and ecological enhancement."

3. The reference to "...Sewers for Scotland which is currently being redrafted to incorporate SuDS" is amended to "Sewers for Scotland 2":

4. The definition of SuDS in Appendix 2 is reworded to the following effect: "Drainage techniques used to treat and return surface water run-

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 14 Surface Water Drainage 5.31		
	<p>off from developments (roof water, road run-off, hard standing areas) to the water environment (rivers, groundwater, lochs) without adverse impact upon people or the environment. Further guidance can be found in CIRIA's SUDS manual C697 or Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition."</p>	
	<p>5. The Policy supporting text is amended to include reference to the following relevant documents: Scottish Planning Policy 7: Planning and Flooding; The SUDS Manual (CIRIA C697); Sewers for Scotland Manual 2nd Edition; PAN 69.</p>	
214 Scottish Water Glasgow	<p>In relation to Policy 14 Surface Water Drainage, Scottish Water supports the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and therefore welcomes the inclusion of this policy in the local plan written statement. Scottish Water would also like to advise that Sewers for Scotland 2 has been published and if the developer wishes to have their Surface Water system vested by Scottish Water it must be designed in accordance with this document.</p>	As above
Chapter 05 GP Policy 16 Housing in the Countryside 5.35		
197 Director of Housing & Property Services Inverness	<p>Social housing Definition - Can you please let me know what your definition of social housing is (as used in the housing in the countryside policy).</p>	The reference will be changed to refer to affordable housing for clarity.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Paragraph 3.4.6(v) includes welcome references to good design quality and place making in new development, but the actual meaning of place-making is unclear. Nor is it clear how this will be judged. This may be best amplified in the supporting text to the most relevant policy, i.e. Policy 18 Design Quality and Place Making. Additional references should be included in the supporting text to Policy 18 to PAN 65 Planning and Open Space and to SPP 11 Open Space and Physical Activity as well as any relevant aspects of the DPPG on Design for Sustainability.</p>	

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Policy 18 The supporting text should include reference also to PAN 65 Planning and Open Space, PAN 83 Masterplanning (when published) and SPP 11 Open Space and Physical Activity.</p>	<p>AMEND POLICY TO MENTION OPEN SPACE AS AN ELEMENT OF PLACES AND TO CLARIFY THAT PROPOSALS SHOULD DEMONSTRATE SENSITIVITY AND RESPECT FOR LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS, SO CLEARLY PROVIDING SCOPE FOR APPROPRIATE CONTEMPORARY DESIGN.</p> <p>The supporting text will not refer specifically to Scottish Government PANs or SPPs as they are already included in Appendix 1 of the Environmental Report. The Council is intending to produce Supplementary Planning Guidance on residential design and layout.</p> <p>A definition of place-making will be included in the local plan glossary. "To ensure that the most sustainable sites are used for development and that the design process, layout structure and form provide a development that is appropriate to the local context and supports a sustainable community".</p> <p>The second paragraph of the policy now includes reference to open space.</p> <p>We will add text to the first paragraph of the general policy that applicants should demonstrate sensitivity and respect towards local distinctiveness. This should hopefully encourage good contemporary architecture.</p>
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>The second paragraph of the policy should include references to open space as follows - "They should have regard to the historic pattern of development and open space in the locality"; "Proposals will also be examined in terms of their creation of attractive and effective streetscapes and other open space".</p>	As above

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

Policy 4

Part 2 of this policy ("National") should be compatible with paragraph 25 of NPPG 14 in respect of NSAs, SSSIs and NNRs. As presently worded, while this reflects the second "test" in NPPG 14, it does not accurately reflect the first "test". Therefore SNH objects to this part of the policy and wishes an amendment to read as follows - In areas of national importance we will allow developments that can be shown not to compromise the amenity and heritage resource. It must also be shown that the development will support communities in fragile areas who are having difficulties in keeping their population and services. In addition, for developments that would affect a National Scenic Area, Site of Special Scientific Interest or National Nature Reserve, we will only allow them if the objectives of the designated area and the overall integrity of the area will not be compromised, or any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance.

Part 3 of this policy, with regard to areas of international importance should be reworded as follows to be compatible with the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 as amended (based on Pilot Model Policy Study, Scottish Executive, January 2006). SNH objects to this part of the policy and wishes an amendment to read as follows -

In areas of international importance, we will allow developments if they will not adversely affect the integrity of the site following an appropriate assessment. Proposals where we are unable to ascertain that they would not adversely affect the relevant interest for which the site is designated will only be allowed if there is no alternative solution and there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature. Where a priority habitat or species (as defined in Annex I of the Habitats Directive) would be affected, consent can only be issued where the reasons for overriding public interest relate to human health, public safety, beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment, or other reason subject to the opinion of the European Commission (via Scottish Ministers).

AMEND POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT WHERE RELEVANT TO UPDATE CATEGORIES AND FEATURES, REFER TO AND REFLECT APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT AND THE LEGAL POSITION FOR EUROPEAN SITES, REFER TO FRAGILE AREAS IN TEXT AND CLARIFY THAT IMPACT ON THE SETTING OF CERTAIN FEATURES IS AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION, NOT JUST THE FEATURE ITSELF.

"Conservation Areas" will be moved from nationally important features to local and regionally important features. In local and regionally important features "C Listed buildings" will be changed to "C(S) Listed buildings".

We do not want to identify certain natural heritage designations within the policy wording, as the policy covers a wide range of nationally important natural and cultural heritage features. Additional text suggested, "we will only allow them" is too negative as proposals must be assessed against all policies before a decision is made. The General Policy is trying to provide a common form of words and policy approach for a range of cultural and natural heritage features, therefore by its very nature it cannot reflect the legal position of all designations in the policy. There will always be a requirement for readers to consult other documents such as national policy, in conjunction with this general policy. Appendix 1 in the local plan provides a definition of all natural and cultural heritage features and provides a policy framework for each designation. We will delete "(See Appendix 1 and Background Maps)" in the first paragraph of the policy and amend to, "This policy must be read in conjunction with the Background Maps and the policy frameworks identified in Appendix 1".

We have amended the international section of the policy to reflect the model policy set out in the Scottish Executive's Model Policy Pilot (January 2006). We have added text

to the supporting text about the requirement for Appropriate Assessment.

Supplementary Planning Guidance on the Historic Environment is not part of the published Development Plan Scheme.

In order to emphasise that it is often the site and the setting that needs protecting we will include the following text to the first paragraph of the policy, "This will include where appropriate, not just the feature itself but the wider setting and impacts which must be taken into account."

Factual changes will be made to Appendix 1.

In supporting text we will amend, "Inventoried semi-natural woodland" to "Inventoried Semi-Natural Woodland and Long-Established Woodland (Plantation)" and Long-Established Woodland (Plantation) will be amended from, "Inventoried ancient and long-established woodland" to "Inventoried Ancient Woodland and Long-Established Woodland (Semi-Natural)". We will amend title to, "Geological Conservation Review Sites and Regionally Important Geological Sites" in appendix 1.

We will consider taking forward important viewpoints and tourist routes as part of the work currently being done for the On-Shore Wind Energy SPG and this will carry forward into the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. In Sutherland there has been an initial attempt to identify some important views over open water on a Background Map as a local regional feature. We will be happy to add additional areas subject to further discussion with SNH.

General Policies 12 and 13 have been amended to take account of biodiversity. General Policy 13 has also been amended to state that The Council will also support, where appropriate, opportunities to create new habitat areas through development

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

There is a list of sites of local natural heritage importance available for Skye and Lochalsh, but at present these are not available for Sutherland or Lochaber. If a Local Biodiversity Group was able to provide the Council with mapped information we would be willing to consider its inclusion to the local plan.

Due to the size of the area that the local plan covers, it is difficult to provide a detailed proposals map for the entire area. If anyone is interested in the detail in any particular area, information and advice can be requested from the Planning and Development Service.

In local/regional section of the policy we will delete "unreasonable" and replace with "unacceptable". This concept should better explain that decisions are taken on the basis of the relative merits of a proposal. We will not mention renewable energy and no other potential economic development activities as it would be unfair and prejudicial. For the national and international sections of this policy the insertion of "unacceptable" is rejected. In the second sentence of the national section we will remove, "For national Designations".

The local plan currently has a background map showing Areas of Great Landscape Value. It is a local/regional feature in General Policy 4, which means that decisions on development proposals will take into account the effect on the Area of Great Landscape Value. The Highland-wide Local Development Plan will be taking forward further work on Areas of Great Landscape Value.

A map from the draft Structure Plan showing Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation will be shown in the local plan. Further work on this will be taken forward via the Highland wide Local Development Plan.

The maps showing NSAs will be changed to reflect their offshore areas.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

For non-national and international designations, the Council can provide advice.

After the list of internationally important features the following text will be added, "These categories may be updated should circumstances change during the Plan period."

It is stated at the beginning of the general policies chapter that all policies must be read together, therefore there is little merit in placing policies 4, 11, 12 and 13 together.

576 The Scottish Government
Edinburgh

I am not fully persuaded that Policy 4 is clear in making a distinction between the built and natural environment or sufficiently unambiguous/precise for an applicant or officer to be able to make a decision on an individual application. It is often not just the site but the wider setting and impacts which must be taken into account in relation to both natural and built heritage. It is not certain that the policy as currently worded gives sufficient balance/weight to the protection of heritage assets. I would also have anticipated that the emphasis of the policy would be on protection and enhancement rather than focusing on the circumstances in which development will be permitted.

As above

Policy 4 deals with natural and other designations by splitting them into international, national and regional/local. This seems a reasonable approach, and the idea of having background maps showing all such constraints which have so far been mapped is a good one. It is therefore a pity that no policy reflects the importance of protecting and enhancing biodiversity/landscape/natural heritage generally in all developments/outwith designated sites.

All the criteria set out in the policy relate to development in the area, but this is not the correct test. For SSSIs and Natura sites, development outwith the designated area can still affect the site's integrity and this is a consideration of Appropriate Assessment. For Sites and Ancient Monuments, it is the setting which is important; likewise this is the case for Listed Buildings. I would therefore suggest that it is noted at the end of the first paragraph of the policy that it applies to development which affects or potentially affects these areas of importance, not just

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

developments which are located within them.

The section of Policy 4 on local constraints is potentially quite permissive as it uses the word unreasonable so it is very much left to judgement. Was this the intention?

The section on national constraints broadly corresponds with advice in NPPG 14. However, the second sentence mentions national designations instead of areas of national importance. This reads as if the Plan is trying to make a distinction between designations and other areas of national importance which is not very clear, particularly to members of the public who may read the plan and assume that this relates to all areas of national importance. If the Plan is not trying to make such a distinction, then the Plan needs to be more consistent in the terminology used here, perhaps simply starting this second sentence with Where there may be.

The section on international constraints appears to accord with the Habitats Regulations, although adding or for reasons of beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment would make it a little more faithful. I note no mention of Appropriate Assessment, but this is acceptable given that the policy is about more than Natura sites and that Appropriate Assessment is for the planning authority to carry out rather than the developer.

576 The Scottish Government
Edinburgh

Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage

As above

This section is welcome and addresses the issues which we would expect to be covered in a concise manner.

The Council should be confident that the list on p29 is comprehensive or risks missing out key elements. It may be useful to include a line which allows for updating of the categories should circumstances change during the Plan period.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13		
495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>Emphasis of protection</p> <p>Policy 4, as it stands, affords different levels of protection to features of different importance and thus to different categories of listed building. However, under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 and NPPG18, all buildings are provided with the same level of protection; planning authorities are required by the Act to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting or its special features, regardless of category. In other words, the management of the resource does not flow from its categorisation but from its identification as a listed building.</p> <p>The overall emphasis of Policy 4 therefore sits at odds with that of national legislation and policy for listed buildings, set out in the Act and NNPG 18. Accordingly, it is our view that the wording of Policy 4 should be amended to reflect national legislation and policy for listed buildings</p>	As above
495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>Supporting Information</p> <p>The supporting information states: "How sensitive these features are to development depends on their level of importance and on the nature and scale of development and the likely effect on the feature in question". We disagree with this statement: the sensitivity of a feature is not a function of its level of importance. For example, many archaeological sites are sensitive to damage from tree planting, irrespective of whether they are Scheduled Ancient Monuments or unscheduled archaeological sites. In our view the issue of importance is more to do with decision-making. We suggest that this text be amended to read "In assessing development proposals, the Council will consider the level of importance and nature of these features, the nature and scale of development, and the likely effect on the feature (including setting) in question".</p>	As above
495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>Site and setting</p> <p>Policy 4, as it stands, does not recognise the need to protect a historic environment feature and its setting. We suggest that the text of the policy, its supporting information and Appendix 1 be altered to include such reference, as follows:</p> <p>Re-wording the first paragraph of the policy to read: When making</p>	As above

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

decisions on development proposals we will take account of the level of importance of, and the effect on, the natural, built and cultural heritage (see Appendix 1 and Background Maps). Impact on historic environment features will be considered in terms of impact on both the site and setting of the feature.

In the supporting text, at the end of the paragraph commencing "the impact on all natural and cultural heritage features". A final sentence should be added so that the paragraph reads "The impact on all natural and cultural heritage features must be addressed however when considering and assessing development proposals, and the Background maps which are contained in the Map booklet of the Plan set out the locations of all these different features in so far as they have been mapped digitally on our system. Impact on historic environment features (i.e. archaeological sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, listed buildings, and Gardens and Designed Landscapes) should be considered in terms of impact on both the site and setting of the feature.

Suggested wording for Appendix 1 is contained in the objection to that appendix.

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

In the preamble to this policy, some further consideration may need to be given to the titles of "inventoried semi-natural woodland" appearing as a "local/regionally" important feature, and "inventoried ancient and long-established woodland" appearing as a "nationally" important feature. This does not strictly reflect the more detailed description in Appendix 1 and so SNH recommends that a more accurate rendering would be -

local/regionally important - "inventoried Semi-Natural Woodland and Long-Established Woodland (Plantation)"

nationally important - "inventoried Ancient Woodland and Long-Established Woodland (Semi-Natural)"

To be accurate in terms of the description in Appendix 1, GCR Sites should read: "Geological Conservation Review Sites and Regionally Important Geological Sites9'- the latter are identified by local RIGS

As above

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

groups.

495 Historic Scotland
Edinburgh

20. There are several sites which have the potential to affect the setting of B- and C(S)- listed buildings, but which have not been identified as such in the assessment. I note that the protection of the setting of B- and C(S)-listed buildings is a matter for The Highland Council to consider, and suggest that you may wish to consult accordingly. The sites in question comprise:

Golspie H2 (three B-listed buildings)
Golspie H3 (one B- and one C(S)-listed building)
Golspie MU1 (two B-listed buildings)
Golspie MU4 (one B-listed building)
Golspie MU2 (one B-listed building)
Brora H4 (one B-listed building)
Ardgay H2 (two B-listed buildings)
Ardgay B1 (one C(S)-listed building)
Lochinver H2 (three B-listed buildings)
Durness MU3 (one C(S)-listed building)

As above

497 RSPB
Golspie

The wording of Policy 4 (page 30 deposit draft) in relation to the 'Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage' gives the impression of a presumption in favour of development on important areas, subject to meeting the appropriate test. In fact, for such sites a starting position that development proposals are unlikely to be successful would be more helpful and less likely to lead to confusion and challenge. Furthermore, the wording covers only development proposed in such sites whereas the proper test is whether it is likely to affect. We object to this policy and recommend the following, alternative wording for subparagraph 3:

Areas of international importance. Any development likely to have a significant effect on such a site will be subject to an appropriate assessment. Development will only be permitted where:

- a) The appropriate assessment concludes that the development will not adversely affect the integrity of the site; or, exceptionally
- b) There are no alternative solutions; and
- c) There are imperative reasons of overriding public interest

As above

Chapter 05 GP Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage 5.13

<p>495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh</p>	<p>Categorisation of features We consider that the levels of importance accorded to historic environment features by the Local Plan should correspond to those set out in national policy and guidance, as follows: Category B and C (sic) listed buildings are identified as "local and regionally important" features, whilst Conservation Areas are identified as nationally important features. We find this categorisation confusing, given that listings are designated at a national level whilst Conservation Areas are designated at a local/regional level. We therefore suggest that Conservation Areas should be identified as "local and regionally important" features.</p> <p>The Local Plan's categorisation of listed buildings sits slightly at odds with the advice provided the Memorandum of Guidance (Para 1.6) where A-listed buildings are considered to be of national or international importance, B-listed buildings are of regional or more than local importance, and C(S) listed buildings are of local importance. We therefore suggest that the difference in importance of B and C(S) listed buildings is identified in "local and regionally important features" and that this carries through to Appendix 1.</p> <p>Please note that the reference to C listed buildings in the supporting information should be to C(S) listed buildings.</p>	<p>As above</p>
--	---	-----------------

<p>495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh</p>	<p>Lack of detailed policy guidance It is our view that Policy 4 does not provide detailed policies and clear guidance, e.g. to planners and developers, on how the historic environment should be taken into account when making decisions on development proposals. Given this lack, we consider that there is a clear need for significant additional supplementary planning guidance (SPG) on the historic environment. The Local Plan should include a commitment to prepare such SPG, and clearly identify its scope.</p>	<p>As above</p>
--	---	-----------------

Chapter 05 GP Policy 6 Designing for Sustainability 5.17

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 6 Designing for Sustainability 5.17		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection</p> <p>SEPA welcomes the inclusion of a policy which considers sustainability. However, SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it is not in accordance with Policy G2 of the Highland Structure Plan and does not provide clear guidance as to when developers are required to submit 'Design for Sustainability' statements. SEPA notes that the supporting text of Policy 6 states that "Highland Structure Plan Policy G2 sets out the requirement for all development to be designed for sustainability", and therefore SEPA considers this should be made clear within the Policy.</p> <p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made.</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The Policy is amended to the following effect:</p> <p>"A 'Design for Sustainability' statement should be submitted with planning applications for all developments. These statements will be assessed in accordance with the Development Plan Policy Guideline on Designing for Sustainability."</p>	<p>CONFIRM POLICY AND AMEND SUPPORTING TEXT</p> <p>Designing for Sustainability in the Highlands calls for those involved in the development process to design buildings that are appropriately located and sited, incorporate renewable energy technologies, improve energy efficiency and use sustainable materials. To help achieve this The Council will place a requirement on planning applicants to demonstrate, by means of a Sustainable Design Statement (SDS), that their proposals take account of sustainable design practice.</p>
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection Policy and Part of Plan Sustainability - Policy 6</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>SEPA welcomes the inclusion of a policy which considers sustainability. However, SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it is not in accordance with Policy G2 of the Highland Structure Plan and does not provide clear guidance as to when developers are required to submit 'Design for Sustainability' statements. SEPA notes that the supporting text of Policy 6 states that "Highland Structure Plan Policy G2 sets out the I-requirement for all development to be designed for sustainability", and therefore SEPA considers this should be made clear within the Policy.</p> <p>Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendment is made</p>	<p>As above</p>

Chapter 05 GP Policy 6 Designing for Sustainability 5.17

1. The Policy is amended to the following effect:
 "A 'Design for Sustainability' statement should be submitted with planning applications for all developments. These statements will be assessed in accordance with the Development Plan Policy Guideline on Designing for Sustainability."

576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Designing for Sustainability</p> <p>In Policy 6, the use of the word normally is confusing without an explanation of potential circumstances in which this would not be required.</p>	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Policy 6</p> <p>The supporting text should make clear that the Council's DPPG on Designing for Sustainability takes full account of such guidance as is contained in say PAN 65, PAN 67, PAN 68 and SPP I I.</p>	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Paragraph 3.4.4(p) refers to accommodating substantial new development in a sustainable way. SNH would welcome the inclusion of further guidance in the Local Plan on the yardsticks to measure and assess sustainability. This may be best placed in the context of Policy 6 Designing for Sustainability. SNH would like to see specific reference to landscaping and open space provision in the justifying reasoning for this policy and in the linked Development Plan Policy Guideline (DPPG).</p>	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>The policy should make clearer that Sustainable Design Statements accompanying planning applications should be drawn up to conform to guidance contained in the DPPG and will be judged as such. Also that this will apply to outline as well as full planning applications.</p> <p>SNH recommends therefore that this policy starts - "All developments should be designed for sustainability. In addition to Structure Plan Policy 62, we will judge development proposals against the conformity and acceptability of a Sustainable Design Statement which we will normally require developers ..".</p> <p>Otherwise this policy is rather weak as currently worded.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
<p>Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19</p>		
<p>311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall</p>	<p>SEPA welcomes the assessment of foul drainage capacity and the detailing of this for each settlement. Whilst SEPA fully supports a policy promoting connection to the public sewer, SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it does not fully accord with SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Settlements which has been adopted since SEPA considered previous Highland Council development plans.</p> <p>Paragraph 23 of Planning Advice Note 79 'Water and Drainage' (which has also been published since SEPA considered previous Highland Council development plans) states that "SEPA also has a role of raising strategic drainage issues in the context of its policies, including its Policy on Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Sewered Areas, to which the planning authority should have regard when preparing development plans and making decisions on planning applications." SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Settlements can be found at www.sepa.org.uk/pdf/wfd/guidance/general/ps06-08.pdf.</p> <p>SEPA notes the reference "allocations Vs capacity" in the supporting text for each settlement in the map booklet. It is SEPA's understanding that "allocations Vs capacity" refers to an assessment of whether or not the existing sewage treatments works can accommodate the Plan allocations. It is unclear from the Plan in each case what the deficiency is and if the capacity assessments assess network capacity as well as the capacity of sewage treatment works.</p> <p>In the light of the new role of SEPA and Scottish Water as key agencies in cooperation in the preparation of development plans, SEPA considers that it would be more useful to the public, developers and planners to identify not only the public sewer capacity for each settlement, but also mechanisms which could be implemented to address capacity constraints, including network capacity issues as well as treatment works capacity. SEPA would be happy to work with Scottish Water and the Council to assist in this process.</p> <p>Scottish Planning Policy 3 'Planning for Housing' Paragraph 85 states "Creating a new settlement or major extension will generally require partnership between the public sector, private developers and other interests. Development plans should be clear about the likely scale of</p>	<p>AMEND POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT TO PROVIDE CLARITY AND REFER TO AND BETTER REFLECT SEPA POLICY.</p> <p>In the supporting text at the end of the second paragraph add, "Developers should refer to SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Settlements, for information."</p> <p>In some settlements the sites that could potentially connect to the public sewer are not feasible for other reasons. The SEA matrices will explain why alternative sites are not available for development.</p> <p>It is unnecessary to state the foul drainage position in each allocation as the policy covers this and it applies to all development proposals. The amended policy states that connection to the public sewer is required for all new development proposals wherever single developments of 25 or more units are proposed.</p> <p>The information provided at the beginning of each settlements description is derived from the Scottish Water 'best known position'. If more information was available from Scottish Water/SEPA we would be happy to include it in the local plan. We will however clarify the existing information provided in the local plan. (See David's e-mail to Scottish Water). We will also ensure consistency in the settlement descriptions in the West Highland and Islands Local Plan.</p> <p>Foul drainage issues are covered by planning conditions. We will add a developer requirement stating, "Provision of shore facilities for sewerage disposal required", at all proposed marinas.</p> <p>In order to address capacity constraints we will add "infrastructure" to list of potential developer contributions in policy 15. However constraints usually relate to Part 4 Assets and developer contributions do not pay for this.</p>

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

developer contributions, which for some sites may include provision of all or most new infrastructure, road improvements and similar requirements. Such provisions should be drawn up in consultation with the relevant parties, and the cost of providing the necessary infrastructure should be commensurate with the scale of the development proposed."

SEPA welcomes the assessment of the ability of each allocation to connect to the public sewer presented in the SEA Environmental Report and notes that the assessment identified that all allocations except Invershin H1, Lochinver H1 and H3, Point of Stoer H1 and H2, Scourie H1, Tongue LT1 and MU2, and Strathy H1 can connect to the public sewerage system. However, in the Plan some of the allocation 'Developer Requirements' make reference to these drainage requirement while others do not. SEPA considers that this approach is inconsistent and does not make the Plan policy and developer requirements clear.

In relation to the above SEPA notes that some of these allocations are within settlements that are served by public sewer but which the assessment presented in the SEA Environmental Report concludes are unable to connect to the public sewer however no measures to overcome this constraint and enable connection to public sewer are detailed.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection
SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.

1. The Policy is modified to the following effect:

Connection to the public sewer as defined in the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968 is a prerequisite for all new development proposals. Planning applications for private systems will only be supported where the applicant can clearly demonstrate the following:

- a) There will be no adverse impact upon the environment; and
- b) That the development is unable to connect to public sewer for technical or economic reasons.

The possible requirement for Appropriate Assessment of the policy is noted. Cross-reference to General Policy 4.3 is not necessary.

The policy outlines when temporary private treatment systems would be supported.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

Any such private system should discharge to land rather than water where ground conditions are suitable.

Where connection to the public sewer is not permitted because there is no capacity but Scottish Water has confirmed that investment to address this constraint has been specifically allocated within its investment programme, a temporary private system would only be supported provided:

- The system would be designed and built to a standard which will allow adoption by Scottish Water.
- The system is designed such that it can be easily connected to a public sewer in the future. Typically this will mean providing a drainage line up to a likely point of connection. The developer must provide Scottish Water with the funds which will allow Scottish Water to complete the connection once the sewerage system has been upgraded."

2.The Policy supporting text is amended to refer specifically to SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Settlements.

3.The following allocations are removed from the Plan and replaced with alternative sites which can connect to the public system or a feasible solution to connect to public sewer is identified for each site and required within the developer requirements for each allocation.

Lochinver H1 and H3
Scourie H1
Tongue MU2 and LT1
Strathy H1

4.The requirement for foul drainage is made explicit for each allocation. This can be achieved by the insertion of the following comments in each allocation Developer Requirement:

4.1 For those allocations in settlements identified as not served by a public sewer, namely Invershin and Point of Stoer - "An environmentally acceptable private sewerage system is required."

4.2 For all other allocations - "Connection to public sewer required."

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

5. Where there are infrastructure issues the Settlement descriptions should set out the nature of these issues and how they could be addressed (e.g. works capacity, network capacity, scale of development that could facilitate upgrades to infrastructure).

Objection

SEPA notes that several policies (for example, Policies 3 and 16) contain a requirement for consistency "with other policies in the Highland Structure Plan and this Local Plan" whilst other policies (for example, Policies 1, 10, 14, 17) do not. There is a danger from this approach that the general public and developers may mistakenly assume that Structure Plan and other Local Plan policies do not apply where this is not specifically stated. SEPA objects to this inconsistency as the Local Plan does not provide clear guidance to developers and the public as to which policies apply and therefore the Local Plan does not appear to have due regard for impacts upon the environment.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if either of the following amendment is made.

1. The wording is removed from specific policies and clarified at the beginning of the Local Plan as a general requirement for all development, or

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19		
2.□ The following wording is inserted into all policies: "All proposals should be consistent with other policies in the Highland Structure Plan and this Local Plan."		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency	Objection Policy and Part of Plan	As above
Dingwall	Waste Water Treatment - Policy 7 and Policy 7 Supporting Text and Map Entitled Physical Constraint: STVVs	
	Objection	
	SEPA welcomes the assessment of foul drainage capacity and the detailing of this for each settlement. Whilst SEPA fully supports a policy promoting connection to the public sewer, SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it does not fully accord with SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage it1 Settlements which has been adopted since SEPA responded to previous Highland Council development plans.	
	Paragraph 23 of Planning Advice Note 79 Water and Drainage' (which has also been published since SEPA considered previous I-Highland Council development plans) states that "SEPA also has a role of raising strategic drainage issues in the context of its policies, including its Policy on Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Sewered Areas, to which the planning authority should have regard when preparing development plans and making decisions on planning applications*. SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Settlements can be found at www.sepa.org.uk/pdf/wfd/guidance/general/ps06-08.pdf	
	SEPA notes the reference "allocations Vs capacity" and in the supporting text for settlements in the map booklet. It is SEPA's understanding that "allocations Vs capacity" refers to an assessment of whether or not the existing sewage treatments works can accommodate the Plan allocations. It is unclear from the Plan in each case what the deficiency is and if the capacity assessments assess network capacity as well as the capacity of sewage treatment works.	

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

In the light of the new role of SEPA and Scottish Water as key agencies in cooperation in the preparation of development plans, SEPA considers that it would be more useful to the public, developers and planners to identify not only the public sewer capacity for each settlement, but also mechanisms which could be implemented to address capacity constraints, including network capacity issues as well as treatment works capacity. SEPA would be happy to work with Scottish Water and the Council to assist in this process.

The Memorandum of Understanding between Scottish Water and SEPA states that "SEPA will promote the proposal that developments of greater than 25 houses in rural areas should have public sewerage systems and treatment works built to Scottish Water standards and taken over by Scottish Water"

Scottish Planning Policy 3 'Planning for Housing' Paragraph 85 states "Creating a new settlement or major extension will generally require partnership between the public sector, private developers and other interests. Development plans should be clear about the likely scale of developer contributions, which for some sites may include provision of all or most new infrastructure, road improvements and similar requirements. Such provisions should be drawn up in consultation with the relevant parties, and the cost of providing the necessary infrastructure should be commensurate with the scale of the development proposed."

SEPA welcomes the assessment of the ability of each allocation to connect to the public sewer presented in the SEA Environmental Report and notes that the assessment identified that all allocations except Invershin HI, Lochinver HI and H3, Point of Stoer HI and 1-12, Scourie HI, Tongue LT1 and MU2, and Strathy HI can connect to the public sewerage system. However, in the Plan some of the allocation 'Developer Requirements' make reference to these drainage requirements while others do not. SEPA considers that this approach is inconsistent and does not make the Plan policy and developer requirements clear.

In relation to the above SEPA notes that there are a number of allocations within settlements that are served by public sewer but which the assessment presented in the

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

SEA Environmental Report concludes are unable to connect to the public sewer however no measures to overcome this constraint and enable connection to public sewer are detailed.

Modifications Required to Remove SEPA's Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.

I. The Policy is modified to the following effect:
"Connection to the public sewer as defined in the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968 is a prerequisite for all new development proposals. Planning applications for private systems will only be supported where the applicant can clearly demonstrate the following:
a) There will be no adverse impact upon the environment; and
b) That the development is unable to connect to public sewer for technical or economic reasons.

Any such private system should discharge to land rather than water where ground conditions are suitable.

Where connection to the public sewer is not permitted because there is no capacity but Scottish Water has confirmed that investment to address this constraint has been specifically allocated within its investment programme, a temporary private system would only be supported provided:

- The system would be designed and built to a standard which will allow adoption by Scottish Water.
- The system is designed such that it can be easily connected to a public sewer in the future. Typically this will mean providing a drainage line up to a likely point of connection. The developer must provide Scottish Water with the funds which will allow Scottish Water to complete the connection once the sewerage system has been upgraded."

2. The Policy supporting text is amended to refer specifically to SEPA's Policy on the Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Settlements.
3. The following allocations, which are in settlements served by a public sewage system but the SEA determines cannot connect to the public sewer, and any others subsequently identified by the Planning Authority

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

are removed from the Plan and replaced with alternative sites which can connect to the public system or a feasible solution to connect to public sewer is identified for each site and required within the developer requirements for each allocation. Lochinver HI and H3 Scourie HI Tongue MU2 and LT1

Strathy HI

4. The requirement for foul drainage is also made explicit for all other allocations. This can be achieved by the insertion of the following comments in each allocation Developer Requirement:

4.1 For those allocations with less than 25 units in settlements identified as not served by a public sewer "An environmentally acceptable private sewerage system is required."

4.2 For all other allocations - "Connection to public sewer required."

5. Where there are infrastructure issues the Settlement descriptions should set out the nature of these issues and how they could be addressed (e.g. works capacity, network capacity, scale of development that could facilitate upgrades to infrastructure).

214 Scottish Water
Glasgow

In relation to Policy 7 - Scottish Water's investment priorities are as set down by Scottish Parliament Ministers, who have previously consulted our environmental and economic regulators [Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA), Drinking Water Quality Regulator (DWQR), and Water Industry Commissioner (WIC) for Scotland], Water Customer Consultation Panels and our national stakeholders including Confederation of British Industry (CBI), Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (CoSLA) and also, Scottish Consumer Council, Homes for Scotland, Scottish Federation of Housing Associations, Communities Scotland, and Scottish Natural Heritage.

On 9 February 2005 the Scottish Parliament gave its final approval to the Water Services Bill. The Bill gives clear powers to Scottish Ministers, to set Scottish Water's objectives, and the principles to be applied in setting charges.

There are many objectives to be met including new principles for charging for public water and sewage services and in relieving development constraints. The Scottish Ministers consider it essential that Scottish Water provides sufficient strategic capacity to meet all estimated new housing development and the domestic requirements of

As above

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

commercial and industrial developments.,

On the 29th September 2005 the Scottish Executive issued the Ministers Directions for Scottish Water 2006 to 2010. These were issued as the "Scottish Water (Objectives for 1st April 2006 to 31st March 2010) Directions 2005 made under sections 56 and 56A of the Water Industry Scotland Act 2002 (as amended by the Water Services etc. Act 2005)" The Directions refer to the Ministerial Statement issued to Scottish Water on the 9th February 2005 that specifies the essential and desirable objectives to be delivered by Scottish Water in the period 2006 to 2010.

The objectives set for Scottish Water with respect to growth, over the period 2006 - 2014 are:

Deliver strategic capacity to allow 60,000 new homes and 2,025 hectares of commercial /industrial land across Scotland to be connected to the public water and wastewater network in each of the four year periods 2006 – 2010 and 2010 – 2014, by providing capacity for 40,000 population equivalent (pe) at wastewater treatment works and 16,500 pe at water treatment works in each period.

Publish annually a document outlining the strategic network capacity and development plans.

Where new developments require additional local capacity, the cost of providing this should be met by the developer and it should be for Scottish Water to remove constraints on development caused by a lack of capacity at a strategic level. This ensures that both the public purse and the private developer pay their proper share of enabling new development to happen.

The Scottish Ministers have issued Regulations, 'The provision of Water and a Sewerage Services (Reasonable Cost) (Scotland) Regulations 2006', define Scottish Water's liability to provide strategic capacity for Part 4 assets as well as a contribution towards the cost of Part 2 and Part 3 assets. Reasonable Cost Contributions (RCC) are limited to a sum that will reflect the additional income Scottish Water will receive as a consequence of the new infrastructure vesting in us.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19

The Minister stated that Developers will be responsible for the costs of Part 1, and the net cost of Part 2 and Part 3 assets. A detailed breakdown of Part 1-4 Assets shown below.

The current RCC payments can be up to a maximum of £1,414.00 for water and £1,598.00 for wastewater per household connection. For non-domestic connections the level of contribution is based on an average unit cost of water delivered and waste water treated.

Under the arrangements Ministers have set, Scottish Water is required to meet all estimated requirements for strategic capacity at part 4 assets over the 8 year period 2006 – 2014. The directions placed on Scottish Water to formulate and deliver such investment plans are detailed below:-

In formulating investment plans for this area of investment, Scottish Water and the Water Industry Commission should take account of: General Register Office for Scotland's population projections; Scottish Executive's household projections; and the SEPA/SW Memorandum of Understanding on the Impact of Proposed Development on the Public System.

Ministers also require that delivery of these investment requirements should be informed by the quality investment programme, the spatial priorities identified in the National Planning Framework, and development priorities identified by local authorities in their Structure and Local Plans.

Scottish Water's approach has been to consult with local authorities to review the development plan demand for growth and to request local authorities to provide development priorities to inform the capital programme. Scottish Water has shared the quality driven investment programme that will afford the opportunity to, co-incidentally, invest for growth. A gap analysis between the quality programme and the development priorities will afford a mechanism to further inform the investment programme for 'growth only' drivers.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Chapter 05 GP Policy 7 Waste Water Treatment 5.19		
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Waste Water Treatment and Waste Management</p> <p>The section on water and drainage covers the main issues. On waste, Policy 8 is reasonably positive, but I would draw your attention to SPP 10's content on site waste management plans, which planning authorities could encourage through planning conditions. Paragraph 51 of SPP 10 recommends that planning authorities should consider requiring the preparation of SWMPs as a condition of planning permission in order to manage waste on site. It may be relevant to position something tailored along these lines in Section 6 of the Plan Designing for Sustainability.</p> <p>It may be helpful to locate the policy on Surface Water Drainage with those on Waste Water Treatment, Waste Management and Flood Risk.</p>	As above

326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Policy 7</p> <p>As it would appear that no settlement in Sutherland has a current population of more than two thousand, alternatives to a connection to the public sewer may be possible and should be considered. As currently stated this policy may be a candidate for appropriate assessment, along with allocated sites that could have a likely significant effect on SACS. In addition we would strongly recommend that this policy is strengthened by adding the following wording at the end of Policy 7 point 3 " Where the proposal is in the vicinity of a European site, Policy 4.3 will apply". This refers to the re-worded policy 4.3 above.</p>	As above

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Objection Policy and Part of Plan</p> <p>Waste Management - Policy 8, Waste Physical Constraints: Existing or Former Waste Management Facility Map</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>SEPA welcomes the inclusion of a policy to address waste management issues, However SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it does not provide clear guidance on how sustainable waste</p>	<p>AMEND POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT TO PROVIDE ROBUST AND UPDATED APPROACH TO ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND TO BETTER LINK TO DESIGNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY.</p> <p>It is agreed that the policy and supporting text require some amendment to provide a more robust and updated approach to achieving sustainable waste management</p>

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

management should be achieved and is not in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy 10 'Planning for Waste Management?' (SPP 10). SPP 10 states "Local development plans will provide detailed policies and proposals, except outside the city regions where they will also contain a vision statement. In the city regions, where significant land use issues around the cross-boundary movement of waste arise, these should be addressed in the SDP. Planning authorities should refer to the Development Planning sections on Need, Areas of Search and Site Assessment in PAN 63 which still apply, with the additional updates under the next section of this SPP on establishing and verifying need."

Further policy within SPP 10 outlines the level of guidance which Development Plans should include to provide the necessary guidance for developers as per the following paragraphs. SPP 10 Paragraph 19 states "At the next level, community composting and "bring" facilities may also create a demand for local sites that support waste recycling which can be identified in development plans at appropriate locations. Other sites, particularly for larger scale installations should also be identified through the development plan".

In addition SEPA considers that the Policy does not provide enough guidance on what developers would need to do to demonstrate sustainable waste management for developments and is not fully in accordance with SPP 10.

SPP 10 Paragraph 46 states "Scottish Ministers are committed to promoting facilities for waste separation and for appropriate kerbside collection of recyclable materials in new housing developments. The Executive expects suitable provision to be included in development plan policies and to be considered as part of the development management process, particularly in relation to major residential developments."

SPP 10 Paragraph 51 states "The efficient use of landfill can be supported through the use of Site Waste Management Plans (SWMPs). The purpose of the Site Waste Management Plan voluntary code of practice 22 is to help resolve the shortage of landfill space and the declining number of waste management sites by minimising waste at source on construction sites through the accurate assessment of the use of materials and the potential for their reuse and recycling both on and off site."

In addition SEPA considers that the Policy does not fully accord with Planning Advice Note 63 (PAN 63) on Waste Management Planning

and to better link to the Council's Development Plan Policy Guideline on Designing for Sustainability. The policy should provide for basic recycling facilities to be provided on a greater range of sites, subject to being close to source. The policy and text can also be clarified. We will cross-refer to the relevant Background Mapping showing waste management sites and will check its content. However, we may not identify former landfill sites where that would prejudice intended future redevelopment. We will refer to existing or former sites in Settlement text if they are important development factors for the settlement.

However, whilst reference to the National Waste Plan, SPP10 and the existence of relevant SEPA guidance should be added in, Government plans for waste management are under review and may provide further, more up-to-date material considerations during the lifetime of the Plan. These circumstances need to be reflected in the Plan.

Matters such as the Council's specific planning policy approach to biomass, energy from waste and landfill sites would be better reviewed as part of the forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan. There will be opportunity for the Council to develop further, Highland-wide guidance on sustainable waste management in association with supplementary planning guidance on Designing for Sustainability and on Developer Contributions.

In the West Highland & Islands Local Plan, the text referring to the existing industrial allocation at the Portree landfill site will be amended to refer specifically to it being identified as the likely location for an Energy from Waste proposal and to provide a specific safeguard for the proposal.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

(paragraphs 51 - 52 and 80 - 83) which requires that the need to provide for the management of waste is incorporated into the design and layout of all new developments.

SPP 6 Paragraph 30 states "Planning authorities should have regard to the Area Waste Plans drawn up for their area and to other waste management proposals put forward by local authorities to move away from landfill. The location of new facilities will be dependent on the source of waste used and likely to be more appropriately developed within industrial Brownfield sites close to the electricity grid or other potential users. A development plan policy framework should support the identification of sites or provide criteria against which planning applications for new waste management development will be assessed. Separate pollution controls are in place covering these developments so development plan policies should restrict broad criteria to land use and locational factors."

SEPA welcomes the map entitled Physical Constraints: Existing or Former Waste Management Facility. However, it does not show former waste management sites and only some existing waste management facilities are shown. In addition no settlement description identifies or safeguards waste management sites. This is important as Policy 8 safeguards existing waste management facilities and therefore these should be clearly identified within the Plan.

Modifications Required to Remove SEPA's Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made

1. Policy 8 is replaced with the following wording:

"Proposals for waste management facilities will be determined in accordance with the Highland Structure Plan, the National Waste Plan, the National Waste Strategy and the Highland Area Waste Plan. Waste management facilities will be supported on business or industrial land provided there are no adverse impacts on surrounding uses and meet other criteria relating to environmental impact and transportation. Community composting and "bring" facilities will also be supported in locations close to source. Biomass or energy from waste facilities will be supported where they provide maximum use of heat and power in locations close to energy grids or users. Proposals for landfill sites would be supported only on degraded land or former quarries, where there is demonstrable need, where the environmental impact would be

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

acceptable and where they deal with residual waste only. Existing waste management sites will be safeguarded for waste management-related uses. Proposals for redevelopment of existing waste management facilities will be assessed against the National Waste Strategy, the National Waste Plan, and the Area Waste Plan, and will be subject to consultation with SEPA.

The Council will also take into account the extent to which development proposals effectively manage and promote the reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of waste. This will include assessment of measures for minimising, managing and re-using waste during the construction and operation of development including measures for waste separation and collection at source. Such waste management measures should be included within the 'Designing for Sustainability statement' required for all development proposals under Policy 6. For significant developments a construction and operational Site Waste Management Plan will be required as a planning condition."

2. Paragraph 1 of the supporting text is modified to include the following sentence:

"Scottish Planning Policy 70 'Planning for Waste Management' states that waste management has to be driven forward to move away from the reliance on landfill and to promote the waste hierarchy."

3. Paragraph 2 of the supporting text is replaced with the following:

"The Highland Structure Plan sets out the strategic policy framework for waste management. In addition the National Waste Strategy, National Waste Plan and Highland area Waste Plan are also important material considerations when determining proposals for waste management. The physical Constraints Map: Existing or Former Waste Management Facility and Settlement section of the Plan sets out the specific waste facilities to be safeguarded."

4. The Physical Constraints map is amended to show and safeguard all existing waste management sites. The map needs to show all waste management facilities including waste transfer stations, recycling points and recycling centres. The map also needs to show all former waste management facilities, including landfill sites.

5. Each settlement description is amended to include all existing waste management sites including waste transfer stations, recycling points and recycling centres.

Other Modification SEPA Would Welcome

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

SEPA recommends that the following sentence is inserted at the end of Paragraph 2 of the Policy supporting text.

"Further guidance on issues to be considered as part of waste management proposals can be found in SEPA's Guidance entitled "Commenting on Development Plan Consultations for National Waste Strategy Issues" and "Guidelines for Thermal Treatment of Municipal Waste

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

As above

Dingwall

Objection

SEPA welcomes the inclusion of a policy to address waste management issues. However SEPA objects to the Policy as it stands as it does not provide clear guidance on how sustainable waste management should be achieved and is not in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy 10 'Planning for Waste Management' (SPP 10).

SPP 10 states "Local development plans will provide detailed policies and proposals, except outside the city regions where they will also contain a vision statement. In the city regions, where significant land use issues around the cross-boundary movement of waste arise, these should be addressed in the SDP. Planning authorities should refer to the Development Planning sections on Need, Areas of Search and Site Assessment in PAN 63 which still apply, with the additional updates under the next section of this SPP on establishing and verifying need."

Further policy within SPP 10 outlines the level of guidance which Development Plans should include to provide the necessary guidance for developers as per the following paragraphs.

SPP 10 Paragraph 19 states "At the next level, community composting and "bring" facilities may also create a demand for local sites that support waste recycling which can be identified in development plans at appropriate locations. Other sites, particularly for larger scale installations should also be identified through the development plan".

SPP 10 Paragraph 35 states that "Thermal treatment technology is more beneficial if both heat and electricity can be recovered or if it delivers combined heat and power (CHP). Siting of plant close to

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

energy grids or users such as manufacturers and processors using heat from their waste will be consistent with this SPP's model policy".

In addition SEPA considers that the Policy does not provide enough guidance on what developers would need to do to demonstrate sustainable waste management for developments and is not fully in accordance with SPP 10.

SPP 10 Paragraph 46 states "Scottish Ministers are committed to promoting facilities for waste separation and for appropriate kerbside collection of recyclable materials in new housing developments. The Executive expects suitable provision to be included in development plan policies and to be considered as part of the development management process, particularly in relation to major residential developments."

SPP 10 Paragraph 51 states "The efficient use of landfill can be supported through the use of Site Waste Management Plans (SWMPs). The purpose of the Site Waste Management Plan voluntary code of practice 22 is to help resolve the shortage of landfill space and the declining number of waste management sites by minimising waste at source on construction sites through the accurate assessment of the use of materials and the potential for their reuse and recycling both on and off site."

In addition SEPA considers that the Policy does not fully accord with Planning Advice Note 63 (PAN 63) on Waste Management Planning (paragraphs 51 - 52 and 80 – 83) which requires that the need to provide for the management of waste is incorporated into the design and layout of all new developments.

SPP6 paragraph 30 states "Planning authorities should have regard to the Area Waste Plans drawn up for the area and to other waste management proposals put forward by Local Authorities to move away from land fill. The location of new facilities will be dependant on the source of waste used and likely to be more appropriately developed within industrial/brownfield sites close to the electricity grid or other potential users. A development plan policy framework should support the identification of sites or provide criteria against which planning applications for new waste management development will be assessed. Separate pollution controls are in place covering these

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

developments so development plan policies should restrict broad criteria to land use and locational factors".

SEPA welcomes the map entitled Physical Constraints: Existing or Former Waste Management Facility. However, it does not show former waste management sites and only some existing waste management facilities are shown. In addition no settlement description identifies or safeguards waste management sites. This is important as Policy 8 safeguards existing waste management facilities and therefore these should be clearly identified within the Plan.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.

1. Policy 8 is replaced with the following wording:

"Proposals for waste management facilities will be determined in accordance with the Highland Structure Plan, the National Waste Plan, the National Waste Strategy and the Highland Area Waste Plan.

Waste management facilities will be supported on business or industrial land provided there are no adverse impacts on surrounding uses and meet other criteria relating to environmental impact and transportation. Community composting and "bring" facilities will also be supported in locations close to source. Biomass or energy from waste facilities will be supported where they provide maximum use of heat and power in locations close to energy grids or users. Proposals for landfill sites would be supported only on degraded land or former quarries, where there is demonstrable need, where the environmental impact would be acceptable and where they deal with residual waste only.

Existing waste management sites will be safeguarded for waste management-related uses. Proposals for redevelopment of existing waste management facilities will be assessed against the National Waste Strategy, the National Waste Plan, the Area Waste Plan, and will be subject to consultation with SEPA.

The Council will also take into account the extent to which development proposals effectively manage and promote the reduction, reuse,

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

recycling and recovery of waste. This will include assessment of measures for minimising, managing and re-using waste during the construction and operation of development including measures for waste separation and collection at source. Such waste management measures should be included within the "Designing for Sustainability statement" required for all development proposals under Policy 6. For significant developments a construction and operational Site Waste Management Plan will be required as a planning condition."

2. □ Paragraph 1 of the supporting text is modified to include the following sentence:

"Scottish Planning Policy 10 'Planning for Waste Management' states that waste management has to be driven forward to move away from the reliance on landfill and to promote the waste hierarchy."

3. □ Paragraph 2 of the supporting text is replaced with the following:

"The Highland Structure Plan sets out the strategic policy framework for waste management. In addition the National Waste Strategy, National Waste Plan and Highland Area Waste Plan are also important material considerations when determining proposals for waste management. The Physical Constraints Map: Existing or Former Waste Management Facility and Settlement section of the Plan sets out the specific waste facilities to be safeguarded."

4. □ The physical constraints map is amended to show and safeguard all existing waste management sites. The map needs to show all waste management facilities including waste transfer stations, recycling points and recycling centres. The map also needs to show all former waste management facilities, including landfill sites.

5. □ Each settlement description is amended to include all existing waste management sites including waste transfer stations, recycling points and recycling centres.

Other Modification SEPA Would Welcome

SEPA recommends that the following sentence is inserted at the end of Paragraph 2 of the Policy supporting text.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 8 Waste Management 5.21

“Further guidance on issues to be considered as part of waste management proposals can be found in SEPA’s Guidance entitled “Commenting on Development Plan Consultations for National Waste Strategy Issues” and SEPA’s “Guidelines for Thermal Treatment of Municipal Waste.”

576 The Scottish Government
Edinburgh

The section on water and drainage covers the main issues. On waste, Policy 8 is reasonably positive, but I would draw your attention to SPP 10’s content on site waste management plans, which planning authorities could encourage through planning conditions. Paragraph 51 of SPP 10 recommends that planning authorities should consider requiring the preparation of SWMPs as a condition of planning permission in order to manage waste on site. It may be relevant to position something tailored along these lines in Section 6 of the Plan Designing for Sustainability.

As above

It may be helpful to locate the policy on Surface Water Drainage with those on Waste Water Treatment, Waste Management and Flood Risk.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 9 Flood Risk 5.23

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency
Dingwall

SEPA supports the inclusion of policy on flood risk. However SEPA objects to the policy as it stands. SEPA considers that the wording of Policy 9 is not in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy 7 ‘Planning and Flooding’ (SPP 7) as it does not clearly promote the flood avoidance principle.

SEPA welcomes the appraisal of sites allocations for flood risk presented in the SEA Environmental Report and Plan. However, flood risk has been dealt with inconsistently in the Plan and SEPA considers that, based on the assessments to date, some allocations are at flood risk and therefore are contrary to SPP 7.

SEPA has reviewed the proposed allocations using the Indicative River and Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) - 0.5% annual probability layer (1 in 200 year return period flood event). From this review, SEPA highlights that the following allocations lie either totally or partially within the indicative limits of flooding as shown on this map.

AMEND POLICY AND SUPPORTING TEXT TO REFER TO AND BETTER REFLECT SPP7 AND TAKE A MORE PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH.

The Council has programmed Supplementary Planning Guidance on Flooding in the published Development Plan Scheme.

For category 1 or 2 allocations we will revise boundaries of sites by removing affected parts of sites if the area in question cannot be developed and the area does not form an integral part of the site. Otherwise areas at risk from flooding will be safeguarded from development and there is potential for affected areas of a site to be used for informal open space. We will also have a developer requirement that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required when submitting a Planning Application. The Council does not have the resources available to carry

Chapter 05 GP Policy 9 Flood Risk 5.23

Dornoch H3, H4, MU1, B1 and LT
 Brora H4, H6 and MU1
 Helmsdale MU1
 Pittentrail MU1
 Ardgay B1
 Bonar Bridge/South Bonar Bridge I1
 Rosehall H2
 Invershin H1
 Lairg H1, H4, LT1, B1 and MU1
 Lochinver I1
 Kinlochbervie H1, H2 and I1
 Tongue MU1 and MU2
 Melvich H1

In addition SEPA notes that the SEA Environmental Report identifies that a Flood Risk Assessment will also be required to support allocations Lochinver I2 and LT. For your information SEPA does not currently hold any flood risk information for these sites.

Modification Required to Remove SEPA's Objection
 SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made.

1. The Policy is modified to the following effect:

"Development on the functional flood plain will be considered contrary to the objectives of this Plan. For planning applications where flood risk is highlighted, the planning authority will exercise the 'precautionary principle' and refuse development proposals where such proposals do not comply with parts (A); (B) and © as set out below and/or on the advice of SEPA.

(A) All types of development within "little or no risk areas" (of less than 1:1000 annual probability of flooding) are acceptable in terms of this Policy unless local circumstances dictate otherwise;

(B) All types of development, excluding essential civil infrastructure, within "low to medium risk areas" (of between 1:1000 and 1:200 annual probability of flooding) are acceptable in terms of this Policy unless local circumstances dictate otherwise;

out a Flood Risk Assessment for these allocations prior to the Local Plan being adopted. For category 1 insert wording to requirements "Site is at risk from flooding, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required. Built development will not generally be permitted on medium to high flood risk areas (SPP7). For category 2 insert wording to requirements ""This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application" For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a Flood Risk Assessment, however the amended policy states that, "A Flood Risk Assessment may be necessary where a site is partially within, bordering or adjacent to the medium to high flood risk area, a small unmodelled watercourse flows within or adjacent to the site, there is historical flooding known on the site or the development may have an impact on flooding elsewhere e.g. "down slope"."

The first sentence of the supporting text will be changed to read, "The risk of flooding from all sources is likely to increase with projected climate change." The second sentence of supporting text after, ".....at risk of inappropriate development..." will have the following additional text, "...to ensure compliance with Scottish Planning Policy 7: Planning and Flooding". In the last sentence of the supporting text we will delete, "...in order to properly take account of the potential for flooding both from rivers and from the sea" and will add, "...in order to take account of the potential for flooding from all sources as required by SPP 7."

The policy does not need to specifically mention renewable energy developments. Regard can be had to the degree of flood sensitivity of the proposed use and its impact on flood risk. There is also generally a lack of coincidence of search areas with flood risk areas. The forthcoming Supplementary Planning Guidance for On-Shore Wind Energy Developments will clarify the spatial planning framework for such developments.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 9 Flood Risk 5.23

© Within "medium to high risk areas" (1:200 or greater annual probability of flooding) only those categories of development indicated in ©(i), (ii) and (iii) may be acceptable.

(i) Residential, commercial and industrial development within built-up areas providing flood prevention measures to the appropriate standard already exist or are under construction. Water resistant materials and construction as appropriate;

(ii) Development on undeveloped and sparsely developed areas within the functional flood plain and comprising:

Essential development such as navigation and water based recreation use, agriculture and essential transport and some utilities infrastructure; and an alternative lower risk location is not achievable;

Essential infrastructure should be designed and constructed to remain operational during floods.

Recreational, sport, amenity and nature conservation uses providing adequate evacuation procedures are in place;

Job related residential use with a locational need;

Loss of storage capacity is minimised and suitably compensated for, and any such measures would not compromise the objectives of the EU Water Framework Directive.

(iii) Development, which is in accord with flood prevention or management measures as specified in association with a Local Plan Allocation or development brief."

2. The Policy supporting text is also modified to the following effect.

2.1 The first sentence is changed to: "The risk of flooding from all sources is likely to increase with projected climate change".

2.2 The second sentence is changed to: "It is therefore important not to allocate land at risk for inappropriate development to ensure

The local plan is subject to Public Local Inquiry therefore if the Council proposes to adopt a local plan contrary to advice on flood risk it does not need to be referred to Scottish Ministers as per The Town & Country Planning (Notification of Applications) (Scotland) Direction 2007.

Chapter 05 GP Policy 9 Flood Risk 5.23

compliance with Scottish Planning Policy 7: 'Planning and Flooding'".

2.3 The last sentence is changed to "in order to take account of the potential for flooding from all sources as required by SPP 7."

3. Any allocations that lie completely within the 0.5% annual probability outline are removed from the Plan or a detailed site specific Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at this stage to determine whether the site can be developed in line with SPP 7.

4. All allocations partially within 0.5% annual probability outline are revised to remove the area indicatively at risk. Following modification the 'Development Requirement' for each relevant allocation should state:

"This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."

In the event that the planning authority proposes to adopt this plan contrary to this advice on flood risk then the Plan must be notified to the Scottish Ministers as per The Town & Country Planning (Notification of Applications) (Scotland) Direction 2007.

The advice contained in this flood risk section of this letter is supplied to you by SEPA in terms of Section 25 (2) of the Environment Act 1995 on the basis of information held by SEPA as at the date hereof. It is intended as advice solely to Highland Council as Planning Authority in terms of the said Section 25 (2).

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT1997

As above

Dingwall

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT
PROCEDURE) (SCOTLAND)
ORDER 1992
ENVIRONMENT ACT 1995, SECTION 25(2)

Objection

SEPA supports the inclusion of policy on flood risk. However SEPA objects to the policy as it stands. SEPA considers that the wording of

Chapter 05 GP Policy 9 Flood Risk 5.23

Policy 9 is not in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy 7 'Planning and Flooding (SPP 7) as it does not clearly promote the flood avoidance principle.

SEPA welcomes the appraisal of sites allocations for flood risk presented in the SEA Environmental Report and Plan. I-however, flood risk has been dealt with Inconsistently in the Plan and SEPA considers that, based on the assessments to date, some allocations are at flood risk and therefore are contrary to SPP 7.

SEPA has reviewed the proposed allocations using the indicative River and Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) - 0.5% annual probability layer (1 in 200 year return period flood event). From this review, SEPA highlights that Category 1 allocations lie either totally or significantly within the indicative limits of flooding as shown on this map. Category 2 allocations lie partially within or adjacent to the indicative limits of flooding as shown on this map.

In addition SEPA has assisted the Council further by highlighting allocations containing watercourses with catchments of less than 3km² which are not modelled on the Indicative River and Coastal Flood Map (Scotland). These are listed above as Category 3 allocations. The planning authority should note that during the above assessment SEPA has utilised a recently updated version of the coastal outline for the Indicative River and Coastal Flood Map (Scotland). The planning authority should have also received this updated map.

In addition SEPA notes that the SEA Environmental Report identifies that a Flood Risk

Assessment will also be required to support allocations Lochinver 12 and ILT. For your information SEPA does not currently hold any flood risk information for these sites.

Modifications Required to Remove SEPA's Objection

SEPA would remove its objection if the following amendments are made

I . The Policy is modified to the following effect:

"Development on the functional flood plain will be considered contrary to the objectives of this Plan. For planning applications where flood risk is highlighted, the planning authority will exercise the precautionary principle' and refuse development proposals where such proposals do

Chapter 05 GP Policy 9 Flood Risk 5.23

not comply with pa& (A); (B) and C) as set out below and/or on the advice of SEPA.

(A) All types of development within "little or no risk areas" (of less than 4:1000 annual probability of flooding) are acceptable in terms of this Policy unless local circumstances indicate otherwise;

(B) All types of development, excluding essential civil infrastructure, within "low to medium risk areas" (of between 1: 1000 and 1:200 annual probability of flooding) are acceptable in terms of this Policy unless local circumstances dictate otherwise; Within "medium to high risk areas" (1:200 or greater annual probability of flooding) only those categories of development indicated in (i), (ii) and (iii) may be acceptable.

(i) Residential, commercial and industrial development within built-up areas providing flood prevention measures to the appropriate standard already exist or are under construction. Water resistant materials and construction as appropriate;

(ii) Development on undeveloped and sparsely developed areas within the functional flood plain and comprising:

(iii) Essential development such as navigation and water based recreation use, agriculture and essential transport and some utilities infrastructure; and an alternative lower risk location is not achievable; Essential infrastructure should be designed and constructed to remain operational during floods.

Recreational, sport, amenity and nature conservation uses providing adequate evacuation procedures are in place; a Job related residential use with a locational need;

(iv) Loss of storage capacity is limited and suitably compensated for, and any such measures would not compromise the objectives of the EU Water Framework Directive.

(iii) Development, which is in accord with flood prevention or management measures as specified in association with a Local Plan Allocation or development brief."

2. The Policy supporting text is also modified to the following effect 2.1 The first sentence is changed to: "The risk of flooding from all sources is likely to increase with projected climate change".

2.2 The second sentence is changed to: "It is therefore important not to allocate land at risk for inappropriate development to ensure compliance with Scottish Planning Policy 7: 'Planning and Flooding'",

2.3 The last sentence is changed to "...in order to take account of the

Chapter 05 GP Policy 9 Flood Risk 5.23

potential for flooding from all sources as required by SPP 7."

3. Any Category 1 allocations that lie completely or significantly within the 0.5% annual probability outline are removed from the Plan or a detailed site specific Flood Risk Assessment is carried out at this stage to determine whether the site can be developed in line with SPP 7.

4. All Category 2 allocations partially within 0.5% annual probability outline are revised to remove the area indicatively at risk. Following modification the 'Development Requirement' for each relevant allocation should state: "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."

5. The 'Development Requirement' for all Category 3 allocations should state:
 "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment may need to be submitted with any planning application." in the event that the planning authority proposes to adopt this Plan contrary to this advice on flood risk then the Plan must be notified to the Scottish Ministers as per The Town & Country planning (Notification of Applications) (Scotland) Direction 2807.

The advice contained in this flood risk section of this letter is supplied to you by SEPA in terms of Section 25 (2) of the Environment Act 1995 on the basis of information held by SEPA as at the date hereof. It is intended as advice solely to Highland Council as Planning Authority in terms of the said Section 25 (2).

Appendix 1 AP Definition of Natural & Cultural Heritage Features 3.01

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
 Golspie

1. Wild land
 As currently presented this Deposit Draft Plan is weak on the subject of wild land. Sutherland is perhaps unique in the extent and quality of wild land which is found within its boundary and which is not currently recognised by inclusion within National Scenic Areas or other landscape designations. Wild land is defined in NPPG 14 as "uninhabited and often relatively inaccessible countryside where the influence of human activity on the character and quality of the environment has been minimal".

Earlier comments above in relation to the 'vision' or strategy suggest where inclusion of reference to wild land might be added for completeness and to strengthen the section. However, given the clear

Add Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation to Plan mapping in advance of further consideration of Wild Land issue in the Highland Local Development Plan (and refer in the Local Plan to that intention to address further through the HLDP). Drop the reference to NPPG 11 in respect of RLVs as suggested. Reject suggested review of Areas of Great Landscape Value in this Plan but programme such work as an input to HLDP (and again indicate that intent in the Local Plan).

Appendix 1 AP Definition of Natural & Cultural Heritage Features 3.01

requirement outlined in NPPG 14 for planning authorities to safeguard wild land character, SNH objects to this omission from the Deposit Draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. This objection will be reconsidered on the assurance that wild land will be afforded policy protection and that background maps will be added identifying such areas. SNH recognises that it is the intention of The Highland Council to work with SNH to identify areas and to include them in the forthcoming Highland-wide Local Development Plan. This being the case, SNH would be content at this stage for the currently available maps showing Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation (RLVR) to be included, together with a clear statement of intention as described above. Regarding Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation, the reference under the policy context in Appendix 1 to NPPG 11 now has to be dropped.

2. Areas of Great Landscape Value

As well as identifying AGLVs and refining the boundaries from those indicatively shown in the Highland Structure Plan, the Local Plan should include an additional Appendix which provides a citation for each AGLV on their character and qualities, the reason for designation (if possible) and the underlying objective to be secured through their identification and safeguarding. Guidance is available in "Guidance on Local Landscape Designations" (2005). It would be SNH's preference that this should be carried out as part of this Local Plan. However, an alternative would be assurance that AGLV work would be carried out as part of the imminent Highlandwide Local Development Plan.

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

Appendix 1 - Definition of Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage Features

SPAs/SACs -this should refer in the text to Natura rather than Natura 2000.

SSSIs - the "background" needs to be updated to allow for the passage of the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004.

Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes -the policy framework needs to updated now to delete the reference to SHN.

NSAs - this should be updated to allow for the passage of the Planning

Amend Appendix 1 as suggested in respect of references to: Natura 2000, the background to SSSIs, the policy framework for Inventoried Gardens & Designed Landscapes, NSAs in the context of the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006, phraseology for woodland features and the policy context for RLVRs.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Appendix 1 AP Definition of Natural & Cultural Heritage Features 3.01	<p>etc (Scotland) Act 2006 and specifically the inclusion therein of Section 263A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. This gives Scottish Ministers renewed powers to designate NSAs where an area is of outstanding scenic value in a national context. Thereafter special attention is to be paid to the desirability of safeguarding or enhancing an NSA's character or appearance.</p> <p>Inventoried Ancient and Long Established Woodland - see note above re alternative phraseology of Invenforied Ancient Woodland and Long Established Woodland (Semi-Natural).</p> <p>Inventoried Semi-Natural Woodland - see note above re alternative phraseology of Inventoried Semi-Natural Woodland and Long Established Woodland (Plantation).</p> <p>Remote Landscapes of Value for Recreation - the reference under the policy context to NPPG 11 must now be dropped.</p>	
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	Settlement Settings and Views over Open Water have not been done for north and west Sutherland. This will need to be added to the text in Appendix 1.	The text of Appendix 1 will be clarified to indicate the extent to which Settlement Settings and Views Over Open Water have been mapped to date and comment further on these considerations.
495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>The purpose of this objection is two-fold: first to correct factual errors and secondly, to strengthen the information provided in Re appendix. I</p> <p>We suggest that the following changes be made to the text provided under "Features of National Importance":</p> <p>Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under "Background" add: "The integrity of the site and its setting is protected by national policy." Under "Policy Framework" add "Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2".</p> <p>Category A listed buildings: Under "Background" change the text to read "Compiled by Scottish Ministers under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as being of national or international importance to ensure the preservation of the</p>	Amend Appendix 1 as suggested in respect of references to: the background and policy framework for Scheduled Ancient Monuments and for Inventoried Gardens & Designed Landscapes, the categorisation of importance of Conservation Areas and the phraseology relating to C(S) Listed Buildings. Amend the background for A Listed Buildings and for B and C Listed Buildings to provide clarity about the basis for their listing, their importance and extent of protection.

Appendix 1 AP Definition of Natural & Cultural Heritage Features 3.01

building or its setting, or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it may possess. The list of buildings also includes structures such as walls and bridges."

Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes. Under "Background" add "The garden and designed landscape and its setting are protected by national policy." In addition, incorrect reference is made to Scottish Natural Heritage having responsibility for Gardens and Designed Landscapes. These are now the sole responsibility of Historic Scotland, as set out in the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2007 (SSI 177). Under "Policy Framework" delete the reference to the requirement to consult SNH.

Conservation Areas: the information on Conservation Areas should be moved to "Features of Local/Regional Importance".

We suggest that the following changes be made to the text provided under "Features of Local/Regional Importance":

The text for Category B and C (sic) Listed Buildings should reflect the advice provided in the Memorandum of Guidance (Para 1.6) where B-listed buildings are considered to be of regional or more than local importance, and C(S) listed buildings are of local importance. Under "Background" change the text to read "Included by Scottish Ministers within a list of buildings (which also includes structures such as walls and bridges) of special architectural or historic interest to ensure that any alteration, extension, repair or demolition of such interest is controlled."

Please note that the reference to C listed buildings should be to C(S) listed buildings

576 The Scottish Government
Edinburgh

The column in the appendix called Policy Framework has much that is legislation rather than policy. If legislation is to be included, the Habitats Regulations should therefore be listed for SPAs and SACs.

The material on AGLVs and local nature conservation sites states that the locations/precise boundaries of these have not yet been finalised,

Add to text of Plan to indicate intentions to map further features as part of preparing the first generation of new Local Development Plans under the Planning, etc. (Scotland) Act 2006. Amend Appendix 1 to refer to the Habitats Regulations in respect of SPAs and SACs and to correct the reference to national policy in respect of

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Appendix 1 AP Definition of Natural & Cultural Heritage Features 3.01		
	<p>much less digitally mapped. It is not stated when and how this will be done – ideally this should be achieved through the Local Plan process in the interests of transparency and therefore be available to inform Policy 4 which relates to these areas.</p> <p>Appendix 1 P47, Settlement Setting reference to NPPG 15 should be replaced by SPP 15 (February 2005).</p>	Settlement Setting, as suggested.
Appendix 2 AP Glossary 7.01		
<p>197 Director of Housing & Property Services Inverness</p>	<p>Definition of affordable housing Please add 'shared equity' to the low cost housing for sale.</p> <p>The glossary definition of private rented housing is misleading in relation to the policy guidance note which defines it as: Approved private rented accommodation - owned and/or managed by a private sector landlord to approved management and maintenance standards with equivalent to Registered Social Landlord rents.</p>	<p>The glossary definition will be amended to reflect the definitions contained within the recently revised Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>A definition of fragile areas is contained in the glossary.</p>
<p>576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh</p>	<p>It would be useful to include a definition of fragile areas in the glossary.</p> <p>There is also a comprehensive definition of affordable housing in draft Scottish Planning Policy 3: Planning for Housing (paragraph 30).</p>	As above
<p>326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie</p>	<p>Appendix 2 - Glossary Article 10 Features - the reference to this is the EC Habitats and Species Directive 1992 (92143IEEC) and not the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994.</p> <p>Add Appropriate Assessment since this phrase is included in the recommended revised Policy 4.3 - an assessment required under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended) in order that the planning authority as competent authority may defermin the likely impact of a development proposal on the conservation interests) for which a European nature conservation site has been classified.</p>	<p>Amend Appendix 2 as suggested in respect of references to Article 10 Features and the Precautionary Principle. Add new definitions as suggested for: Appropriate Assessment, Place-Making, Landscape Character, Open Space (but particularly to clarify how the term 'open space' is used in this particular Local Plan) and miscellaneous acronyms.</p>

Appendix 2 AP Glossary 7.01

Open Space may need to be defined - see SPP 11.
 Precautionary Principle - can cross-refer to Structure Plan Policy G8 here Placemaking - this term requires a definition. Refer for example to "Designing Places -A Policy Statement for Scotland".

Add Landscape Character particularly if this phrase is added to Policy 3 - the distinct and recognisable pattern of landscape elements that occurs consistently in a particular area, and how these are perceived by people, that makes one landscape different from another.
 Consider including all acronyms in the glossary.

Appendix 3 AP Landscape Character Assessment 8.01

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
 Golspie

Appendix 3 - Landscape Character Assessment
 As well as Structure Plan Policies L3 and L4, there should also be reference to Policies G2 and G6.

SNH would welcome a map being included of the Landscape Character Types, There should be reference here also to the Sutherland Housing Landscape Capacity Study (Horner and MacLennan, 2006) which, although not having any basis in policy like the LCA, is likely to provide very useful background information for developers and the planning authority.

Add to Appendix 3 reference to Structure Plan Policies G2 and G6 as suggested. The Appendix is specifically about the Landscape Character Assessment, therefore the Housing Landscape Capacity Study will be referenced elsewhere in the Plan. Reject suggestion to include the map of Landscape Character Types in the Local Plan; the mapping of LCTs is not a mapping of areas to which specific policies of the Plan apply. The LCT map is available elsewhere and it is more beneficial to access and refer to it with the LCA.

Inset Maps Dornoch G General Comment

579 Mr Michael Davis
 Dornoch

I write further to our recent meeting and discussions regarding the above property and;
 1. the possible future development of the building and grounds
 2. the difficulties of achieving satisfactory access thereto

Ambassador House, which lies inside the limit of the Dornoch Settlement Development Area, is within my ownership and development of the property and grounds has been the subject of many discussions with the Planning Department over a number of years.

The format and density of any such development have not been discussed in detail but the intention to develop has been a point of

NO CHANGE

Ambassador House is a Category B Listed Building sited within the Dornoch settlement development area. The consideration of development proposals within the SDA are indicated in General Policy 1: Settlement Development Areas.

In terms of the inclusion of the house and grounds as an allocation, there are many issues that would need to be considered in relation to the impact on the Listed Building and its setting. The potential for redevelopment of

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch G General Comment	<p>common knowledge for a significant period of time and correspondence has been exchanged which clearly demonstrates this.</p> <p>I note that the Sutherland Local Plan, Deposit Draft: October 2007 does not, at present, allocate Ambassador House and grounds for residential development and I therefore respectfully request that the property be considered for allocation.</p> <p>In addition, in order to mitigate the access difficulties previously discussed, specifically the unsuitability of Earls Cross Road for significant increase in vehicular movements and the usage limitations arising from the existing Road Construction Consent for Earls Cross Gardens, through which I hold a legal right of access in title & have financially contributed greatly towards the building costs of access. I would also request that the area of ground know as 'plot 1 Earls Court Gardens' also be allocated in the Local Plan as a potential new point of access into the grounds of Ambassador House.</p> <p>I am grateful for the guidance afforded to me in exploring the means to overcome the difficulties identified in our recent discussions and trust the above representations will be accepted at this stage in the plan making process.</p>	<p>Ambassador House and grounds can be investigated within the existing policy context.</p>
215 G I Grant Dornoch	I object to the local plan of the Dornoch area on the grounds that the land shown on the enclosed plan has not been included.	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>The area of ground indicated on your plan submitted with the representation lies to the north of the Dornoch Settlement Development area. The site lies within the hinterland area where the Housing in the Countryside applies. This policy holds a general presumption against housing development that is not related to land management, agricultural, crofting or other rural businesses. Other exceptions exist in this area which relate to a specific need for affordable housing or to the redevelopment of exiting buildings, the full detail of these can be found within the Council's Development Plan Policy Guidance: Housing in the Countryside.</p> <p>The site is located around 1 mile outwith the settlement</p>

Inset Maps Dornoch G General Comment

boundary on the Poles Road on a site north of Pitgrudy Farm buildings. The site falls well outwith the settlement boundary and is dislocated from the community although reference is made to the provision of a foot/cycle path to connect to Dornoch.

Scottish Planning Policy SPP3: Planning for Housing indicates that wherever possible most housing requirements should be met within of adjacent to existing settlements. The area identified falls within the extent of the hinterland around towns as indicated within the Council's approved Structure Plan and as such is subject to policy H3 Housing in the Countryside which holds a presumption against development in these areas. The policy seeks to strengthen the role of settlements, making efficient use of existing infrastructure and services in line with national guidance and sustainable principles.

In terms of the need for this scale of allocation, that already identified within the adopted local plan provides already for a level of development beyond the period that this plan review is seeking. There is progress on the delivery of large housing allocations in Dornoch and these are likely to meet the development needs for the plan period and beyond. In terms of the specific requirement for retirement housing it is felt that these could be accommodated in closer proximity to centre of Dornoch within land already identified.

113 A Connell
Dornoch

Could you provide a site plan for the area shown crosshatched.

Ordnance Survey extracts can be purchased from the Highland Council, Planning and Development Service.

304 Sarah Wild
Dornoch

P113. A5.2: To continue to refuse any building programme on this site. High water table increased threat of flooding.

The site adjacent To Meadows Park Football Ground was not included in the draft plan as a result of earlier consultation.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch G General Comment		
243 HSCHT Dornoch	As some of the other allocations in Dornoch would appear to be unlikely to come forward within the life of this plan, the Trust feel consideration should be given to the field to the West of H3, as a possible allocated site.	NO CHANGE The current allocations identified within the Local Plan are expected to deliver an adequate supply of housing for the needs of the settlement. The progression of developments at Sutherland Road, Bishopfield and at Meadows Park will meet the short to medium needs of the plan. Development proposals are also progressing for the longer term allocation at Dornoch North. At present these sites along with other infill/brownfield opportunities provide an adequate supply. A further review of the plan may identify the need to allocate further land to maintain an adequate land supply and provide choice within the settlement.
Inset Maps Dornoch MB Prospects		
220 Mrs Morag Murray Dornoch	Roads, if more houses where are the jobs, schools, hospitals, doc, dentists, etc for the public.	Dornoch has an identified housing need, with a significant waiting list for affordable homes. The settlement has a high average house price that may be driven by purchases from outwith the Highland area, the East Sutherland and Edderton Ward has one of the highest levels of sales to outwith the area. The provision of a larger and more varied housing stock will assist in the ability of the local population to access the housing market. In relation to the provision of business and industrial opportunities these have been identified within the plan at the extension to the business park, in order to facilitate the growth of local employment opportunities. Both the Dornoch Primary and Academy have experienced falling school rolls in recent years, event with a significant growth in house construction this is likely to steady the existing school rolls. Proposals to upgrade the level of facilities available for the primary and secondary school are under consideration. The local community association are pursuing the potential for the refurbishment of the existing or the delivery of a new

Inset Maps Dornoch MB Prospects

community centre.

The provision of adequate infrastructure is an issue that is the subject of consideration when allocating land. Further detail on improvements that require to be undertaken or contributed to by developers will be the subject of more detailed discussion when proposals are formed and submitted for consideration. These issues relate to all factors that are required to facilitate a development to proceed, ie adequacy of roads, pedestrian access, water and drainage provision, flood risk, service provision etc. The preparation of the plan involves discussion with other agencies to allow consideration of the impact on services and allow for the programming of adequate provision.

146 Mr & Mrs S Dean
Dornoch

1. Against any further housing developments and the area of or to be used for business or industry.
2. Geographically Dornoch is too far north for daily commuting to Inverness for employment. Jobs in Dornoch and surrounding area are limited.
3. Infrastructure would not cope with a larger population.
4. Academy near full capacity.
5. Local council refuse to extend the present buinding academy.
6. The pavement and narrow road to the primary school and academy is of great concern to parents. An increase in traffic would be far more dangerous than it already is.
7. Houses in the town on the market at the moment are taking a long time to sell. With Tulloch and Munro building a vast number of houses. Do we need more?
8. Many houses in Dornoch have been purchased as holiday homes for wealthy visitos from elsewhere in the UK, Canada and America used only for a few weeks each year.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch MB Prospects		
23 Mr P Higgins Dornoch	As part of the present ongoing development of Dornoch, the extra housing will have an effect on demand for already overstretched social resources, especially social functions. Present facilities are already inadequate. Developers should donate/contribute to provision of a new/refurbished village hall.	As above

255 G A Marshall Dornoch	<p>Lack of need for large quantities of housing in Dornoch as seen by the length of time available properties take to sell at the moment.</p> <p>The change of Dornoch from a small town with its attraction for tourists to a satellite of Inverness.</p> <p>I would question the building of commercial units a little or no manufacturing would be viable due to high costs of transport. This is highlighted by the lack of take up of the site laid out in Golspie by CASE.</p> <p>Lack of employment for some 200 people assuming 200 houses and one employed person per house.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure i.e.. Waste water disposal, education facilities assuming one school age person per house; shops, dentists, medical, public transport etc.</p> <p>Increased pressure on roads which are not of sufficient standard for current usage.</p> <p>Cost of transportation.</p> <p>Reduction in value of surrounding properties.</p> <p>The site is on the old drovers road and is thought to be the site of drovers fairs.</p> <p>The area is quite wet, however does produce good crops for the farmer, there are areas of not such good quality farm land which should more housing be required, which I doubt, could be used such as the land between Canmore and the schools where there is better access to the roads & main drainage without impacting on the town centre.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch MB Prospects		
	<p>I would be concerned as to the depth excavations would have to go to find a solid base for foundations.</p> <p>Increase in traffic through the town.</p>	
<p>380 A M A Bagott Dornoch</p>	<p>1). Is there a proven demand for more houses in Dornoch?</p> <p>2). More houses mean a greater volume of traffic on roads that are narrow and ill suited for extra volume - leading to a greater accident risk especially with, I suspect a higher than average in most towns.</p> <p>3). Where are the jobs for these new home owners?</p> <p>4). How many more pupils can the school accommodate?</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>175 Mr Harold Lane Dornoch</p>	<p>We need a small but appropriate gymnasium up here.</p>	<p>NOTED.</p> <p>The development of a sports barn at the school will offer facilities for the wider public.</p>
Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopsfield		
<p>48 Mr & Mrs Murray Dornoch</p>	<p>Support allocation.</p>	<p>Support Noted.</p>
<p>47 Mr & Mrs Dingwall Dornoch</p>	<p>Support allocation.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>245 Mr Graham Grant Dornoch</p>	<p>Support allocation.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>14 Mr Andrew Macleod Dornoch</p>	<p>Support allocation.</p>	<p>As above</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopsfield		
205 Mr & Mrs G & V Baker Dornoch	Support allocation.	As above
32 Mr Kenneth MacDonald Dornoch	Support given if clean well kept landscaping is certain. Also good quality roads and lighting included. Good quality homes also essential.	Noted.
127 Mr Allan Todd Dornoch	I have no objections to what is effectively an extension of an already developed area.	As above
65 Mr & Mrs Albert & Margaret Knight Dornoch	No adverse comments.	As above
226 Francis Dawson Dornoch	<p>I am not sure if these plans relate to future property to be built or whether it is in connection with the buildings that are already well on the way to completion - this is Albyn housing I understand. As things are, the gable end of a structure almost completely blocks light or view from my kitchen window - which is very depressing to say the least. Should this form apply to future property to be built then I do not relish anymore houses etc being built. The only window I have at the back of the house is my bedroom. Had the existing partly built house been a single storey, it might have been acceptable but it is more than that - two storey house it would seem.</p> <p>Another matter is that as there is only a hedge - thin at that, a few narrow bands of metal fencing between me & my immediate neighbour, we would require a very much stronger division between us and the buildings to be erected. I am very unhappy at having so many houses etc built at this piece of ground.</p> <p>We are all elderly people at Stafford Court, but like others, we enjoy peace and quietness which is going to be very unlikely if 30 houses you mention are to be built and 14 houses Albyn is already building - or perhaps the Albyn houses are included in the 30 you mention.</p>	<p>NOTED. NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The Local Plan aims to identify areas of land for development that will meet the existing and projected need for each settlement and its catchment. This includes developments that already have the benefit of planning permission or are under construction. There is a need to ensure that there is an adequate supply of effective land, that being readily able to develop, and land capable of being developed in future years.</p> <p>The purpose of the identification of potential sites for housing and other development is to establish the principle of development on an area of ground. An assessment of site suitability involves the consideration of a number of factors. The Local Plan does not seek to determine the final physical form of a development but does indicate the requirements expected to be provided as part of a development.</p> <p>The requirement section of the allocation indicates the anticipated level of development that may take place on the site along with further development considerations. The actual form of development will be developed</p>

Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopsfield

through provision of a detailed application for the site where issues relating to layout, design, road and pedestrian access, car parking and open space provision will be determined. This would also cover the management of the site, delivery and phasing of the development.

The submission of a planning application provides a consultation period where views on proposals can be submitted. It is understood that a masterplan is to be prepared as part of a submission to support further applications to the overall development of the allocation, providing ample opportunity to comment on detailed matters relating to layout, open space and recreation.

137 Mrs Margaret M Shaw
Dornoch

Some of these house are already built or in the process of being built. I cannot base a decision on the above information because it does not tell me much! The plan was received late November and is dated October 2007. Perhaps you can let me know the date the first of these H1 houses were started?

As above

Are any of the planned houses to be more than 2 storey in height? And is 30 units the maximum or will there be more on this land? How will it affect the parking at the existing car park? (During building and afterwards)

113 A Connell
Dornoch

Would it be possible to have a path to the playground as a safe passage for children to keep them away from the main roads?

As above

537 Mrs Catherine Charlish
Dornoch

When we moved into 'STRATHAN' eleven years ago we were told that the area I have shaded in would not be built on.

As above

We want it to remain an open space, with possibly some trees planted and grassy area.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopsfield		
79 Ms Laura Hudson Dornoch	<p>Roads should be built first to allow for delivery of materials and parking for works vehicles, so that existing residence within the area are able park their own cars. This has already become an issue for residents at Elizabeth Court, we are consistently unable to park our vehicles at the front of the house and have had to park elsewhere. There have also been road blockages due to large lorries unloading as they cannot take the lorries onto the building site due to unsuitable grounds (no road or temporary road).</p> <p>I would also like to see the area developed within a short period so that the area does not become an ongoing building site over a long period.</p>	As above
151 Mhairi A MacKay Dornoch	<p>I am unable to object/support these plans as they provide insufficient detail.</p> <p>This plan does not show anything which I do not know.</p> <p>I would prefer a rough idea of the positioning of the 30 units.</p> <p>I would request that the current rough "walkway" used by children and adults from Elizabeth Gardens to gain access to the playpark at the games court be made into a permanent path for us all to gain easy access to the park (see attached map)</p>	As above
154 R H Bluck Dornoch	<p>These plans are inaccurate and are not detailed correctly.</p> <p>The whole area would benefit from a tree planting scheme to add beauty to the area and break up building lines and soften the outlook.</p>	As above
352 Mrs Joyce Everitt Dornoch	<p>Housing already underway before opportunity to object!</p> <p>Would like to make representation against any road linking Elizabeth Crescent to new development</p> <p>Tight corner at Stafford Road/Grange Road junction and at corner end of Golf Hotel (East) and college railing. Also exit onto Dornoch/Embo road - poor visibility-</p> <p>Green belt area - was sowed for landscaping and tree planting?</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopfield		
132 Mary Littlejohn Dornoch	I refer to Dornoch as being a town not a village. I notice there are going to be affordable houses this is much needed in this area.	The reference to Dornoch will be changed to reflect Dornochs role as a town rather than a village. Support Noted for development of housing.
165 Mrs Louise Lafferty Dornoch	<p>I have had two extensions to my house that do not appear on the house plan. These extensions will be extremely close to any new build and are already very close to the existing path, and one is right on the bound of the path. I applied unsuccessfully for an extension to our land at the back, which I was happy to pay for, would it be possible to reconsider where the nearest house will be at the planning stage. We could then discuss with the developer or the council how to overcome what will be a serious privacy issue. There must be rules about how close you can build to an existing property.</p> <p>I further this has been used for recreational purposes and is a nice feature in the middle of what is already an extensive development. We are in danger of turning a beautiful village into an urban sprawl. Roany people do not want all of this development. In a village that does not have the infrastructure to support more houses. We are turning the A9 to Inverness into a carpark.</p>	<p>NOTED. NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The consideration of issues relating the exact form of development of the site will be the subject of detailed consideration through a planning application. It is understood that a masterplan is to be prepared as part of a submission to support further applications to the overall development of the allocation, providing ample opportunity to comment on detailed matters relating to layout, open space and recreation.</p>
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	<p>Suggest that area North West should be included in the plan and that capacity of 50 more appropriate. Owner (Council) intends to produce a master plan which may include building for community use. Also some consideration should be given to inclusion of area West of H3.</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 30 Suggested Capacity:50</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 BISHOPFIELD BUT EXTEND ALLOCATION TO INCLUDE GAMES COURT AND PLAYGROUND AREA. AMENDT INDICATIVE CAPACITY TO 50 UNITS.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that the inclusion of land to the north and west of the allocation will allow a masterplan to provide a comprehensive overview of proposed development. This would assist in the integration of the play area as part of the overall development.</p> <p>In regard to the potential capacity existing ongoing development will utilise around 50% of the indicative figure, there is scope on the site for a greater number of houses on the basis of these densities. An indicative figure of 50 units would be a more appropriate indication.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopfield		
544 Mr & Mrs S M Wilson Dornoch	<p>This is a joint response by residents who own private houses in Elizabeth Crescent and Earl Cross Gardens, Dornoch.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Firstly you have sent out plans asking for comments, as housing developments are already well advanced on both the areas is it not a bit late to be asking for comments as it is already "fait accom'pli"especial1y in the area H2. 2. H1 has already got houses under construction, yet none of the property owners in Elizabeth Crescent were served notice of the planning application, yet some of the properties have boundaries that border on to the area that is currently being developed. 3. The plan available to view in the local library has more detail regarding accesses to area H1 than the plan that was posted out to all the properties, was this a deliberate omission ? 4. We the undersigned all strongly feel that the end of Elizabeth Crescent should remain a 'cul de sac' with plots being sold to private individuals and not to a property developer. All the existing private houses in the crescent were built by private individuals on plots sold by the council and that is the way the vacant land at the end of the crescent should be further developed. 5. A green belt should be left between the private housing and the "affordable" housing. 6. Vehicle access to the affordable housing must not be via the end of Elizabeth Crescent, if an access was put in it means that all the private houses which individuals have invested in would be "sandwiched" between what would be basically two "council schemes." 7. We have no objections to the developments in area H2 except for the comment in (1) 8. Before any further developments are allowed to take place in the Bishopfield area, the tight dangerous corner where Stafford Road joins Grange Road requires to be addressed. <p>General Comment</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Local Plan is intended to identify housing allocations within each settlement required to meet the overall housing need and demand for each settlement. There is a need also to demonstrate that this requirement is being met on a variety of sites that can provide choice of type and location. 2. Neighbour notification is carried out as a requirement of submission of a planning application. The requirements for neighbour notification relate to direct neighbours or to those with common boundary within 90m of development sites. Details of neighbour notification carried out for individual applications are available from the Area Planning and Building Standards Office. 3. A technical printing issue has removed the transparency of the Local Plan map from individual notices sent out. 4. - 6. The Local Plan aims to identify areas of land for development that will meet the existing and projected need for each settlement and its catchment. This includes developments that already have the benefit of planning permission or are under construction. There is a need to ensure that there is an adequate supply of effective land, that being readily able to develop, and land capable of being developed in future years. <p>The purpose of the identification of potential sites for housing and other development is to establish the principle of development on an area of ground. An assessment of site suitability involves the consideration of a number of factors. The Local Plan does not seek to determine the final physical form of a development but does indicate the requirements expected to be provided as part of a development, this includes issues such as flood risk assessment and surface water drainage.</p> <p>The requirement section of the allocation indicates the anticipated level of development that may take place on</p>

Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopsfield

If it ends up with a surplus of affordable housing, will it not end up with them being occupied by problem families from outside the area or with numerous EU workers all living in the one property, this is already happening in the region. Is there not a breach of planning regulations where the housing that is currently under construction, planning applications were not served on the owners of properties that border this H1 area.

We the undersigned all owning the properties at the stated addresses fully agree with the contents of this letter in response to the Dornoch local plan for the Bishopfield areas H1 and H2. This is in addition to any individual comments that some of us may have already sent in.

the site along with further development considerations. The actual form of development will be developed through provision of a detailed application for the site where issues relating to layout, design, road and pedestrian access and open space provision will be determined. The submission of a planning application provides a consultation period where views on proposals can be submitted.

Proposals will need to address issues relating to affordable housing provision and also to the delivery of this whether it be rented, low cost home ownership, or the provision of a low cost building plot.

7. As above.

8. The consideration of an overall masterplan for the site will reveal any technical deficiencies in the road network serving the area. Planning conditions would require improvements to be undertaken as part of the development.

General Comment. The provision of affordable housing is related to identified need within the area. The issue of Homes in Multiple Occupancy is to be the subject of guidance to address the growth of this housing sector.

544 Mr & Mrs S M Wilson
Dornoch

You are asking for comment on a development that is already partly being constructed.

As above

Elizabeth Crescent (the end towards the Cul-de-sac) consists of private 'quality' houses and that is the way any further development should be not directly bordering affordable housing. It should remain a cul-de-sac and not a loop road for joy riding traffic to cruise round.

People in the crescent including ourselves have invested heavily and in no way wish to be closely surrounded by what is basically a "council scheme".

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Dornoch H 1 Bishopsfield

544 Mr & Mrs S M Wilson Dornoch	<p>Is there sufficient employment in the area to support the occupants of all the proposed housing as there is very little local industry? Most of the service jobs in the hotels are low paid and seasonable and a high proportion of the positions are currently filled by Eastern Europeans. If it ends up with a surplus of affordable housing, will it not end up with them being occupied by problem families from outside the area or with numerous EU workers all living in the one property, this is already happening in the region.</p> <p>There are also all the private developments that are proposed for the "flood plains" on the downside of the road opposite the War Memorial and also between Sutherland Road and the sea. (Is global warming and rising sea levels not going to affect the Dornoch Area)? A development that has to pump drainage water surely tells it own story.</p> <p>Is Dornoch not going to end up with more housing that the local infrastructure can support ?</p> <p>There is a definite requirement for affordable serviced plots to be available to buy by private individuals who want to self build, this can be with "water tight" conditions of sale to stop speculators from buying plots and either not developing them or developing and immediately selling on for massive profits. In the 1970s the local council successfully did this at Darroch Brae in Alness and also at Conon Bridge.</p> <p>A more relaxed planning attitude is also required that would allow houses to be built out with the current designated zoned areas.</p>	As above
------------------------------------	--	----------

Inset Maps Dornoch H 2 Earl's Cross

48 Mr & Mrs Murray Dornoch	Support allocation.	Support noted.
14 Mr Andrew Macleod Dornoch	Support allocation.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 2 Earl's Cross		
245 Mr Graham Grant Dornoch	Support allocation.	As above
205 Mr & Mrs G & V Baker Dornoch	Support allocation	As above
47 Mr & Mrs Dingwall Dornoch	Support noted.	As above
137 Mrs Margaret M Shaw Dornoch	<p>I am a little confused as to why this comes to us at this time considering it's dated Oct 2007 and we received it late November and the houses are already built (or several of them at least)</p> <p>It would appear to be a tick box situation - ie have you consulted with residents. I don't understand the thing of it.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is intended to identify housing allocations within each settlement required to meet the overall housing need and demand for each settlement. There is a need also to demonstrate that this requirement is being met on a variety of sites that can provide choice of type and location. In this respect the allocation at Earl's Cross is part of this requirement.</p>
544 Mr & Mrs S M Wilson Dornoch	What is the point of asking for points of view on a development already being developed!	As above
113 A Connell Dornoch	This seems a total waste of money since the site has been laid out and work started.	As above
23 Mr P Higgins Dornoch	Since this land has been designated for housing for some time and since some plots have been and are been developed is this consultation a little late.	As above
127 Mr Allan Todd Dornoch	I have no objections to expanding an already developed area.	Noted.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 2 Earl's Cross		
65 Mr & Mrs Albert & Margaret Knight Dornoch	No adverse comments.	As above
32 Mr Kenneth MacDonald Dornoch	As long as clean, well kept landscaping is certain, I have no objection. I also understand that new roads with lighting will be established. If this is so, I have no objection. Good Quality homes essential.	As above
151 Mhairi A MacKay Dornoch	This plan does not show us anything we don't already know. It would be more beneficial to give an idea of the positions of the proposed properties.	NO CHANGE Detail relating to the siting of individual properties will be available to inspect as part of the planning permissions relating to this development, these can be viewed at the local Area Planning and Building Standards office.
23 Mr P Higgins Dornoch	There is a need to ensure proper archaeological intervention.	The development of the houses was subject to a planning condition relating the need for an archaeological survey to be undertaken prior to the submission of reserved matters.
137 Mrs Margaret M Shaw Dornoch	I have no objection to the houses, although it seems to include the cholera burial ground - is this allowed?	As above
502 Mr Fergus MacLeod Evelix	I would have no objection to the development on the area mentioned above, however I would have to insist that suitable measures are taken to prevent any further problem in respect of flooding. In October 2006 this area suffered as a result of the heavy rains and I hope that Highland Council can recognise this and take the relevant action required prior to issuing relevant permission.	Proposals in terms of drainage and disposal of surface water have been concluded to the satisfaction of both the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Council.
154 R H Bluck Dornoch	These plans are inaccurate and are not detailed correctly. The whole area would benefit from a tree planting scheme to add beauty to the area and break up building lines and soften the outlook.	The planning permission does include a requirement for landscaping and tree and hedge planting.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 2 Earl's Cross		
352 Mrs Joyce Everitt Dornoch	See H1 Connection road accessing Elizabeth Crescent.	Consideration of the allocating of sites and the subsequent consideration of planning application takes into account all relevant factors including vehicular access and parking provision.
132 Mary Littlejohn Dornoch	One of my concerns is that there is going to be adequate parking spaces at these houses. Also that there is affordable houses available to first time buyers. Also I hope the road surfaces will be looked after and repaired when necessary because the increase of traffic which will be on them.	As above
Inset Maps Dornoch H 3 Sutherland Road		
53 R A Dickenson Dornoch	Support allocation.	Support noted.
265 Mr H Turner Dornoch	<p>I consider a through road to Evelix road should have been included in the plan, as it appears this is not services though should be given to the Sutherland Road Castle Street junction as the night times are very bad.</p> <p>Four suggestions: Remove church hall wall Traffic lights Install roundabout Realign the junction to Cromartie Road</p> <p>The boundary with Roderick Court should be planted with mature screen trees.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>The consideration of the planning application for the development of the site addressed the need for the provision for adequate landscaping and tree planting for the development. The provision of a scheme of landscaping and planting was a requirement of the planning permission issued for the site. This dealt with the mix of trees to be planted and the subsequent replacement of any failed trees or plants along with the longer term maintenance provision. This scheme also dealt with the retention of existing trees and shrubs.</p> <p>In regard to archaeology, a programme of archaeological work including the preservation and recording of archaeological features has been submitted to the Council.</p> <p>The improvements required to Sutherland Road and the junction to the A949 have been agreed with the developer.</p> <p>Proposals in terms of drainage and disposal of surface</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 3 Sutherland Road		water have been concluded to the satisfaction of both the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Council.
84 M J Napper Dornoch	Whilst it is now too late to object as the developers have started work, we are concerned that there is insufficient landscaping planned and that mature trees on the Sutherland Road will be destroyed to ease the development. These trees have been numbered by SNH and should be respected; they currently provide both an excellent entry to Dornoch and a windbreak to adjacent houses. No archaeological work carried out!	As above
224 Elizabeth A Coghill Dornoch	<p>I understand that it was a requirement of the permission for a screen of mature trees to be planted between the development site and Roderick Court prior to any development taking place. This was to protect the amenity of the (mainly) elderly residents of Roderick Court. Obviously, if trees are planted in advance of any construction work taking place, any that fail to grow can be replaced timorously.</p> <p>On examination of the site to the south of Roderick Court all topsoil has been removed and replaced with compacted gravel right up to the boundary fence, thus making it more difficult to plant the mature tree screen, which makes me think, will the planting for a screen of mature trees really go ahead?</p> <p>It was understood that Sutherland Road would be widened to double width up to the entrance of the site prior to construction work commencing - again this has not been done.</p> <p>The final condition not adhered to is improvement to the junction of Sutherland Road and the A949 (Main Street).</p>	As above
378 Mrs Caroline Logie Dornoch	Whilst visually more pleasing and not high density this development is dependant on H4 proceeding and therefore the land is not suitable due to the topographic survey carried out for Pat Munro.	As above
304 Sarah Wild Dornoch	H3 : Due to high water table no extended permission beyond existing boundary. Site to be kept tidy during construction.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 3 Sutherland Road		
176 Mr & Mrs Ross Dornoch	Drainage is a major problem. Having watched the machinery clearing this site you can see it is a quagmire. Where will this water go? This land is a bog, too low lying and we anticipate ongoing drainage problems just like we already have at the Meadows.	As above
125 Tulloch Homes Ltd Inverness	Dornoch H3/Sutherland Road. I can advise that development has commenced on this site under planning permission as noted. At this time I anticipate that this site will be built-out within the provisions of these permissions.	Noted.
237 F G Blackett Dornoch	<p>I trust that further development of land to the west of H3 & south of the Evelix Road will not be undertaken at any time in the future. I would object to such development in the strongest terms having lost prospect view from Broomhill to the west due to a dodgy planning decision I would fear such occurring to the south resulting in further loss of prospect & reduction in property value.</p> <p>I note that planning consent has been granted for 140 house units on 2 sites in Dornoch. If the land specified is not already a flood plain it certainly has the potential of becoming such in the mid term future.</p>	The land to the west of H3 lies outwith the settlement boundary and is not the subject of consideration for allocation at this time.
380 A M A Bagott Dornoch	5). At present there is a magnificent view down to the Dornoch firth from Evelix Road - the main access and exit road to and from town. This will now be ruined forever.	The development of this site relates only to a relatively small area of ground on the periphery of the settlement sited below the level of the Evelix Road and has minimal impact on views.
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2 Flood Risk	In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."

Inset Maps Dornoch H 4 Meadows Park Road

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 4 Meadows Park Road		
53 R A Dickenson Dornoch	Support allocation providing there is no change to the cul de sac shown as The Meadows.	Support noted. The proposals for the development of the site, now approved, do not indicate any impact on the cul de sac at the Meadows.
95 Pat Munro (Alness) Ltd Alness	Support allocation.	Support noted.
378 Mrs Caroline Logie Dornoch	This high density housing is visually unattractive as an entrance to Dornoch. The topographic survey stated that the percolation tests were implacable due to the high water table, unstable excavation conditions, upward migration and promotion of running conditions. Thus the land is not suitable. There is not adequate provision of services for another 152 houses. The 10 year development to be suffered by neighbours on noise pollution doesn't bear thinking about. Please refer to letter of 12/03/07 for future reading.	The improvements required to Sutherland Road and the junction to the A949 have been agreed with the developer. Proposals in terms of drainage and disposal of surface water have been concluded to the satisfaction of both the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Council. The approved development makes adequate provision for open space.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	1.1 Dornoch Housing development H4 has particularly high density and is a clear candidate for the provision of open space.	As above
84 M J Napper Dornoch	This is an appalling development of a very low lying and inherently boggy bit of ground. The houses (102) are crammed into a very small area more suited to 50 units. There is only one road into the estate with consequential safety implications (major fire - road blocked) No consideration has been given to safety at junction of Sutherland Rd and Castle Street when either a roundabout or traffic lights will be essential due to blind junction.	As above
265 Mr H Turner Dornoch	I consider a through road to Evelix road should have been included in the H3 plan as it appears this is not services though should be given to the Sutherland Road Castle Street junction as the night times are very bad. Four Suggestions: Remove Church Hall wall Traffic lights Install roundabout	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 4 Meadows Park Road	Realign the junction to Cromartie road.	
176 Mr & Mrs Ross Dornoch	<p>1. We already have ongoing problems with drainage. Feel that extra housing will just exacerbate the problem. At the end of the day no one can beat the water table.</p> <p>2. The junction from Sutherland Road onto Castle Street is not suitable for extra traffic.</p>	As above
361 Alison Burnett Dornoch	<p>When planning permission was given for the 102 houses the committee were lead to believe that all the required tests on the ground had been satisfactorily completed. When our spokesman pointed out that this was not so he was not believed by the members.</p> <p>In appendix B percolation test results and site investigation appendix C you find there are outstanding points soil investigation: Page 1 1.0 Introduction - last 2 sentences Page 2 2.0 Field work - last paragraph Page 4 5.0 Laboratory testing - the sentence Page 4 5.0 Ground water - Paragraph 2 Page 8 9.0 - no report given</p> <p>In view of the current very high water table at this site and the prospect of climate change making this worse, I feel the decision to approve building on this site should be considered.</p> <p>Should approval not be withdrawn I strongly recommend that the area should have gravel and grass where possible to allow as much natural surface drainage as possible.</p>	As above
304 Sarah Wild Dornoch	H4: Due to high water table no extended permission beyond existing boundary. Site to be kept tidy during construction.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch H 4 Meadows Park Road		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2 Flood Risk	In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."
<hr/>		
Inset Maps Dornoch MU 1 Dornoch North		
308 Mrs I Sutherland Dornoch	<p>Possible alternative access to North Street from Dornoch North Development.</p> <p>I spoke briefly to Mr Cowie about Planning application 06/00488/FULSU which has been approved (with conditions) for Allen Holmes & Sons to build 3 houses in North Street, Dornoch. I told Mr Cowie that I had spoken to Mr J.S Mackintosh, Embo on 22/11/07. Mr Mackintosh owns neighbouring land which has recently been cleared for the proposed Dornoch North development. He advised me that he had offered the use of part of his land to the Holmes as an alternative access to the North Street site.</p> <p>I have written of this to the Highland Council on 17/01/08, as Mr Cowie advised me, and my letter has been acknowledged saying this matter is being looked into by the Planning and Development Department.</p> <p>I felt I should update you of this before the deadline date of 01/02/08 and ask you to please bear in mind that, if this alternative access could be made viable, it would alleviate the very real vehicular access difficulties to North Street.</p>	The development at North Street has commenced on the basis of the approved access to North Street. When the Dornoch North development progresses and there is a clearer indication of the roads and infrastructure provision there may be the opportunity for this development to provide an alternative vehicular access.
118 Torrance Partnership Dornoch	Capacity suitable for this area if suitably phased and appropriate layout.	NOTED.
54 J Luckie Dornoch	But please get your plan correct! What in mixed use and when?	The base map is provided by the Ordnance Survey. The mix of uses acceptable is indicated in the site allocations table, and further in the Developer Requirements column. The timescale for development of the entire site, is likely to span over many years, preparatory work aimed at bringing the site forward is being undertaken by the

Inset Maps Dornoch MU 1 Dornoch North

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
218 Mr M MacGregor Dornoch	<p>1. I am not aware of any access arrangements to the new development at Dornoch North. Nobody has approached me on the subject with any clarification. So I can add no further comment than already said on access.</p> <p>2. The Dornoch Burn on the Sutherland Local Plan Deposit Draft (Plan) seems to have disappeared from the industrial estate going north. The burn in the boundary between the two farms of "Achnichanter" and "Balloan" and I do not know of any access rights for Balloan farmland from Station road, refer to the plan and letter I sent to your office on 8/11/2006 and you can see the boundary burn and my unadopted access road 10 foot wide leading to my house "Glenburn" and the bus depot garage from Station road.</p> <p>3. I have made your office aware of the flooding problems in this area by photos I sent to your office and also sent photos to the developer, SEPA, and Elizabeth Maciver TEC services Dingwall. If the historic flood plains at this development are interfered with it will cause worse flooding in this and Dornoch area than has already been experienced. What guarantee can the council or the developer give to the damage arising through worse flooding to my properties in this sensitive area if the development goes ahead. Flooding in this area is already being experienced through inefficient culvert in the council industrial estate in a storm surge and the back up of sewage waste from overflow.</p> <p>4. I would like also to inform you that all my service cables and pipes to "Glenburn" and the bus depot property run under my access road.</p> <p>5. I can not see how a double track road which is necessary for this development can be built on the north side of the burn considering the roads proximity to my property and no arrangements or proper enquiries made by the developers or the council.</p> <p>6. The councils adopted road stops at the entrance to the industrial estate just off the A949 so I am surprised to see a wide road continuing past this on your Sutherland Local Plan Deposit Draft October 2007. The road on the plan is encroaching a long way on to my property.</p>	<p>landowner.</p> <p>1. The potential access points are indicative only and are suggested points of access that may serve part of the development and represent options, the final positioning of the access points will be the subject of a detailed submission.</p> <p>2. A technical printing error on the neighbour notification forms obliterated detail below the allocation shading.</p> <p>3. - 7. The Council is aware of the flood risk issues associated with the site, the Developer Requirements of the section indicates the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment to be prepared for the site, this will involve assessing the potential impacts of flood risk, both on and off-site and consider measures to address the position. The outcomes of the study will affect the form of development that will be allowed to take place on the allocation.</p> <p>Issues relating to providing infrastructure and services to the site will need to be considered as part of the delivery of an overall plan for the site.</p>

Inset Maps Dornoch MU 1 Dornoch North

7. I can give you a list of some (about 20) disposition and access arrangements in this area and the burdens which exist going back to 1902 if you require them.

234 Mr Adrian Green
Dornoch

It is important to remember that the area adjoins an industrial estate which is fully occupied and if work is to be provided, due consideration should be given to extending this area. However the area for industrial use needs a delineation from any new housing, trees or a playing field perhaps, to prevent future housing occupants being affected by industrial processors.

The extension to the Business Park I1 gives the opportunity for the expansion of business uses for economic development. It is agreed that there is a need for further opportunities for business/industrial development and the Dornoch North development can offer further potential to accommodate appropriate uses.

The industrial area also suffers flooding and urgent need is required to address this. Already additional housing at Embo Street has increased the flooding problems. Diverting or enlarging the capacity of the Dornoch Burn is imperative.

553 R V Galley
Dornoch

I object to any social housing in Dornoch based on what I have said below.

The provision of affordable housing within developments is a policy requirement for all but the smallest scale of housing development within the Highland Council area. The intention of the affordable housing policy is for planning system to assist in the provision of affordable housing to meet the needs of those who are unable to acquire housing in the private sector.

I would have little complaint against the development of these units in the area shown if the 25% of Social Housing were to be replaced by houses for first time buyers only. There would then be some ownership in the town by the residents.

Dornoch is not a town where you can start providing social housing. Dornoch is an area of outstanding beauty, has zero crime rate, no vandalism, lots of retired people and a major tourist attraction. The people of Dornoch do not want the presence of dysfunctional families with feral children ruining a capital town and spoiling the place as is the case in some close by towns!

The delivery of affordable housing can take different forms, this can be rented, or a variety of low cost home ownership options. Details can be found on the Highland Council website.

NB. Housing should not be at the whim of the developers, it should assist children living in Dornoch for when they are ready to settle. I object to the scheme as a whole.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch MU 1 Dornoch North		
580 Bowlts Chartered Surveyor For: Messrs MacKintosh and Murray, Dornoch	<p>I refer to David Cowie's letter of 29th November 2007 regarding the Local Development Plan for Sutherland and the land allocated in Messrs Mackintosh and Murray's ownership at Dornoch (MU1) and Messrs Mackintosh's land at Embo (MU1 and HI). I note the deadline for comments was 1st February 2008 and I apologise for not getting our comments to you prior to this. I hope that despite the delay in our response, the comments below can be considered in the review process. As you are aware, we are supportive of the allocations that have been made at Dornoch and Embo, but would make minor comments on each allocation below:-</p> <p>Dornoch - MU1 - Dornoch North</p> <p>1) Ownership - Messrs Mackintosh and Murray</p> <p>2) I note reference is made in the Developer Requirement section to "development of a masterplan through community consultation". As you are aware, a masterplan has been prepared for this site and the Council have acknowledged this as a significant material consideration. I would therefore suggest reference to development of a masterplan is removed from the text and replaced with "development of an urban design framework".</p> <p>3) The arrows upon allocation plan within the Deposit Draft indicate where the access points are proposed to be taken. I would be grateful if you could confirm that these are indicative only and that the actual position of the access points will be finalised through the Urban Design Framework.</p> <p>4) The area Highlighted as MU1 should also include the area we have shown in red on the enclosed plan.</p> <p>I hope you find the above comments to be of assistance and I would be happy to discuss these with you further.</p>	<p>AMEND TEXT IN REQUIREMENTS OF ALLOCATION TO READ AFTER SECOND SENTENCE, DELETING EXISTING THIRD AND FOURTH SENTENCE, "COMMUNITY CONSULTATION ON PROGRESSION OF PROPOSALS OF THE SITE THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK. PROPOSALS TO BE ACCOMPANIED BY INFORMATION ON ISSUES SUCH AS ACCESS PROVISION, ASSOCIATED ROAD AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS, LANDSCAPING AND PLANTING." INSERT TEXT BEFORE LAST SENTENCE "FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT WILL BE REQUIRED, BUILT DEVELOPMENT TO AVOID IDENTIFIED FLOOD RISK AREA.</p> <p>AMEND PLAN KEY TO READ "POTENTIAL ACCESS" RELOCATE POTENTIAL ACCESS POINT AT STATION SQUARE</p> <p>1. NOTED</p> <p>2. The Council acknowledge that a masterplan has been prepared in October 2005 and that this would form a material consideration to development as part of a planning application, whether lodged as planning application in its own right or as a supporting document to a more detailed submission. The Council note that further work is currently underway to further address flood risk issues and detail of the urban design framework, this work supplementing the contents of the masterplan. The proposed community consultation will likely consider issues raised in all these documents and this may result, on your part, a review of elements of the existing masterplan and design framework prior to the formal consideration of a planning application. A textual amendment is therefore appropriate.</p> <p>3. The potential access points are indicative only and are suggested points of access that may serve part of the</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch MU 1 Dornoch North		
		<p>development and represent options, the final positioning of the access points will be the subject of a detailed submission. The plan key will be amended to refer to potential access points.</p> <p>4. NOTED</p>
<p>311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall</p>	<p>Category 1 Flood Risk</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>538 Mrs Anne Campbell Dornoch</p>	<p>When speaking to our neighbour Mr MacGregor "Glenburn" he drew to our attention the local development plan for Dornoch.</p> <p>As far as I am aware we did not receive this plan but I believe there could be a road passing by or through our garden which we would strongly object to.</p> <p>I trust if this is to happen in the near future we would be consulted and this fully explained to use.</p>	<p>As above</p>
Inset Maps Dornoch B 1 Dornoch Business Park		
<p>199 Historylinks Museum Dornoch</p>	<p>Areas approaching the site and to the sides of the playing fields and residential housing should be landscaped and maintained.</p>	<p>The planning permission associated with the development of the site required planting and landscaping, the planting of the bunds has taken place.</p>
<p>122 J Mackenzie For: On behalf of Dornoch Medical Care, Dornoch</p>	<p>Would you consider planting some trees between the business park and the nursing home. This is a view supported by residents and staff.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>492 Director of ECS</p>	<p>Support allocation.</p>	<p>Support Noted.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch B 1 Dornoch Business Park		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 1 Flood Risk	RETAIN ALLOCATION AMEND BOUNDARY TO REMOVE FLOOD RISK AREA AMEND SDA TO EXCLUDE AREA FROM SETTLEMENT In respect of identified potential flood risk issues delete affected area from allocation.
Inset Maps Dornoch C 1 Academy Fields		
256 Jessie Bell Dornoch	Re. C1, Academy fields - I feel they are a top priority for the pupils health and well being and must be preserved - as far as a sports barn is concerned it would have to be built with great sensitivity as any major construction work on the actual playing fields would be unacceptable.	RETAIN ALLOCATION C1 ACADEMY FIELDS BUT CHANGE ALLOCATED LAND USE FROM COMMUNITY TO OPEN SPACE. DELETE FROM SITE ALLOCATION TABLE. The Community allocation applied to the school playing fields was intended to allow for the potential development of a sports hall to serve both schools and also have access for community use. Proposals have now progressed for the provision of this facility at the secondary school and the need for this allocation has been removed. In consideration of the potential for housing use the playing fields and has a long established role, providing playing and open space within the community. The current level of opportunity afforded through existing allocations will serve the community for the plan period and beyond. The funding of the sports barn is being incorporated in the Education Capital Programme.
77 Evelyn McLennan Dornoch	Against	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch C 1 Academy Fields		
237 F G Blackett Dornoch	The school playing field land was donated to the school for use as a playing/sports field for use of the school by a prominent local landowner/business man. I would object to any development outwith the use of area by any other than school control and supervision	As above
366 Mr Struan Robertson Dornoch	<p>1 The 'C1' area, in yellow, was gifted to the school for use of children's playing fields, but the late Mr Murray, Balloan. This gift did not encompass local development of any sort, or in any way, so that the local authority or Council of whatever name, in contemplating such would be in default of the terms of the Murray, Balloan gift.</p> <p>2. The object of the Murray, Balloan gift was to enhance, by the provision of adequate grounds area for the then present, and future development of the school, open-air sports ground for all sports purposes then, and in the future, for the general health of the children and through this to develop team-spirit in games, and in life generally - not to provide entertainment for adults on holiday - why is the Golspie school baths not repaired ever yet?</p> <p>3. The gift was made accrediting the local authority/council or body by whatever name with the sanctity its use as such, and not for annexation, in part or whole, for alternative development or purposes - a breach of trust.</p> <p>4. It is public knowledge that, throughout the country, school playing fields are being abused or sold-off for development - of housing mostly, but for industrial purposes also to the detriment of fresh air and exercise, and the general playing of local children, who are thus decanted onto the streets for a playing space. Such tends to breed quarrels and gang-formation - as accrues in all towns and runs the constant risk of injury on the streets. Such is an abomination to be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>5. The nature of proposed community development should at all times be explicitly indicated - for instance "Community" which is a blanket term covering all possible uses and entertainment of the public. Community and leisure uses can involve socially inappropriate and antagonistic purposes in juxtaposition, such as public football pitches, skate-board courses, public lavatories, band stands etc, and all sources</p>	As above

Inset Maps Dornoch C 1 Academy Fields

of uncontrolled noise, loitering and anti-social behaviour intolerable to existing well-kept housing. All contemplated usage should be declared, as should the nature and potential use for housing, or building of any sort under consideration.

Your REF Sulp Deposit Draft, paragraph 3 invites comments on other site - See site H3

The choice of this site for housing is both foolish and contrary to public not to build on flood-plane land. Already the potentiality of flooding is apparent to the naked eye, in the welling-up of ground water. This is bog-land, and has been marked as such for centuries on maps - which even show a burn running from the site.

492 Director of ECS

ECS wish to re-designate the 'hatched' area for potential future housing development to provide an asset that can be realised to part fund the proposed community/leisure facility at this location. Site C1 (Dornoch Academy) playing fields has an area to the south west 'hatched' for our aspirations to redesignate this area for housing to provide a potential capital receipt to part fund the leisure facility planned for that location. This will have to be subject to further discussion/consultation (particularly with neighbours).

As above

Inset Maps Dornoch LT Dornoch North Expansion

174 R Glen Grant
Dornoch

LT allocation is a hare brained idea, all these developments will change the character of Dornoch. There is no infrastructure to cope with it all.

The development of the Long Term allocation will be tied to the provision of the necessary infrastructure to serve the development and to address any wider implications to the rest of Dornoch. The allocation intends to fulfil the longer term housing and business requirements for the settlement, indicating that this is the area that is likely to be able to accommodate for the future growth of Dornoch. Development proposals for this and other allocations for Dornoch will continue to be the subject of the more detailed consideration through the planning application process.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Dornoch LT Dornoch North Expansion		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2 Flood Risk	In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."
<hr/>		
Inset Maps Dornoch MB Inset 1.1 Dornoch		
254 Dornoch Commnuity Council Dornoch	<p>I write on behalf of the newly formed Dornoch Community Centre - Action Group to request that under the Sutherland Local Plan (draft), you will consider the following points. The Social Club on School Hill is in very poor condition and will either need to be re-furbished or sold. This decision will be taken after the Community Association (current Leased) AGM on 7.02.08. If it is decide to sell the building then it will be necessary to build a new Community Centre for the town and it's environs. The most likely viable alternative is the Meadows Park, currently designated as Open Space, or the field to the east of it. The Community Council are currently negotiating the lease of this field from the Royal Dornoch Golf Club. Would you consider changing the designation of the Meadows Park and the field adjacent to it, to an area for Community Use rather than an Open Space.</p> <p>South End of Meadows Park. Rabbit fence is not the boundary for open space zone, it should extend further south to original boundary. Ownership of this area seems to be in some doubt. Sutherland Estates Common Good, Trustees of Games Committee, it is marked a Highland Council for maintenance purposes.</p> <p>Request to change designation of OS Meadows Park and field adjacent to Community Use.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION OS AT MEADOWS PARK BUT CHANGE ALLOCATED LAND USE FROM OS TO C (COMMUNITY). ADD TO SITE ALLOCATIONS TABLE "C1, 3.6 HA, MEADOWS PARK,-, SITE MAINTAINED FOR COMMUNITY USE AND ASSOCIATED USES. POTENTIAL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY CENTRE SUBJECT TO SUITABLE ACCESS, SITING AND DESIGN"</p> <p>The potential for the community to develop a new community centre is recognised by the Council and the potential to develop this adjacent the playing fields may be appropriate. The location for the siting of a new community centre should be provide suitable access for all the community and may be better sited to the north of the existing playing fields area. The inclusion of an area to the east of the playing fields would compensate for loss of open space as a consequence of part of the site being developed.</p> <p>It is noted that the extent of the playing fields does functionally extend beyond the boundary indicated, to correctly represent the areas current function the extent of the boundary will be amended to reflect this.</p>
492 Director of ECS	WE have no objections to the designations for sites MU3 and B1. I understand there is some discussion with Estates over land ownership on site OS (meadows park).	Noted.

Inset Maps Embo G General Comment

Inset Maps Embo G General Comment

198 Struan M. Robertson
Embo

Further to the meetings last year in Dornoch regarding future development in Embo I continue to express my dissatisfaction at the venue for these meetings and the inadequate substance of the redrafted plan.

I was very disappointed when you informed me that this new Sutherland Plan will be considered a new starting point and that all previous correspondence shall be consigned to history! Whilst this may be proper planning procedure the Planning & Development Service (PDS) have clearly failed to address the material considerations raised by over one hundred residents in Embo. Even allowing for the scaled down development, the precedent of allowing construction on the "wrong-side" of the by-pass is not a compromise but a total capitulation to the wishes of the developer. This slight of hand to try and relegate the unresolved objections to the dustbin is both arrogant and contemptible; I trust that the PDS will behave in a manner befitting a department whose advice and recommendations will shape the nature of a community for generations.

The specific objection to site H1 is that it is part of an area of public recreation. It is my understanding that this area belongs to the village. If you have seen legal title indicating otherwise, I shall be pleased to receive a copy.

Regarding my objections to site MU1, I would simply refer you to my letter of 5th December 2006 (a copy of which is attached for your convenience). The PDS has failed to address the material considerations raised in my letter and has therefore failed to move the debate forward. Clearly the effect of PDS procedures has conditioned its employees to the rules of the asylum resulting in common sense being relegated to a quaint archaic notion.

Finally, I am perplexed that the roads department have not been consulted during the past year regarding the feasibility of the Embo part of the Sutherland Plan. It does beg the question; why are so many man-hours being spent on a project which may prove prohibitively expensive if done properly?

Letter of 5th December 2006: Regrettably, neither your letter nor the meetings have alleviated my concerns about the proposals for Embo,

The development plan process seeks to carry out various stages of consultation to inform the plan making process. The consultation of the draft local plan represents the first formal stage of the plan process. Views are sought on the draft plan, which has already been developed in the light of earlier consultation, with the public, landowners, developers and other agencies.

It is important that views are sought on ongoing drafts to the plan, to ascertain the level of support for revisions to the plan that may resolve outstanding concerns. This process is repeated through drafts of the plan as proposals are refined and issues clarified. The consultation of the development plan forms part of a statutory process, giving opportunity for all interested parties to come forward with representations on the plan contents. It is therefore an obligation to allow all interested parties the ability to comment on the provisions of the plan. This stage of the development plan process does represent the first formal stage of the statutory process.

The development of the plan has taken all the issues raised into account when bringing the draft plan forward. The plan does look to address the main community concern regarding traffic safety issues, through the provision of either a re-routing of the bypass or appropriate methods to calm traffic movement.

The proposals included within the plan do not represent a scaling down of proposals as the "options" indicated within the Sutherland Futures document were to assess the suitability of each site and the community's views on each in order to identifying a site.

The intention of one landowner has ruled out a large portion of the option favoured by the community in previous consultation although H2 represents the residue of this "option." Compulsory purchase of land is not an option where other land that can realistically be

Inset Maps Embo G General Comment

but I am encouraged by the fact that you seem to appreciate my concerns. I must confess that I resent the approach of the planning department whereby people like myself are expected to do the work of unpaid advisors to professional planners in addition to attending meetings. You know the feelings of the people of Embo, but still your "masters" demand that opinions are submitted in writing; very time consuming and equally disappointing when only one of your "masters" (cllr Duncan Allen) bothered to turn up!

Turning to Embo as a small scale development of only 35 houses, you are aware of the fact that this demand can be met through sites 2 & 3. This is in the local plan at the moment and is widely accepted. My letter of 24th November detailed the support for this proposal and I do not feel the need to elaborate.

Regarding the "options" (4a, 4b and 4c) these are all totally unsuitable as they are on the other side of the Embo by-pass. Furthermore, there are material considerations which need to be considered which rule out these options:-

These options create an undesirable precedent. Any one of the options would satisfy the 35 house requirement and once that is exhausted the precedent has been set for more houses on the wrong side of the by-pass!

The history of these sites was reviewed 10 years ago and deemed inappropriate. Nothing has changed in the intervening period, except increased usage of the by-pass, therefore it follows that the decision against those sites should be the same?

There is no suitable access across the by-pass. There are safety issues and the additional traffic would be detrimental to pedestrians and cyclists. I have had experience of villages with traffic calming measures and they are not to be encouraged. They have only been introduced as a last resort where there is a threat to persons or property. This is not appropriate for Embo as an alternative by-pass is the solution but I intend to address that issue in more detail later.

A further safety consideration would be the proximity of houses on the wrong side of the by-pass to the piggery. If the wind is blowing in the

developed is available.

Previous decisions regarding allocation of land for development have been taken in the context of the wider availability of development land. The allocation of land on the other side of the bypass requires to address issues relating to traffic safety and access.

The advice of the Council's Roads Engineers has formed part of continuous liaison between Council Services and other service agencies in assessing the capacity of all infrastructure serving settlements and assists in forward programming of future investment.

The delivery of traffic calming can be delivered through various physical forms and the introduction of a roundabout at the junction of the by-pass road and Embo Post Office Road. This would lead to significant reduction of traffic speeds on either sides of the roundabout.

The issue of the need for developer contributions will be addressed through General Policy 15 Developer Contributions.

The provision of adequate infrastructure is an issue that is the subject of consideration when allocating land. Further detail on improvements that require to be undertaken or contributed to by developers will be the subject of more detailed discussion when proposals are formed and submitted for consideration. These issues relate to all factors that are required to facilitate a development to proceed, ie adequacy of roads, pedestrian access, water and drainage provision, flood risk, service provision etc. The preparation of the plan involves discussion with other agencies to allow consideration of the impact on services and allow for the programming of adequate provision.

Policy considerations will also address issues relating to the delivery of affordable housing as part of

Inset Maps Embo G General Comment

wrong direction there are days when it is impossible to open house windows, impractical to hang out laundry and unadvisable to leave the house!

The final material consideration against sites 4a, b & c but can all be overlooked when applied to sites 2 & 3 and trust that they go somehow towards helping you in the decision making process.

On a more positive note I would reiterate something I said at the meeting as I was uncertain whether you or your colleague, Malcolm Macleod, fully appreciated my suggestion or whether the Highland Council have considered such an approach. Is there serious consideration given to a plan which will survive beyond 5 years? I'm tired of having to go through this "battle" every 10 years and would rather the Council adopted a plan which will survive 25 years plus. It has been established that Dornoch/Embo is a desirable place to live and you have confirmed that developers are queuing up to get into the area, so why not provide something that can meet the demand and the need. Forget about a short term requirement of houses and consider the possibility of a much greater figure for a longer term requirement and the services such as an increase demands.

If the council took this approach improvements to the infrastructure and roads would have to be carried out:-

Other considerations might include schools, medical facilities, policing requirements, leisure facilities, shops, trades, etc., etc..

So the council sets aside £10 million for the above and actually builds the infrastructure. The developer comes along and says he wants to build so many units or develop a certain acreage. The council approves the plans and demands a contribution towards the £10 million infrastructure costs. This would initially equate to £10000 contribution per house unit - hardly exorbitant!

The major benefit to Dornoch is that it would remove the Embo traffic which in the height of the season could be as much as 300 cars per day from Dornoch town centre. The major benefit to Embo is that it gives a new by-pass and a better road to the nearest service centre.

developments and the appropriate delivery method ie rented, low cost home ownership or affordable house plots. Whilst the forest croft initiative is supported within the Plan and the successful development of this initiative will provide opportunities for housing and economic development for the wider area. There is still a need to meet the general needs housing requirements for the area and the settlement.

Inset Maps Embo G General Comment

As I mentioned at the Embo meeting, I was horrified when you mentioned that the roads department suggested that the Embo by-pass could cope with increased traffic; almost without exception that traffic has to travel on the Dornoch / Embo traffic single track road. If the Council approve further housing in Embo without consideration to improving that road it is only a matter of time before someone is killed and that would be nothing short of manslaughter!

You mentioned at the Embo meeting that there were many areas in the Sutherland which were only serviced by single track roads. I now challenge you to provide me with an example which is as densely populated and subjected to the massive seasonal increases? If you do not have figures available, I expect that you would agree that it would be very useful to know what the daily volume of traffic on the Embo road was in February compared with July?

In conclusion, I hope you will appreciate that there is a very strong community in Embo which is not frightened to share its quality of life with the outside world, but we just do not want to have our way of life turned upside down or destroyed in the process.

202 Mr & Mrs D E Fraser
Embo

The village is vastly overpopulated with cars and people from April-October due to the caravan site being overlarge. If new homes are built as I expect they will whether we object or not the traffic will be even worse, plus sewage, water & electric are not adequate enough. It's bad enough at the moment, especially sewage and water. The road from Dornoch to Embo is bumper to bumper even if its made 2 way traffic it will still be over busy due to the amount of traffic in months state. So if new homes go ahead the problems will get larger as will the building plans for the future.

The caravan site in Embo has been allowed to grow overlarge making the road from Dornoch to Embo ridiculously choked in the period from April-October by holiday traffic. Even if the road was improved to 2-way, it would still be bumper to bumper. God help anyone needing emergency treatment in those months e.g.. Fire brigade or Ambulance.

Now you are wanting to build more houses with more traffic eg. 1 or 2 cars per house. Or as your plan states "affordable houses" for who.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo G General Comment	<p>Sewage, electric and water to the village needs upgrading especially the sewage.</p> <p>16 new houses are built as I expect they will be, "whether we object or not". New homes need new schools, shops, hospitals etc will need to follow. Where will they be built?</p>	
227 Mr Tom Jamieson Inverness	<p>Turning now to the proposals for Embo, we would re-iterate the view expressed in our letter of 11 September that the most suitable of the sites suggested is that to the south of the village. If the centre of the village is considered to be the shop, Post Office and Community Centre, this is the closest, and it would maintain a compact shape to the village. We are aware that many others in the village are concerned about the traffic if this site were to be developed, but we feel that it should be possible to overcome these problems.</p> <p>Site 2 in itself does not seem to pose any problems, but without site 3 it is detached from the existing village and therefore does not appear to be a suitable option.</p> <p>The extent of housing required still appears to be debatable, especially in light of the forest croft initiative, which may meet much of the local need. The question of the extent to which any affordable homes would be earmarked for local people has not been satisfactorily answered, as far as we are aware, and the benefit to the community (as opposed to that of the landowner and developer) has not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Finally, we are aware that others have expressed concerns regarding the infrastructure, and we concur with those expressed by Mr Watt, in particular his view that 'it makes more sense to have the infrastructure in place before new development takes place.' As we have indicated above we would hope to see definite proposals in this respect in the Local Plan.</p> <p>As I previously stated, I believe that, if a site for additional housing is to be included in the Local Plan, the site to the south of the village makes most sense, both in terms of the overall layout of the village (seeing the shop and community centre as the centre), and in terms of traffic management.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo G General Comment		
374 Mr David John Williams Embo	<p>I have some general objections which need consideration. All developments are required by law to deliver 'affordable housing' there is no mention of 'social housing' or schemes to promote local occupation. This should be included in this plan. How are young people supposed to find a home if they are not supported locally?</p> <p>All these developments in Sutherland will not only require local infrastructure but also major road (A9) improvements. As I was informed that a large number of houses would be for Inverness commuters, I thought we were supposed to be conserving energy. None of these issues have been addressed</p>	As above
281 Mrs Liz Robertson Embo	<p>In principle, I am not against an appropriate percentage of additional housing in relation to the existing number of houses currently in the village (approx 150), but the inherent problems with the sub-standard infrastructure should be put right first.</p> <p>In addition, it should also be noted that Embo is a traditional settlement and both this and its character should be protected in relation to additional housing, as per HRC Statement of Observations -Alteration No 2 (11112195) in The Highland Structure Plan (2001).</p>	As above
157 Mr Alex Watt Embo	<p>Regarding our conversation on 17th December 2007 (at the East Sutherland and Edderton Ward Forum meeting) about inclusion of the Grannie's Heilan Hame caravan site in the Local Plan. I have now downloaded the Ordinance Survey map of the area (see attachment). This clearly shows the extent of the caravan site, including the roads, I have marked the approximate boundaries of the caravan site with a blue line. The orange line shows a possible route for a new bypass road for access to the caravan site should your proposed draft plan be accepted, this would separate caravan site traffic from village traffic, as is the case at present.</p> <p>The purple arrow indicates the site of the old quarry, which is shown on the Ordinance Survey map but not on your draft plan. This old quarry was used over a period of years for the dumping of carcasses of dead pigs from the nearby pig farm.</p> <p>At present there are permanent sites (many concreted) for</p>	<p>ADD NEW BUSINESS ALLOCATION Amend inset map Embo to indicate extent of Grannies Heilan Hame Insert new allocation "B1, 23ha, Holiday Park, Existing holiday caravan park with potential for further development relating to existing planning consent and masterplan. Development proposals to respect the setting of the chambered cairn, Scheduled Ancient Monument"</p> <p>Grannies Heilan Hame is the subject of ongoing development that relates to a existing planning permission. In this respect it is accepted that the impact of this is pertinent to the settlement of Embo, given the scale of the caravan park. The boundary of the approved site will be indicated on the inset map with appropriate references.</p>

Inset Maps Embo G General Comment

approximately 280 static caravans and planning consent for 80+ static caravans/chalets for the stage 1 expansion of the caravan site. This means in excess of 360 caravans most of which can accommodate 6 persons, therefore a possible increase of population for the Embo area, during the tourist season, of somewhere in the region of 2000+ people, and vehicles used by them. This is without counting the touring caravans, caravanettes and campers.

These are the reasons why I am of the opinion that any Local Development Plan must show the extent of the caravan site and its impact on the infrastructure of the Embo area. This has not been done in the present Draft Development Plan.

If the area of the caravan site is included then the burial cairn could be said to be in the centre, otherwise the first paragraph should read "-a fine example of a burial cairn can be seen near the Southern boundary of the village".

229 Jean Jamieson
Balloch

I would also like to point out that Haven Holidays are expanding at Grannie's Hielan Hame at an alarming rate. Do they have planning permission for some of those chalets & caravans which are almost as big as houses? Do they just have free reign to expand & cram in at will? The resulting traffic on the road renders the single track between Dornoch & Embo unable to cope, neither can the water supply cope during the summer months.

As above

281 Mrs Liz Robertson
Embo

The village should not be shown in isolation.

As above

Grannie's Heilan' Hame caravan site should be marked on the Local Plan to show the extent of this complex in relation to the village, especially as there are more holiday units (over 400) than houses.

Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects

Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects

382 Mrs Margaret MacKay
Embo

1) COMMUNITY CENTRE (INSET 1.2 : EMBO - Page 8)
There is at present no community centre, although there is fund raising ongoing for this there are no guarantees that this will ever come to fruition, due to the demands on monies from other organisations and groups within the country.

2) GHH CARAVAN SITE (INSET 1.2 : EMBO - Page 8)
This should be mapped on the Local Plan to show the extent of this development in relation to the village and how it affects the area (ref attached plan). The huge impact of the volume of vehicles and visitors (approximately 2000 tourists every day during the season - 7 times the population of the village and twice the size of Dornoch!) should also be mentioned.

3) BY PASS (INSET 1.2 EMBO - Page 8)
The reasons as stated in the attached letter dated December 2006 (Paragraph 5 By-Pass Road) still refers, and traffic calming should not be considered as an option.

6) EMBO TO DORNOCH ROAD (INSET 1.2 : EMBO - Page 8)
It is a matter of urgency now, and also in view of any future development (as highlighted in this Local Plan), that this road needs to be upgraded from single track to two-way carriageway.

1. It is noted that community fund raising is constrained by ongoing demands.

2. Grannies Heilan Hame is the subject of ongoing development that relates to a existing planning permission. In this respect it is accepted that the impact of this is pertinent to the settlement of Embo, given the scale of the caravan park. The boundary of the approved site will be indicated on the inset map with appropriate references.

3. The advice of the Council's Roads Engineers has formed part of continuous liaison between Council Services and other service agencies in assessing the capacity of all infrastructure serving settlements and assists in forward programming of future investment.

The delivery of traffic calming can be delivered through various physical forms and the introduction of a roundabout at the junction of the by-pass road and Embo Post Office Road. This would lead to significant reduction of traffic speeds on either sides of the roundabout.

6.Embo to Dornoch Road

The Embo - Dornoch Road is the subject of provision of further passing places as a response of the intensification of use at Grannies Heilan Hame. The need for further improvement is acknowledged and contributions to further work will be sought from emerging development proposals to address traffic safety concerns.

436 Mr Gerald Fitzpatrick
Embo

as above

As above

431 C Cogan
Embo

as above

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
487 Mr James H MacKay Embo	as above	As above
435 S Anderson Embo	as above	As above
417 Mrs Lillian Moffat Embo	as above	As above
430 Mr R Smedley Embo	as above	As above
432 Penelope Patton Embo	as above	As above
419 Mr James Calder Embo	as above	As above
420 Mr John Bronthron Embo	as above	As above
402 Mr David MacKay Embo	as above	As above
424 Mr Edward Moffat Embo	as above	As above
434 Mr John Bonthron Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
489 A Winning Dornovh	as above	As above
433 Mr Donald Ross Embo	as above	As above
429 Margaret Smedley Embo	as above	As above
425 Wilma Ross Embo	as above	As above
422 Mr D MacKay Embo	as above	As above
423 Mrs S MacKay Embo	as above	As above
488 Coral MacKay Embo	as above	As above
468 Lyndsey McMicor Embo	as above	As above
451 Barbara Shillinglaw Embo	as above	As above
473 Mr Ewan MacDonald Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
452 Mr Graham Davidson Embo	as above	As above
472 Mr Donald Ross Sutherland Embo	as above	As above
453 Kathryn Davidson Embo	as above	As above
471 Mr & Mrs W Hadden Embo	as above	As above
454 Laura Bissett Embo	as above	As above
470 A & J MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
455 Julia MacKay Embo	as above	As above
438 Mr Trevor MacKay Embo	as above	As above
456 Mr James MacKay Inverness	as above	As above
475 Jenny MacKay Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
457 Hugmina McGrath Embo	as above	As above
467 Mr Murdo MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
458 Mr David A Munro Embo	as above	As above
466 Mrs Shirley MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
459 Munro Cross Embo	as above	As above
465 Mr Alexander MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
460 Mrs S Cross Embo	as above	As above
464 Elaine Lindsey Embo	as above	As above
461 Nancy Collett Embo	as above	As above
463 Helen Hercher Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
469 Howard & Michelle MacKay Embo	as above	As above
480 J R Bower Embo	as above	As above
437 Frances & John Munro Embo	as above	As above
485 Mr Paul A MacKay Embo	as above	As above
416 Mrs Shirley May Gamble Embo	as above	As above
484 Karen Holmes Embo	as above	As above
418 Mrs S Calder Embo	as above	As above
439 Anna C Ross Embo	as above	As above
483 Mr J R Cumming Embo	as above	As above
440 Diana Gunn Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
482 Sybil Cumming Embo	as above	As above
441 Sandy Gunn Embo	as above	As above
474 Susan Foreman Embo	as above	As above
442 C Winning Dornoch	as above	As above
450 Christina Gill Embo	as above	As above
444 Janice Watt Embo	as above	As above
479 W Fraser Embo	as above	As above
446 D Ross Shand Embo	as above	As above
478 Mr & Mrs A D Hutton Embo	as above	As above
447 Marion Shand Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
477 Joyce & Stan Collett Embo	as above	As above
449 Mrs Jeanette Cumming Embo	as above	As above
476 W Hamilton & M MacKay Embo	as above	As above
448 Mr Johnny Cumming Embo	as above	As above
486 Christine MacKay Embo	as above	As above
481 E A Bower Embo	as above	As above
390 A MacKay Embo	as above	As above
407 Mrs Caroline Fitzpatrick Embo	as above	As above
386 Mr Donald Swanson Embo	as above	As above
406 Helen Lawson Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
397 Mr George Fraser Embo	as above	As above
387 Mr Robert Wilson Embo	as above	As above
393 Mrs Elizabeth Wilson Embo	as above	As above
404 Christine Burton Embo	as above	As above
388 Colin & Elaine MacKay Embo	as above	As above
403 Mr Thomas James Murray Embo	as above	As above
389 Alexanderina MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
408 Mr Barry Walters Embo	as above	As above
400 Cheryl McAffer Embo	as above	As above
405 Alexander G Lawson Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
462 S Longstaff Embo	as above	As above
399 Mr William A More Embo	as above	As above
398 Jean Fraser Embo	as above	As above
415 Mr Albert Stuart Gamble Embo	as above	As above
391 George & Iris Munro Embo	as above	As above
412 Mr John S Campbell Embo	as above	As above
396 Morag Jamieson Embo	as above	As above
392 Alex & Heather Lyon Embo	as above	As above
395 Fraser Bronthorne Embo	as above	As above
445 Mr Gary Bissett Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
394 Michelle Rafferty Embo	as above	As above
401 Mr Ian Ross Carlton Embo	as above	As above
414 Fiona McCornindal Embo	as above	As above
427 Jessie Ross Embo	as above	As above
374 Mr David John Williams Embo	as above	As above
426 Miss I MacKay Embo	as above	As above
413 Maureen A Campbell Embo	as above	As above
385 D E Fraser Embo	as above	As above
428 S Smith Embo	as above	As above
375 Susan Williams Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects		
421 Mrs Donella Smith Embo	as above	As above
410 Mrs Iris Fraser Embo	as above	As above
411 Catriona Grigg Embo	as above	As above
381 Mr Thomas Foreman Embo	as above	As above
383 Mrs Patricia Waymouth Embo	as above	As above
384 Mr Gordon Waymouth Embo	as above	As above
443 Mr David Grant Embo	as above	As above
409 Mrs J K Walters Embo	as above	As above
8 Mrs Jean Fraser Embo	Support	Support Noted.
9 Mr George Mackay Embo	Support	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
<p>Inset Maps Embo MB Prospects</p> <p>227 Mr Tom Jamieson Inverness</p>	<p>H1/MU1The 'Prospects' summary refers to 'limited supply of housing with high house prices' and 'a steady demand for housing'. A look at the housing market over the past year or so suggests that house prices are not high in comparison with the area in general, and several houses have remained on the market for considerable periods of time.</p>	<p>The existence of an identified waiting list for housing for the area indicates that the availability of houses on the open market within the settlement still lie outwith the reach of those with an identified housing need. The lack of an effective housing land supply has led to the lack of provision of a choice of available housing types for the settlement..</p>
<p>Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House</p> <p>227 Mr Tom Jamieson Inverness</p>	<p>H1: As stated in my letter of 12 December 2006 (copy below), I am of the opinion that site H1 should be designated as Public Open Space, not as Housing. It is very close to the SSSI, the SPA and the RAMSAR sites, and contributes to the biodiversity and public amenity of the area. Access to the site could also prove difficult.</p> <p>The site should, we feel, be rejected on the grounds outlined in your September 2006 document 'the highland council planning and development service' which talks about the need to 'protect the special places that make our area a great place to be'. Although this area is not within the boundaries of the SSSI, the SPA and the RAMSAR site, it is very close to these, and contributes to the biodiversity which forms the basis of these designations. It is a small area of land, and its value as part of a very special natural area surely outweighs its value as a small housing site.</p> <p>Turning to housing, there are statements about 'affordable' housing, but these are vague ('may be assisted', 'seeking to secure', etc) and the overall aim stated on page 6 seems rather weak. Statements have been made at public meetings about a minimum of 25% of affordable houses in all housing developments other than very small ones. The 'headline' aim of 1300 houses by 2016 including 150 affordable homes therefore suggests either that less than half of these will be in developments to which the 25% rule can be applied (i.e., at least 700 houses in small developments), or that the Dornoch Square example will be more widespread with developers 'buying out' the affordable provision for undisclosed sums which are then used by the Council for undisclosed purposes.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION The allocation at H1 North of Station offers potential for small scale development to take place within the settlement. The retention of the site offers choice in respect of development options for the settlement. The site offers capacity for a limited number of lower density units or a small higher density development reflecting the original "Fishertown". The access constraint restricts the overall development potential for the site.</p> <p>The allocation lies on land immediately adjacent existing development and will offer the opportunity to develop formal recreational links with the wider countryside without impacting on nearby natural heritage interests.</p> <p>Environmental Report</p> <p>4) Embo - North of Station House</p> <p>Population and Human Health</p> <p>1. The area referred to forms part of the wider countryside, and is not defined as formal open space.</p> <p>4. Amend response to "Y" It is accepted that there may be a need for further off-site road improvements that will improve road safety.</p> <p>Material Asset and Landscape</p> <p>12 The response to this point remains "No" as the area of land affected does not relate to a defined remote</p>

Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House

landscape of value.

18. The response to this point remains "No" as the area of land affected does not relate to a natural heritage designation or nor is it identified as an area for nature conservation. The potential does exist to improve habitat for native biodiversity.

381 Mr Thomas Foreman
Embo

I object to the 10 properties for North of Station House because at this time I feel there would be enough new houses, 60+ in the field, plus all the new build going on in Dornoch at the moment.

As above

258 Mr Donald R Haddon
Embo

With reference to the above proposal for 10 housing units located at the rear of my property (Station House), I wish to lodge my objection to the current proposal.

As above

I was approached by the prospective developer in December 2007 & was informed that due to the limited access to the site, the developer was enquiring about the possibility of obtaining a strip of land along the west side of my property. Initially, I was led to believe that a strip of "3 or 4 feet" would be required. I provisionally agreed to this, on the understanding that the developer would cover the cost of relocating the LPG tank currently located in the area.

I suggested that access to the development would be easier if the developer obtained the required land from the adjacent field, but was told that this was not an option as the developer had previously had difficulties dealing with the landowner. (Cambusmore Estates)

On 21st January 2008, the developer called in by my house & requested my assistance in measuring the strip of land required. On measuring out the area it is now apparent that the strip of land needed is almost 7 metres wide at the front of my property. If this was allowed to go ahead, the access road to the development would be approximately 1.5 metres from the south west corner of my house.

Giving up this amount of my property is not an option. I have been considering adding an extension to my house & will be severely limited if I lose 7 metres from the available ground.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
382 Mrs Margaret MacKay Embo	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT</p> <p>4) SITE REFERENCE: Embo - North of Station House - H1 (Page 129)</p> <p>Population and Human Health: 1 - Should be 'Y' as it is open space now and this would not exist if developed (also see Number 11).</p> <p>4 - Should be 'Y' as until plans are drawn up this is unknown.</p> <p>Material Asset and Landscape: 12 - Should be V as any development will have an affect.</p> <p>Biodiversity, flora and fauna: 18 - Should be 'Y' as per comments under 'Opportunities to Mitigate, Improve or N/A'.</p>	As above
460 Mrs S Cross Embo	as above	As above
145 Mr & Mrs Brian & Isabell Jones Embo	This area encroaches on land which for years has been considered as land for common use. ie Dog walking especially this is the only access, also what may happen if rail gets go ahead in the future. Improvement is required to Dornoch Road and water supply pressure before a population increase.	As above
459 Munro Cross Embo	as above	As above
392 Alex & Heather Lyon Embo	as above	As above
447 Marion Shand Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
448 Mr Johnny Cumming Embo	as above	As above
461 Nancy Collett Embo	as above	As above
446 D Ross Shand Embo		As above
391 George & Iris Munro Embo	as above	As above
452 Mr Graham Davidson Embo	as above	As above
455 Julia MacKay Embo	as above	As above
385 D E Fraser Embo	as above	As above
456 Mr James MacKay Inverness	as above	As above
454 Laura Bissett Embo	as above	As above
453 Kathryn Davidson Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
458 Mr David A Munro Embo	as above	As above
457 Hugmina McGrath Embo	as above	As above
449 Mrs Jeanette Cumming Embo	as above	As above
388 Colin & Elaine MacKay Embo	as above	As above
451 Barbara Shillinglaw Embo	as above	As above
389 Alexanderina MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
386 Mr Donald Swanson Embo	as above	As above
450 Christina Gill Embo	as above	As above
390 A MacKay Embo	as above	As above
387 Mr Robert Wilson Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
410 Mrs Iris Fraser Embo	as above	As above
397 Mr George Fraser Embo	as above	As above
406 Helen Lawson Embo	as above	As above
407 Mrs Caroline Fitzpatrick Embo	as above	As above
431 C Cogan Embo	as above	As above
430 Mr R Smedley Embo	as above	As above
408 Mr Barry Walters Embo	as above	As above
409 Mrs J K Walters Embo	as above	As above
429 Margaret Smedley Embo	as above	As above
425 Wilma Ross Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
229 Jean Jamieson Balloch	I would like to object to any development along Back Park. This land, as far as I understand, was for the use of the village and, as such, it is constantly in use by the people of Embo. Already, this has been encroached upon by the building of the football changing rooms and this insidious development on land where there is such a diversity of flora and fauna is to be abhorred.	As above
423 Mrs S MacKay Embo	as above	As above
404 Christine Burton Embo	as above	As above
422 Mr D MacKay Embo	as above	As above
420 Mr John Bronthorne Embo	as above	As above
411 Catriona Grigg Embo	as above	As above
419 Mr James Calder Embo	as above	As above
412 Mr John S Campbell Embo	as above	As above
413 Maureen A Campbell Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
417 Mrs Lillian Moffat Embo	as above	As above
416 Mrs Shirley May Gamble Embo	as above	As above
414 Fiona McCornindal Embo	as above	As above
415 Mr Albert Stuart Gamble Embo	as above	As above
424 Mr Edward Moffat Embo	as above	As above
399 Mr William A More Embo	as above	As above
444 Janice Watt Embo	as above	As above
394 Michelle Rafferty Embo	as above	As above
442 C Winning Dornoch	as above	As above
395 Fraser Bronthorne Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
441 Sandy Gunn Embo	as above	As above
396 Morag Jamieson Embo	as above	As above
440 Diana Gunn Embo	as above	As above
418 Mrs S Calder Embo	as above	As above
439 Anna C Ross Embo	as above	As above
405 Alexander G Lawson Embo	as above	As above
438 Mr Trevor MacKay Embo	as above	As above
393 Mrs Elizabeth Wilson Embo	as above	As above
437 Frances & John Munro Embo	as above	As above
436 Mr Gerald Fitzpatrick Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
400 Cheryl McAffer Embo	as above	As above
435 S Anderson Embo	as above	As above
401 Mr Ian Ross Carlton Embo	as above	As above
434 Mr John Bonthron Embo	as above	As above
402 Mr David MacKay Embo	as above	As above
433 Mr Donald Ross Embo	as above	As above
403 Mr Thomas James Murray Embo	as above	As above
432 Penelope Patton Embo	as above	As above
398 Jean Fraser Embo	as above	As above
383 Mrs Patricia Waymouth Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
488 Coral MacKay Embo	as above	As above
426 Miss I MacKay Embo	as above	As above
470 A & J MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
484 Karen Holmes Embo	as above	As above
487 Mr James H MacKay Embo		As above
471 Mr & Mrs W Hadden Embo	as above	As above
477 Joyce & Stan Collett Embo	as above	As above
475 Jenny MacKay Embo	as above	As above
482 Sybil Cumming Embo	as above	As above
478 Mr & Mrs A D Hutton Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
486 Christine MacKay Embo	as above	As above
473 Mr Ewan MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
384 Mr Gordon Waymouth Embo	as above	As above
445 Mr Gary Bissett Embo	as above	As above
474 Susan Foreman Embo	as above	As above
427 Jessie Ross Embo	as above	As above
443 Mr David Grant Embo	as above	As above
485 Mr Paul A MacKay Embo	as above	As above
476 W Hamilton & M MacKay Embo	as above	As above
374 Mr David John Williams Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
481 E A Bower Embo	as above	As above
421 Mrs Donella Smith Embo	as above	As above
463 Helen Hercher Embo	as above	As above
428 S Smith Embo	as above	As above
464 Elaine Lindsey Embo	as above	As above
480 J R Bower Embo	as above	As above
375 Susan Williams Embo	as above	As above
469 Howard & Michelle MacKay Embo	as above	As above
243 HSCHT Dornoch	As H1 appears insular and has a fairly limited capacity we would suggest continuing H1 eastwards to meet the football field, which would allow continuation of the well established, tightly grouped housing layout in Embo.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Statistics on housing demand are inconclusive but some demand (inc for LCHO) exists. Current allocation of H1 appears to be slightly incongruous in such a strictly laid out townscape. Consideration should be given to extending this allocation of H1 to the east to provide appropriate balance of the development envelope.	As above
466 Mrs Shirley MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
462 S Longstaff Embo	as above	As above
479 W Fraser Embo	as above	As above
467 Mr Murdo MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
483 Mr J R Cumming Embo	as above	As above
489 A Winning Dornovh	as above	As above
468 Lyndsey McMicor Embo	as above	As above
472 Mr Donald Ross Sutherland Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo H 1 North of Station House		
465 Mr Alexander MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
145 Mr & Mrs Brian & Isabell Jones Embo	This area is on private land which should not affect village residents, except perhaps for a few houses, though not much can be seen in that direction. Also services such as Dornoch Road needs much improving and poor pressure on water supply before you start increasing population.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION MU1 WEST EMBO. DELETE FIRST SENTENCE AND REPLACE WITH "SITE OFFERS POTENTIAL FOR THE GROWTH OF SETTLEMENT. DEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO BE PHASED AND PROPOSALS SHOULD SEEK TO REFLECT THE EXISTING FORM OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE OLD PART OF THE VILLAGE. MIX OF USES RELATE PRIMARILY TO HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WITH POTENTIAL FOR PROVISION OF SMALL SCALE BUSINESS/INDUSTRIAL UNITS OR WORKPLACE HOMESHOMES (HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED BUSINESS UNIT)." AMEND FINAL SENTENCE TO READ "AN ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL CONTAMINATION ISSUES WILL BE REQUIRED" ADD FURTHER POTENTIAL ACCESS POINT AT JUNCTION TO STATION ROAD.</p> <p>The development of allocation MU1 offers potential for the longer term expansion of Embo. Currently there is not an effective supply of housing land that can deliver for the longer term and also address current constraints whilst meeting local housing need. Improvements to local infrastructure are needed to facilitate progress of development. This can be delivered through the phased development of the site for the expansion of the village. Proposals should seek to reflect the existing form of development in the old part of the village.</p> <p>Environmental Report</p> <p>5) Embo - West Embo - MU1</p> <p>4. & 5. Amend response to "Y" The provision of a by-pass would not be an off-site provision but would have an off-</p>

Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo

site benefit. The options for dealing with traffic issues remain open for consideration, either through appropriate traffic calming or through an alternative route for the bypass. "An access to the site may incorporate the development a roundabout on the existing bypass. This would lead to significant reduction of traffic speeds on either sides of the roundabout."

6. The response to this point remains "No" as the allocation does not relate to any adjacent "bad neighbour" uses.

7. Amend response to "Y". The response should reflect the acknowledged issue identified in the map booklet text.

9. Amend response to "Y". The response should reflect the acknowledged previous use on part of the site.

10. Amend response to "N". The allocation does not lie within the existing adopted plan settlement boundary, and has been identified to provide an effective housing land supply.

382 Mrs Margaret MacKay
Embo

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

As above

5) SITE REFERENCE: Embo - West Embo - MU1 (Page 131)

Population and Human Health:

4 - Comments should be to divert by pass round new development under Opportunities to Mitigate, Improve or N/A, for reasons stated in letter dated December 2006.

5 - Same comments as 4 above.

6 - Should be 'Y', because of local farmer using the pig manure on the fields.

7 - Should be 'Y' as this area was previously used for rubbish and quarry infill as well as the mass pig burial site. (INSET 1.2 : EMBO Site

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo

Allocations - MU 1 (H/1) refers.)

Material Asset and Landscape:
 9 - Should be 'Y1 for same reasons as 7 above.

10 - Should be 'N', as this area is outwith current settlement boundary.

Biodiversity, flora and fauna:
 18 - Should be 'Y1 as per comments under 'Opportunities to Mitigate, Improve or N/A1.

427 Jessie Ross
Embo

as above

As above

425 Wilma Ross
Embo

as above

As above

424 Mr Edward Moffat
Embo

as above

As above

423 Mrs S MacKay
Embo

as above

As above

421 Mrs Donella Smith
Embo

as above

As above

422 Mr D MacKay
Embo

as above

As above

415 Mr Albert Stuart Gamble
Embo

as above

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
426 Miss I MacKay Embo	as above	As above
254 Dornoch Commnuity Council Dornoch	West Embo Proposed Development. There are concerns about the safety of pedestrians crossing the road from the main village to the area MU1, particularly as this is development for housing.	As above
383 Mrs Patricia Waymouth Embo	objecting	As above
420 Mr John Bronthron Embo	as above	As above
281 Mrs Liz Robertson Embo	<p>The proposed housing at MU1 is on the other side of the by-pass road and, therefore, outwith the existing village boundary/settlement area.</p> <p>The by-pass road should be re-routed to encompass proposed site MUI, otherwise it is no longer a by-pass and not fit for purpose. (I assume when the Road Department states that it is fit for purpose, they mean it was constructed to handle the volume of traffic using it?)</p> <p>This by-pass road has been totally successful since it was built some 30 years ago to keep the holiday traffic out of the village, thus making Embo a safer place to live. Traffic calming will only result in the village being used as a 'rat-run' once again.</p> <p>As a result of the intrinsic dangers associated with this road, it was built without lighting or paving to discourage its use by pedestrians, also for safety reasons the houses bordering this road were not permitted direct access onto it. Therefore, to build across this road without re-routing the by-pass would be irrational, irresponsible and culpable.</p> <p>Therefore, on the above grounds, I strongly object to proposed traffic calming as an alternative to re-routing the by-pass.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
416 Mrs Shirley May Gamble Embo	as above	As above
419 Mr James Calder Embo	as above	As above
417 Mrs Lillian Moffat Embo	as above	As above
418 Mrs S Calder Embo	as above	As above
229 Jean Jamieson Balloch	Embo is a beautiful village with traditional layout and care has to be taken not to desecrate it with large scale development, as is happening in Dornoch & elsewhere. The siting of houses at MU1 will serve to elongate the village and its position then to the south of the village would make much more sense. Tourism is very important to the village and this could well be adversely affected if care is not taken to curb development and hold on to what is irreplaceable.	As above
392 Alex & Heather Lyon Embo	as above	As above
409 Mrs J K Walters Embo	as above	As above
388 Colin & Elaine MacKay Embo	as above	As above
402 Mr David MacKay Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
389 Alexanderina MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
390 A MacKay Embo	as above	As above
401 Mr Ian Ross Carlton Embo	as above	As above
387 Mr Robert Wilson Embo	as above	As above
400 Cheryl McAffer Embo	as above	As above
386 Mr Donald Swanson Embo	as above	As above
399 Mr William A More Embo	as above	As above
393 Mrs Elizabeth Wilson Embo	as above	As above
394 Michelle Rafferty Embo	as above	As above
398 Jean Fraser Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
395 Fraser Bronthorne Embo	as above	As above
396 Morag Jamieson Embo	as above	As above
411 Catriona Grigg Embo	as above	As above
407 Mrs Caroline Fitzpatrick Embo	as above	As above
414 Fiona McCornindal Embo	as above	As above
413 Maureen A Campbell Embo	as above	As above
374 Mr David John Williams Embo	as above	As above
412 Mr John S Campbell Embo	as above	As above
410 Mrs Iris Fraser Embo	as above	As above
408 Mr Barry Walters Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
403 Mr Thomas James Murray Embo	as above	As above
445 Mr Gary Bissett Embo	as above	As above
428 S Smith Embo	as above	As above
443 Mr David Grant Embo	as above	As above
406 Helen Lawson Embo	as above	As above
384 Mr Gordon Waymouth Embo	as above	As above
405 Alexander G Lawson Embo	as above	As above
385 D E Fraser Embo	as above	As above
404 Christine Burton Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo

580 Bowlts Chartered Surveyor For: Messrs MacKintosh and Murray, Dornoch	Embo - H1 -North of Station House Ownership - Messrs Mackintosh. Embo - MU1 -West Embo	As above
--	--	----------

I consider that this allocation should be reworded to indicate that this is primarily a housing allocation. The industrial element requires to be clarified to show the intention is to create "live work units" for craft or light industrial uses as stated under the "Prospects" heading of the Embo chapter. I would suggest the following wording is added to the developer requirements for MU1 - West Embo:-

"Housing allocation with opportunities for small scale business/industrial units or workplace homes (house with associated business unit)".

466 Mrs Shirley MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
-----------------------------------	----------	----------

480 J R Bower Embo	as above	As above
-----------------------	----------	----------

468 Lyndsey McMicor Embo	as above	As above
-----------------------------	----------	----------

455 Julia MacKay Embo	as above	As above
--------------------------	----------	----------

444 Janice Watt Embo	as above	As above
-------------------------	----------	----------

375 Susan Williams Embo	as above	As above
----------------------------	----------	----------

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
454 Laura Bissett Embo	as above	As above
456 Mr James MacKay Inverness	as above	As above
469 Howard & Michelle MacKay Embo	as above	As above
457 Hugmina McGrath Embo	as above	As above
478 Mr & Mrs A D Hutton Embo	as above	As above
442 C Winning Dornoch	as above	As above
479 W Fraser Embo	as above	As above
441 Sandy Gunn Embo	as above	As above
453 Kathryn Davidson Embo	as above	As above
467 Mr Murdo MacDonald Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
449 Mrs Jeanette Cumming Embo	as above	As above
470 A & J MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
452 Mr Graham Davidson Embo	as above	As above
471 Mr & Mrs W Hadden Embo	as above	As above
451 Barbara Shillinglaw Embo	as above	As above
472 Mr Donald Ross Sutherland Embo	as above	As above
477 Joyce & Stan Collett Embo	as above	As above
473 Mr Ewan MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
440 Diana Gunn Embo	as above	As above
474 Susan Foreman Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
448 Mr Johnny Cumming Embo	as above	As above
475 Jenny MacKay Embo	as above	As above
447 Marion Shand Embo	as above	As above
476 W Hamilton & M MacKay Embo	as above	As above
446 D Ross Shand Embo		As above
450 Christina Gill Embo	as above	As above
430 Mr R Smedley Embo	as above	As above
465 Mr Alexander MacDonald Embo	as above	As above
488 Coral MacKay Embo	as above	As above
432 Penelope Patton Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
489 A Winning Dornovh	as above	As above
431 C Cogan Embo	as above	As above
487 Mr James H MacKay Embo		As above
391 George & Iris Munro Embo	as above	As above
434 Mr John Bonthron Embo	as above	As above
463 Helen Hercher Embo	as above	As above
460 Mrs S Cross Embo	as above	As above
397 Mr George Fraser Embo	as above	As above
462 S Longstaff Embo	as above	As above
461 Nancy Collett Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
429 Margaret Smedley Embo	as above	As above
381 Mr Thomas Foreman Embo	as above	As above
459 Munro Cross Embo	as above	As above
481 E A Bower Embo	as above	As above
439 Anna C Ross Embo	as above	As above
482 Sybil Cumming Embo	as above	As above
458 Mr David A Munro Embo	as above	As above
438 Mr Trevor MacKay Embo	as above	As above
433 Mr Donald Ross Embo	as above	As above
464 Elaine Lindsey Embo	as above	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Embo MU 1 West Embo		
437 Frances & John Munro Embo	as above	As above
484 Karen Holmes Embo	as above	As above
436 Mr Gerald Fitzpatrick Embo	as above	As above
485 Mr Paul A MacKay Embo	as above	As above
435 S Anderson Embo	as above	As above
486 Christine MacKay Embo	as above	As above
483 Mr J R Cumming Embo	as above	As above
Inset Maps Evelix MB Inset 1.3 Evelix		
349 Mr Jack Anderson Dornoch	This letter is to bring to your attention my support for the area I suggested to be included at Evelix, near Canmore, in my letter to you dated 12 December 2006, during the consultation process. I would develop this area to include a dwelling house with garden ground.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION AND ADD TEXT TO EXISTING TO ADDRESS ROADS AND FLOODING CONCERNS "Necessary road improvements to serve development may be required and will be provided directly by the developer or through developer contributions. Localised flooding issues may require the preparation of a Flood Risk Assessment. A high quality of design will be required."</p> <p>General Policy 9 seeks to address situations where there is potential from flooding although not identified through</p>

Inset Maps Evelix MB Inset 1.3 Evelix

the SEPA flood risk mapping. Where a history of flood risk has been identified a Flood Risk Assessment may be required. The assessment is to predict and assess the probability of flooding for a particular site or area and to recommend mitigation measures.

In relation to the capacity of the road to absorb further development and that there will be a requirement for related road improvements and traffic control, these would form the basis for appropriate planning conditions or requirement for contributions.

The rural nature of the allocation also determines that a high level of design will be required for development as referred in Policy 18 Design Quality and Place-Making. Individual applications will be assessed on their relative merits in meeting policy considerations.

139 Mr Donald J H Balfour
Tain

It has been noted that the Local Plan for Evelix makes allowance for increased housing along the road , known locally as the road, which passes the Manse We have no difficulty with that. However, concern was expressed that the width and quality of the road itself will prove inadequate in its present state for the volume of traffic already using it let alone and increased use. There is a lack of passing places and a narrow blind corner.

As above

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

1.2 Evelix
This SDA has been created following the earlier 'Futures' consultation and falls close to, but just outside the Dornoch Firth NSA (mapping error here - see Annex 3). SNH recommends that further text setting out the requirement for the highest standards of siting and design be included.

As above

352 Mrs Joyce Everitt
Dornoch

I wish to make representation for housing development in the area indicated green on enclosed map

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Evelix MB Inset 1.3 Evelix		
504 Mr Donald Malcolm John Munro Dornoch	Sutherland Local Plan Deposit Draft - Insert i.3 Evelix Part 5 Whilst I have no objection to proposed future residential development within the Evelix area, I do however have concerns regarding more flooding and the further deterioration of the single track road currently servicing mine and neighbouring properties. With regard to the flooding it was particularly severe in October 2006 in which my property almost succumbed and indeed my driveway was washed away and needed considerable earthworks to repair I would therefore like it noted that should any future planning applications which are presented within the Evelix area only be granted if the infrastructure is upgraded to cope with the possible increase in traffic and alleviate any possible future flooding. I would also like it noted that when I received planning permission for my house in 2001 the roads department raised concerns then regarding the volume of vehicular traffic on the aforementioned single track road, which is also at times used as a "rat run". Since the completion of my house a further two properties which also use the road have had planning permission granted and are erected. The road itself has received no maintenance of upgrading from before I took residence in my house.	As above
350 Linda Robichaud Inverness	Having looked at the recently released draft local plan for Sutherland, this letter is to provide general support for the inclusion of the Evelix area, Nr Dornoch which has been included in the aforementioned plan. More specifically, I would like to highlight my support for the area outlined by me, in my letter to you dated 10 December 2006, during the consultation process. I would develop this area to include a dwelling house and garden.	As above
212 Mr Grant Fairns Dornoch	I would like to make representation for housing development at grid reference E276950, N890762 as highlighted in green on the attached extract from the draft local plan.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Evelix MB Inset 1.3 Evelix		
503 Ronnie & Lillian MacRae Evelix	<p>We are happy to support future development in this area but are concerned about the possible impact of flooding. This area has been flooded on numerous occasions in the past, with at least 3 of our immediate neighbours being affected by flood water, It is essential that any new development allows excess surface water to flow on it's natural course, eastwards. As this area does not show up on SEPA's flood risk map it is extremely important that local planners have a clear understanding of the issues involved and ensure minimal impact on neighbouring properties should any further development take place in this area.</p> <p>Before planning permission was granted on our property it was recommended for refusal on the grounds that the road was not suitable for further development. This is an adopted road and is widely used as a shortcut to Dornoch, and is indeed in need of repair works.</p>	As above
Inset Maps Golspie G General Comment		
241 Mr & Mrs A Ogilvie Inverness	<p>We consider that the plan should refer to sites and properties that need to be promoted for Lack of Promotion of Environmental Improvements/Enhancement environmental improvement/enhancement. In particular we refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the former Drill Hall; (b) the shore side walk way between the former dairy and Seaforth House; and c) the blaise pitch north of Golspie Primary School. <p>We are particularly concerned about the condition and future use of the former Drill Hall. It has been much neglected by successive owners in recent years and as a Listed building they should be reminded that they have an obligation to maintain and make appropriate use of it. It has an interesting history of significance to the heritage of the village and East Sutherland.</p> <p>The Council will have on file a copy of the economic study and Conservation Plan carried out for the Highland Buildings Preservation Trust. These identified a range of potential community and tourist related uses that would help integrate the village better with Dunrobin Castle as well as offer a major performance and events venue on a par</p>	<p>The Council is aware of the aspirations of the community for improvements and environmental works at various sites and buildings within the settlement. Many of these are best promoted through the Councils environmental improvement programme, a process that has been partly informed through the consultation on the local plan.</p> <p>The former Drill Hall is in private ownership with that entails the maintenance and development of the building. The Planning and Development Service has powers to serve enforcement notice where a building is falling into disrepair and also to take action where maintenance is not implemented.</p> <p>Queries regarding the planning status and building warrants should be directed to the Area Planning and Building Standards office in Golspie.</p>

Inset Maps Golspie G General Comment

with the restored Carnegie Hall at Clashmore and the Strathpeffer Spa Pavilion. Unfortunately, these ideas were not progressed through lack of support from public funding agencies. Subsequently the building has been allowed to fall into further disrepair.

We urge the Council and other potential funding agencies to support the community in promoting future for this building and other environmental improvements around the village. We also ask the planning authority to please clarify whether the existing uses have planning consent and/or building warrant.

240 Peter Polson & Angela Ogilvie
Golspie

There is also a lack of a relevant policy in the Written Statement tied to Settlement Development Areas. We therefore suggest that to help protect the setting of settlements an additional clause be inserted into Policy 1 (Settlement Development Areas). This would also help to restrict the unplanned growth of villages and/or piecemeal development within a certain distance of their boundaries.

The Golspie settlement statement should refer to the development constraints of the nearby townships (Backies, Golspie Tower and Dunrobin), which could also partly justify the major housing land allocations and promote their development within the village SDA.

We appreciate the need for a shorter more concise plan particularly as it now covers the whole of Sutherland. However, we are concerned that the broad application of General Policy 3 gives the initial impression that development is now encouraged in constrained areas of Countryside like Backies.

INSERT ADDITIONAL TEXT AFTER FIRST SENTENCE OF PROSPECTS SECTION "The defined Golspie settlement provides effective development allocations that can provide for the longer term development of the settlement in a sustainable way. Pressure for development within the settlement setting of Golspie will only be considered appropriate where this can be supported in terms of appropriate provision of infrastructure and in terms of wider policy considerations."

Policy references for development proposals outwith SDAs are referred to in General Policy 3 Wider Countryside. The supporting text of the general policy is to be amended to include advice on the importance of or sensitivity of some settlement settings. In those areas of the wider countryside development will only be supported if it does not impact negatively on settlement settings as well meeting necessary infrastructure requirements.

Additional text to the prospects section will reinforce the role of the defined settlement development area and allocations in providing the main opportunities for development for the area.

Inset Maps Golspie H 1 Woodland Way

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie H 1 Woodland Way		
117 C H Port Golspie	Support allocation.	Support noted.

499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Understood to be under way/complete with small number of units/ Capacity as per draft: 10 Suggested capacity: 4?	Noted. Allocation has delivered 2 units but scope for development of smaller units still exists on site

Inset Maps Golspie H 2 Sibell Road		
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	This site appears to be not coming forward due to constraints.	NO CHANGE TO H2 SIBELL ROAD It is noted that the progress of the development of the site has not progressed at this time.

18 Ms Rosalie Askew Golspie	The development of the site will remove a natural habitat and beautiful outlook enjoyed by local people. The field and tress are occupied by many different types of wildlife with Herons nesting in the trees annually. The area is also utilised as a play area by the local children. Development will remove all the wildlife from the area The site is not the easiest to develop and there are other locations which could be developed with less disruption.	NO CHANGE TO H2 SIBELL ROAD The consideration of the planning application for the site included an assessment of habitat and impact on nesting birds. No significant bird interests or designations were identified on the site by RSPB. The site was indicated as supporting a number of common breeding woodland birds, as a result of this input a condition was applied to the permission restricting tree/gorse clearance work to outwith the nesting season. The provision of enhanced play facilities at Ross Street was also conditional to the approval of planning permission.

519 Mr Donald John Henderson MacKay Golspie	As owner of 2 Argo Terrace, I wish to bring to your notice of the flooding that occurred after the test bores which probably broke all the land tiles while that work was going on. In October 2006 there was heavy rain for a number of days and severe gales as well. The flood came down the field that you are preparing to develop along towards the property of Reiss bungalow and cut through the hedge and flooding No.1 and No. 2 Argo Terrace to a severe depth.	NO CHANGE TO H2 SIBELL ROAD A condition of the approval of planning permission is that adequate surface water drainage scheme has to be agreed with the Council prior to commencement of development. Developers are also bound by planning condition to also agree foul drainage provision prior to commencement of development.
I enclose a photograph of No.2 Argo Terrace but you are not seeing it		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie H 2 Sibell Road		
	<p>at its worst because at one stage it was up to the oil storage joints. What I want to ask you is to be sure that ample drainage is in place to protect the Argo Terrace houses as a large amount of water comes off that field with the steep incline incut.</p>	
<p>285 Mr Angus MacKay Golspie</p>	<p>Test bores which you conducted in the field burst all the drains causing flooding at no.1 and no.2 Argo Terrace. I am enclosing a photo of proof of the flooding. I have no objections for the building of houses in the field but would not want more flooding around my house.</p>	<p>As above</p>
Inset Maps Golspie H 3 Adjacent Macleod House		
<p>346 Mr & Mrs P O'Brien Golspie</p>	<p>Noise, disruption, access, our view, down sizing the playing field.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE TO H3 ADJACENT MACLEOD HOUSE</p>
		<p>The allocation Adjacent MacLeod House makes reference in the developer requirements section to the need to widen and improve the access road to meet current standards. The design and layout of proposed development will need to take into account the characteristics of the site and the potential impact of existing development. The question of individual views is not a planning consideration but the preparation of a layout should take into consideration the amenity of adjacent properties. The allocation is indicated as being suitable for a fairly low level of development and any traffic related implications are likely to be minimal.</p>
		<p>The site is not allocated specifically for affordable housing but the development of the land would require a 25% contribution in terms of affordable housing. The development of this site would go some way to meeting previously unmet local demand.</p>
		<p>The purpose of the identification of potential sites for housing and other development is to establish the principle of development on an area of ground. An assessment of site suitability involves the consideration of a number of factors. The Local Plan does not seek to determine the final physical form of a development but</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie H 3 Adjacent Macleod House		does indicate the requirements expected to be provided as part of a development.
45 Sue Doward Golspie	<p>I am objecting initially but if all below are met I am able to support the plan. I would like confirmation that my issues are being met.</p> <p>Not a Bed & Breakfast or hotel. No parking on my property. No access for materials/goods from my property. No dyke/wall damage to my property. No overlooking of any part of my hotel. No access to proposed site for drainage, plumbers, electricity, oil, water or any other services from my property.</p>	As above
190 Dennis & Moira Bremner golspie	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To achieve a suitable 2 way traffic system plus footpath. This would require a minimum of 7.5m width. At present the distance from the cemetery wall to our boundary is only 5m!! 2. Our property level is approx 800mm below the current field level, which would create a problem with regards lighting levels and tenants looking down into our property, creating privacy problems. 3. One of the original reasons we purchased this property was the fact that we had uninterrupted views to the hills about Golspie. We wish to retain this view. 4. The increased volume of traffic could cause noise pollution as according to the proposed plan. The access road would be in very close proximity to our property. 5. In the case that any future developer decides to build multiple low cost housing, this could bring anti-social behaviour, which we have not had in our 20+ years living here. 6. See sketch of restrictions which we would require to be implemented 	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie H 3 Adjacent Macleod House		
59 Mr John Murray Golspie	<p>1. I would support this but would point out that an embankment is steep at back of our property and would be concerned about movement caused by heavy plant operations during construction.</p> <p>2. I would also point out that although you show this site for development, I would question when it would get developed, as the Highland Council did not show willing when I asked.</p> <p>3. As long as I can still gain access to our site from car park (as marked)</p>	As above
521 Mr George Mowat Golspie	<p>1. Block the view from my home and probably lower the value of my property.</p> <p>2. All these houses being built, so where are the occupants going to get employment in the area.</p>	As above
524 M I MacBeath Golspie	<p>I don't think that houses should be built in field at back of our houses. There is enough noise about, car parking and blocking the road at the back of our houses and don't know if it will affect the road that is there for deliveries such as oil, sticks, manure etc. This road was refurbished by Councillor Ross and it was only finished a matter of weeks when Scottish Water dug it up again to put in a new drainage system and it did not near come up to the same standard after been redone by them.</p> <p>The present road coming up from Churchyard is all holes and dangerous and the main Sibell Road I would think would have to be widened if all the houses on the other side are to be built and I think that would be plenty houses for here. Where are they all to get jobs?</p>	As above
131 A L Akers Golspie	<p>As this is Education ground for the use and benefit of pupils for the promotion of sporting activities we object strongly to the suggestion of this area being used for any other purpose than what is in force at present. As far as I can see it is used to promote pupils training in the field of hockey and other grass sports. I feel it would be totally out of order to use this land for any other purpose. I cannot state any stronger than to say I object to any other use of this land for any other use than sports as per the status quo.</p>	The allocation does not impose upon the hockey pitch itself but to adjacent land.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie H 3 Adjacent Macleod House		
Inset Maps Golspie H 4 Rhives Farm Steading		
185 Mrs & Rev Forsyth Golspie	Part of area marked H4 belongs to us at Rhives Lodge and a small section belongs to Rhives House and there are no plans for developing this area. Much of the other areas especially MU4 are subject to flooding. I have also shown the final part of the cycle track next to our property and the trees which have been planted in 2007 which were not on the cycle track plan. These trees when mature, will cause damage to dry stone walls and will obscure the wonderful views. Part of H4 also includes access to our property.	RETAIN ALLOCATION H4 RHIVES FARM STEADING BUT AMEND BOUNDARY TO OMIT LAND UNRELATED TO POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITE. The Local Plan boundary is intended to represent the area of land and buildings at Rhives Farm steadings that have been the subject of housing development interest. The next draft of the plan will correctly reflect the extent of this site and omit areas of land not relating to this proposal and opportunity.
Inset Maps Golspie H 5 Ben Bhraggie Drive		
261 Sutherland Estates Golspie	Supporting	DELETE ALLOCATION BUT RETAIN SITE WITHIN SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY It has been noted that the housing allocation at Ben Bhraggie Drive has been the subject of a tree planting scheme and inclusion of a bike trail across part of the site. This will remove the development potential of the site within the short to medium term. The longer term potential for the site will be the consideration of subsequent plan reviews.
526 Marlene Cowie Golspie	As you can see, the proposed access is very close to my front garden. Also my garden and front bedroom. I'm concerned from a noise point of view. Also any future plans I may have for extending outwards. Environmentally, I also fear an even greater reduction in the number of roe deer in the area, already visibly reduced since the bicycle track was built. Perhaps access could be obtained up under the railway bridge at the top of Fountain Road.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie H 5 Ben Bhraggie Drive		
152 Mrs Linda MacKay Golspie	<p>It would clash with the cycle path. Ben Bhraggie Drive's road is not suitable for extra traffic.</p> <p>Trees which have just been planted would be uprooted.</p> <p>Access to the new development is too narrow.</p> <p>Traffic would think it is a shortcut to miss out the main road.</p>	As above
177 Mr Daniel Oman Golspie	Support in principle. Subject to proper improvement to turning point at top of Ben Bhraggie Drive. Ridiculous that lorries (ie coal/oil delivery) have to reverse up Ben Bhraggie Drive.	As above
179 Mr Donald MacKay Golspie	<p>I understand that site H5 has featured in local planning for a considerable time. If it is now being given a firmer status, this seems and odd time to choose, since the site is crossed by a recently constructed mountain bike track accompanied by fairly dense amenity planting.</p> <p>As to the capability of the site, the deposit draft correctly states that access is constrained. Ben Bhraggie Drive itself is narrow and the turning space at the end of the Drive is scarcely adequate for current levels of traffic. An additional 15 housing units would create pressure and, even if a more generous turning space were provided within H5, it is unlikely that turning traffic, would be prepared to go the extra distance in order to make use of it.</p>	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	<p>Given recent planting unlikely to be developed. Question whether an allocation of 15 units is too many given the circumstances.</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 15 Suggested capacity: ?</p>	As above
76 Mrs M Barnes Golspie	There are lots of new trees planted on the site and also the wildcat trail runs right across it	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie H 5 Ben Bhraggie Drive		
89 Mrs H A Bush Golspie	<p>1. A large number of trees are now growing on the proposed site and since we are being urged to save the planet it would be wrong to tear them up in order to build yet more houses.</p> <p>2. The cycle trail, completed only recently and which cyclists travel long distances to come and use, crosses the same site.</p>	As above
120 Mr Douglas Mackay Golspie	I think it's great to see land coming available in Golspie for houses. On my part it's good to see the road getting extended as the turning place at the top of Ben Bhraggie Drive is grossly inadequate and my fence keeps getting broken by big lorries that struggle to turn and hope that a decent turning place is made available at the end of the new road.	As above
39 Mr J F Sutherland Golspie	<p>No one can reasonably object to development of this land. It is just curious that having been empty fields for so many years, a new tree plantation has taken place within the past year. The existing road is a cul de sac and for two years we have been assured by our local councillor Ross that a sign would be attached to an existing post at the entrance with this indication. In the meantime tourists arrive expecting to find access to Ben Braggie as the road name might imply. More importantly very heavy trucks arrive at the end and are unable to turn in the limited space so have to reverse down the complete length of road to busy A9.</p> <p>It is hoped that the council will eventually address this problem, probably after some fatal accident.</p>	As above
Inset Maps Golspie MU 1 Mackay House Hostel site		
241 Mr & Mrs A Ogilvie Inverness	Whilst we support this allocation, we suggest that it be extended south across the underused school bus park and the text modified to allow for commercial development, possibly a larger foodstore. This would offer an allocation close to the village or "town" centre in line with the general Commerce policy and Scottish Planning Policy 8. With a quality design solution development of a larger store and other uses in this location would also help regenerate the centre of Golspie and avoid the threats posed by a similar allocation for a potential "out of town" store at Drummuie (MU3). See also our objection to MU3.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION MU1 BUT AMEND TEXT TO "Site suitable for a variety of uses including business, residential or retail. Subject to appropriate access from Fountain Road."</p> <p>The former Mackay Hostel is allocated for the development of mixed use development. The potential of the site for use as a retail site is constrained by the school playing grounds to the east. The addition of the bus park would extend the possible area available for a retail</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie MU 1 Mackay House Hostel site		
	<p>As an alternative (to MU3) it would be more appropriate to positively identify a more modest commercial development opportunity adjacent to the village centre - a combination of the former Mackay Hostel site and the adjoining under-used school bus park (see our comments on MU1). Development here could be better integrated with the village centre. It could also be of a scale more in keeping with a food store serving Golspie and its immediate surroundings, rather than one with a larger floor area also aimed at drawing trade from Dornoch, Embo, Lairg, Brora and Helmsdale to the detriment of the commercial viability of existing stores within these villages.</p>	<p>type development but would provide an elongated site difficult to develop for such a use without undue impact on neighbouring properties.. The potential for extending the former Mackay Hostel site would give greater scope for a development of a retail nature but this would be subject to land assembly. There is benefit in extending the potential for retail use to be included within the supporting text. It is noted however, that the landowner is seeking to promote housing development on the site.</p>
<p>232 D H M Fraser Golspie</p>	<p>The surrounding development is residential.</p> <p>I would support an application for a housing development in keeping with the substantial properties already on Fountain Road and with access only on to Fountain Road as present.</p> <p>I would strongly object to access to this site through the area currently used as a school car park on the grounds that the boundary is immediately adjacent to the living area of my property and traffic would substantially reduce my enjoyment of the property.</p>	<p>The requirements of the policy have been amended to require access from Fountain Road.</p>
<p>201 Mr Martin Ross Aberdeen</p>	<p>Currently conducting feasibility study with architect with specific attention to parking/housing ratios & costings.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Inset Maps Golspie MU 2 Drummuie		
<p>241 Mr & Mrs A Ogilvie Inverness</p>	<p>Reference should be made to the Drummuie Development Brief approved by the Council in January 2001 following extensive community consultation and agreement. This brief provides more detailed guidance on the layout and development of these land allocations which is not reflected in the new local plan. In the absence of such detail in the plan it should refer to the development brief as supplementary guidance. (Please see attached any related materials such as maps, photos, etc.)</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION MU 2 DRUMMUIE BUT AMEND TEXT</p> <p>It is agreed that reference should be included in the text to the existing Drummuie (Golspie) Development Brief which provides further detail on the development options for the site. The current development proposals have followed the option identified in Framework 2 of the brief. This opportunities for development identified within the brief identify the range of development opportunities within the overall site including housing business and industrial.</p>

Inset Maps Golspie MU 2 Drummie

The document will be revised to take account of relevant factual changes. Amend text to include "The existing Drummie Development Brief provides approved supplementary guidance to the development potential of this site."

325 HIE Caithness & Sutherland
Thurso

Golspie - as you may be aware we have recently undertaken some feasibility work with regard to developing land as an industrial estate. Some issues have been identified with the land originally identified (MU3) for this type of development which may affect its suitability. However it is evident that the Drummie area (identified as MU2) may offer a suitable alternative for development as an industrial estate. We would ask that an area is identified within MU2 for potential industrial development.

As above

264 Mr John Mackay
Golspie

There is still no indication of the location of private plots and "affordable" housing. Are they to be mixed or is there to be a ghetto behind the Steading.

Ms Torrance promised to show us plans of the proposed development - at a meeting with Drummie residents in 2007 - we have seen nothing.

As mentioned in the response above the overall development of the Drummie site is guided by the existing approved Drummie Development Brief. The current proposals for housing development are following the Framework 2 option of the brief with variations to the form and density of development.

The detail of the proposals are the subject of a detailed planning application that addresses details relating to design, delivery, tenure and layout, including open space provision and footpath linkages.

With regard to the future potential for the Drummie Farm Steadings, these are the subject of a feasibility study to determine the options for the conversion or redevelopment of the site.

The Drummie Development Brief and the subsequent planning application identified the access to the "Technical School" as being from the existing access. The development incorporated improvement to the access road in it's implementation.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie MU 2 Drummie		
		The Drummie Development Brief does have reference to the need to protect existing trees and a requirement for landscaping and structural tree planting to form part of any proposal within the overall area.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	2.1 Golspie MU2 SNH recommends that a masterplan is required for this allocation and that this includes a clear provision for open space. The inclusion of footpath links to Ben Bhraggie Wood could also be considered.	As above
207 Mrs Elizabeth Woollcombe Golspie	I do not think your map is correct. We have so much here to invite people - lets not spoil it with concrete and large shop/s. We bought our plot - my husband (Royal Navy) in 1970 - Why? The beautiful beaches, the fishing, both sea and rivers and lochs - the walks, our helpful shops and post office. Farms - cattle, sheep, lambs and space and freedom. The biking track seems ok. If you're planning planting trees you could see that I'm doing - we need windbreaks & shelter. (Sad so many cut down and east wind let in).	As above
545 Robert & Jennifer MacKenzie Golspie	We were concerned about the state of the old Sutherland Technical School building and are pleased to see its redevelopment. We also accept that there is a need for housing in East Sutherland; however we think that the current proposed developments in Brora, Dornoch and Golspie are out of proportion for current needs. The housing development planned for mixed use area 2 on the map will be on a completely new and attractive site but looks dull & suburban in its concept. This could still be a development which takes account of the rural nature of the environment and complements it. We think that far too many houses are proposed for this site. Rather than being "well related to the existing settlement" (note 2) the proposed housing will swamp it. Blocks of flats are particularly inappropriate. We are also surprised and disappointed at the proposal to cram the low-cost and rented housing together in the small field next to the existing settlement, separate from the private plots. This does not seem like a genuine mix of housing. We think that there should be fewer houses, a genuine mix and a housing plan which is sympathetic to the rural environment.	As above

Inset Maps Golspie MU 2 Drummuie

The Notes also refer to the "protection of the outstanding natural and built heritage" and with this in mind, we are very concerned about the possible fate of the old farm Steading. We believe that the Steading was built around the same time as the original farm house - now Drummuie House, a listed building. After the purchase of the whole of Drummuie Farm by Sutherland County Council the Steading building became an integral part of the Tech - also a listed building - so arguably, the Steading, although not itself listed, is part of the curtilage of two neighbouring listed buildings. The Steading is inextricably linked with the history of the Tech, and now represents the only reminder of the Tech Farm, the first farm in Scotland attached to a school. It is also a fine building in its own right, although of course it has suffered from neglect in recent years. It would seem short-sighted to demolish a vernacular building made from traditional material for yet more concrete and tarmac. In other parts of the country, such buildings are much sought after for conversion to residential or holiday accommodation, retail or workshop space. We think the Steading should be preserved in some form, and if necessary, put on the open market.

We are surprised by the decision to persist with the existing access to the new council offices. It was always the understanding of the inhabitants of Drummuie that access to the council offices would be via a new road from the wind farm near the top of the fields. We think that would provide a more suitable access.

Notwithstanding the Developments Brief's undertaking that there would be "an assumption in favour of retaining existing trees" there has been wholesale destruction of nearly all the trees in Drummuie along with the natural scrub and vegetation. We would like to see a comprehensive plan for replanting, including new groups of trees to break up the housing areas. We would also like to see the former areas of whin and birch restored.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie MU 2 Drummuie		
365 Lena Dow Golspie	<p>Specific Development Plan for Drummuie Tree-Felling with respect to the woodlands surrounding the development - if trees are felled to ensure the safety of houses on the proposed development, will application be made to Sutherland Estates for such permission? This, in our view, will affect the privacy of Westerwood since houses at the top of the field will be able to view our back garden and the rear of our house.</p> <p>Security - with an increased population in the immediate vicinity, there comes an increased risk of crime. From a personal perspective, we are concerned that the privacy and security of our property will be compromised. What assurances can you give us that this will not be so? Up until this point, we have had little need of extra security provision, but in view of the proposed development, we require this property to be securely fenced. This will lead to substantial costs.</p> <p>View - our living and dining room windows look immediately onto the plots. Without knowing the height or style of the proposed units, we are greatly concerned both that our western views from the aforementioned windows will be impeded, and that the proposed development may cause considerable shadowing of our property (including the issue of privacy).</p> <p>Right of Ways - with the planned development bordering the forest; and the forest, in the locality having a number of pathways leading into our back garden, what guarantees can you provide that these rights of way will not compromise our security? (Or in other words, can you assure us that people will not use our back garden as a right of way to the village?)</p> <p>Litter in the Forest - whose responsibility is it for clearing litter from the forest?</p> <p>Boundaries between wooded area surrounding and the proposed development site - will provision be made for boundaries between the proposed development, the forest and Westerwood?</p> <p>Developer's Undertaking - can you assure us that there will be no damage caused to this property by the developer's undertaking? This may require a full structural survey being carried out on Westerwood - the cost to be borne by the developer.</p>	As above

Inset Maps Golspie MU 2 Drummuie

Thus, on balance, until we receive more detailed plans of the above development, and satisfactory answers to our questions (particularly a guarantee regarding bullet point 1 of the local development plan and your suggestions regarding bullet point 2 of the specific plan for Drummuie) we must raise an objection.

365 Lena Dow
Golspie

Westerwood has been our family home for 33 happy years. Over those years we have enjoyed privacy, security and unbounded views.

Whilst we do not wish to stand in the way of progress, we wish to express our concerns at the above proposed development. We find it very difficult to make detailed comments on the local development plan, since no detailed statistics have been made available to us. On that basis, we can neither support nor object to this development. Questions we would like an answer to include:

Will this development be another Hallow Park? Without prejudice, we do not wish to have the 'undesirable' element, bringing their own social problems onto our immediate doorstep.

If the site is fully developed, what provision has been made in the wider infrastructure of Golspie for such a population increase? Where is the need for so many new properties in the next 5 years in Golspie?

Who are the intended benefactors of these sites? Will they be commuters who live in Golspie and work in Inverness, first time buyers from Golspie, or people retiring to the area?

The development of Drummuie will deliver a mix of housing tenures across the site with the exact distribution being the subject of detailed planning applications.

The overall provision of infrastructure and service delivery is the subject of discussion with other agencies and services to ensure that there is adequate provision to meet any increase. Development within the settlement have been very low rates, in part due to the lack of effective development land, this has seen a decline in the settlement population and also the primary and secondary school rolls. The availability of development land and progression of house construction will provide opportunities for a currently unmet local need for housing and assist in the maintenance of existing services. Any infrastructural or service provision that needs to be augmented as result of development will be subject to developer contributions.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency
Dingwall

Category 3 Flood Risk

For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a Flood Risk Assessment, however the amended policy (GP9) states that, "A Flood Risk Assessment may be necessary where a site is partially within, bordering or adjacent to the medium to high flood risk area, a small unmodelled watercourse flows within or adjacent to the site, there is historical flooding known on the site or the development may have an impact on flooding elsewhere e.g." down slope"."

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie MU 3 Drummuie (south)		
<p>241 Mr & Mrs A Ogilvie Inverness</p>	<p>We have serious concerns about the impact of this allocation in terms of:</p> <p>(a) the setting of the village and views towards the sea and golf course; and</p> <p>(b) the commercial viability of Golspie village centre and the food stores located in the centre of other villages in East Sutherland (see also our comments on MUI).</p> <p>With regard to the landscape impact, on the western approach to Golspie generally open views exist on the seaward side of the AS Trunk road. Development on the north side of the road and the restored B Listed building at Drummuie will or at least should be able to enjoy this outlook. Similarly the views from the shore line and golf course towards the Listed building and Ben Bhraggie are generally across open fields. However, the proposed allocation for mainstream industrial and commercial uses suggests that these views and possibly the setting of the Listed building could be affected by large scale shed type buildings and open storage yards.</p> <p>MU3</p> <p>We fully appreciate that Golspie is short of mainstream industrial land that could help provide much needed jobs and allow existing businesses to expand to regenerate the economy. We also acknowledge that the statement for the allocation at MU3 refers to the need for landscaping and screen planting. However, we question the location for such buildings given the potential detrimental impact upon the setting of this approach to the village and the Listed building. The existing business park has not set a precedent given its location closer into the village and controls over the design and use of buildings.</p> <p>We therefore urge the Council to reconsider this allocation for mainstream industrial and commercial uses. If the plan is unable to identify suitable alternative locations then at the very least significant advance landscaping should be undertaken and given time to become established before any development is permitted. We also urge the early preparation of an accompanying detailed design brief as part of the Action Plan in order to guide the building scale, uses and finishing materials as well as control external storage.</p>	<p>DO NOT RETAIN ALLOCATION MU3 DRUMMUIE (SOUTH) AND REVISE SDA TO EXCLUDE EXTENT OF ALLOCATION.</p> <p>The allocation of MU3 Drummuie (south) sought to provide a much needed supply of industrial land to support the continued growth of local business' in need of an effective supply of land to on which to develop. The requirements contained within the allocation placed an emphasis on not only the delivery of an available supply of developable land but also to address concerns of the potential visual impact of developing on this site.</p> <p>After further feasibility work has been undertaken on the site, various factors relating to the development costs of making the site available make the site unviable to progress at this point in time.</p> <p>There is a need to promote the development of industrial land on alternative site. The progress of development at Drummuie MU2 has established the basic infrastructure to assist in the future delivery of land for industrial purposes on the site. The existing approved development brief for the site clearly identifies the potential for light industrial uses.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie MU 3 Drummuie (south)	<p>The statement refers to commercial development being 'Trudged against the Commerce policy of this plan" and implies that a large food store might be located on this site subject to meeting the criteria indicated in that general policy. We are concerned that such a development could undermine the already fragile commercial viability of the centre of Golspie and other villages. As an alternative it would be more appropriate to positively identify a more modest commercial development opportunity adjacent to the village centre - a combination of the former Mackay Hostel site and the adjoining under-used school bus park (see our comments on MU1). Development here could be better integrated with the village centre. It could also be of a scale more in keeping with a food store serving Golspie and its immediate surroundings, rather than one with a larger floor area also aimed at drawing trade from Dornoch, Embo, Lairg, Brora and Helmsdale to the detriment of the commercial viability of existing stores within these villages.</p>	
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>MU3 This site substantially extends the existing settlement envelope on the south side of the road and occupies a visually prominent location at the entrance to the village. SNH has previously commented to the effect that this site should remain undeveloped due to its location and the important views afforded to the sea over the site. Should this site be developed, tree screening would be required along the western edge and adjacent to the road however, this will obscure views to the sea. This site is particularly sensitive as the welcome/gateway to a village which is promoting its beach and marine/coastal heritage. However, we recognise that there is a requirement for a business allocation in Golspie and that suitable sites are limited. Given the sensitivity of the site, SNH recommends that the Council consider alternative locations for the provision of light industrial facilities including the substantial allocation (MU2) at Drummuie in the first instance. This area has much greater potential for the development of effective screening.</p>	As above
260 Ms Lesley Cranna Golspie	<p>I object to the zoning of the area MU3 for light industrial use. I recognise and fully support the need for a site for light industrial use in Golspie but I believe the site identified at the entrance to the village is a very bad choice. This is the gateway to the village and is an important first impression. This gateway has recently been enhanced by the redevelopment of Drummuie. MU3 has key views to the sea -one</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Golspie MU 3 Drummuie (south)

of Golspie's strengths - and promoted by the sign at the entrance to Golspie. Industrial development at this site would have to be on the higher part of this site and be well screened. Obscuring the views from the road to the coast will be an inevitable consequence of developing this site.

I strongly recommend that an alternative site with better natural screening, or potential for screening, is identified to replace MU3 and would suggest that this could be located in MU2.

The sensitivity of MU3 was identified as an important issue at the Local Plan consultation meeting in Golspie by a significant proportion of the audience. It is therefore disappointing to see that this has not been reflected in the plan.

545 Robert & Jennifer MacKenzie Golspie	We are also very concerned as to what may happen in Mixed Use Area 3, to the south of the A9. Previous proposals suggested, amongst other things, a supermarket. We remain implacably opposed to a supermarket there, or anywhere else in Golspie. At the moment, Golspie still has a thriving Main Street with a mix of shops. A supermarket would destroy these, and knock the heart out of the village. We think that any other development on that site should also be in proportion to the local community of Golspie.	As above
--	---	----------

492 Director of ECS	Supporting	As above
---------------------	------------	----------

Inset Maps Golspie MU 4 Rhives

277 Jacqui Payton Golspie	<p>I fully support tourist caravan/camping for a fixed season. I would not support all year round caravan living.</p> <p>Drainage and flooding have become an issue since the cycle track has been completed - only happens in extreme conditions but must be a consideration.</p>	<p>SUPPORT NOTED. The development of the caravan/camping site will not be for year round use and will be restricted on the length of occupancy by condition. The development of the site will need to address issues relating to drainage in order to satisfy policy considerations.</p>
------------------------------	--	--

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie MU 4 Rhives		
501 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) to the north-east of this land allocation. This SAM (Index No. 1814) comprises a chambered cairn.</p> <p>Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation.</p> <p>However, there is potential for the design of the development to have an adverse effect on the setting of this nationally important site. We therefore recommend that text is included in the Developer Requirements for this site so that such effects can be avoided and suggest: "The design of the site should address any potential impact on the setting of the chambered cairn, a Scheduled Ancient Monument".</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION MU4 RHIVES BUT AMEND TEXT OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO ADD AFTER LAST SENTENCE, "THE DESIGN OF THE SITE SHOULD ADDRESS ANY POTENTIAL IMPACT ON THE SETTING OF THE CHAMBERED CAIRN, A SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT".</p> <p>General Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage takes account of the potential impact of development on heritage features. It is accepted that this can be highlighted within the allocation requirements.</p>

495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) to the north-east of this land allocation. This SAM (Index No. 1814) comprises a chambered cairn.</p> <p>Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation.</p> <p>However, there is potential for the design of the development to have an adverse effect on the setting of this nationally important site. We therefore recommend that text is included in the Developer Requirements for this site so that such effects can be avoided and suggest: "The design of the site should address any potential impact on the setting of the chambered cairn, a Scheduled Ancient Monument".</p>	As above

Inset Maps Golspie B 1 Golspie Business Park		
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	<p>Inset Plan 4.1 Transport Scotland objects to the access proposals affecting the A9, as indicated on:</p> <p>Inset Plan 2.1 for site B1 and MU3 for Golspie.</p> <p>Also, the site reference OS indicated on the Inset Plan 4.1 for Helmsdale identifies an Opportunity Site adjacent to the A9 indicating a potential access to the A9. It should be made clear in the Plan that in the event of road-based access emerging from an appropriate appraisal, that such access should be taken from the local road network.</p>	<p>NOTED.</p> <p>The Golspie Business Park is currently operational as a business park with an existing access to the A9(T) road. The allocation to extend the business/industrial land to the south is recommended for deletion from the next draft of the plan and as such there will be no implications for the existing access.</p>

Inset Maps Golspie B 1 Golspie Business Park

Given the strategic role of the trunk road network, there is a general presumption against new trunk road accesses, highlighted in SPP 17; therefore, a proposal for a new trunk road access for development must be appropriately appraised in terms of need, location and access, to determine the potential trunk road impact, public transport access and Travel Plan content.

SPP 17 states in paragraph 21:

Development Plan strategies should aim where appropriate to reduce the need to use strategic routes for short local journeys. Development at strategic road junctions should be resisted unless the development is integrated with existing settlements through local public transport, new and existing cycle and footpath networks and not be dependent for local journeys on the strategic road network. Other significant travel generating developments should be similarly integrated.

Moreover, paragraph 72 states:

direct access on to a strategic road should be avoided as far as practicable.

Additionally, PAN 66 Annex B states in paragraph 16:

there is a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road and motorway network.

Where access is proposed to be taken from the strategic road network, it will be recommended that alternative access should be taken from a local road, given the presumption against new accesses on the trunk road network.

Given the above, Transport Scotland would ask that the following statement be included within the Plan.

It should be noted that there is a Scottish Government policy of a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road network. Where a new or significantly improved junction is proposed to facilitate development, within the transport accessibility assessment for a specific land use allocation, appropriate justification of such a strategy will require to be provided in support of such an access strategy. This will enable Transport Scotland to determine if such a justification is sufficient to set aside this policy.

Inset Maps Golspie B 1 Golspie Business Park

In addition, the Scottish Government policy of a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road network should be added as another physical constraint in Policy 10.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency
Dingwall

Category 3 Flood Risk

For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a Flood Risk Assessment, however the amended policy (GP9) states that, "A Flood Risk Assessment may be necessary where a site is partially within, bordering or adjacent to the medium to high flood risk area, a small unmodelled watercourse flows within or adjacent to the site, there is historical flooding known on the site or the development may have an impact on flooding elsewhere e.g." down slope".

Inset Maps Golspie MB Inset 2.1 Golspie

241 Mr & Mrs A Oglvie
Inverness

We question why the King George V playing fields appear to have the same designation as the surrounding countryside. As far as we are concerned they have always been located within the village. We ask that the Inset Map be modified to include this area together with the area of foreshore and open space between the pier and the Shore Street Car Park. The Open Space designation should also be applied to these areas. Other part of Plan:

We also question why not all the key public open spaces and amenity woodland in the village are designated as Open Space. In this respect we consider that the following areas should be so designated: -

1. Land south of Ross Street, Argo Terrace and Sibell Road, together with the blaise pitch.
2. Woodland along the Back Road, West of Fountain Road.
3. Land between the development areas and the A9 on the north side of Drummue.
4. The lawn in front of the Lawson Memorial Hospital and Cambusavie Wing.
5. The two areas of woodland straddling the railway, south of the A9 between the hospital and Ferry Road.

Other Inset Map designations

INSERT NEW ALLOCATIONS FOR IDENTIFIED AREAS OF OPEN SPACE WITHIN THE VILLAGE AND ENLARGE SDA TO INCLUDE GROUNDS OF LAWSON MEMORIAL AND ALSO KING GEORGE PLAYING FIELD

The Council accepts that important areas open space need to be safeguarded from development. The areas indicated on the inset map were derived from the Council's own record of maintained open space. There is a need to augment this information with areas that are accepted to fulfil this roll. The exclusion of the King George field and the land in front of the Lawson Memorial from the settlement boundary will allow the same level of protection as being allocated a open space within the settlement, given the function of the playing field for the community and the relationship of the Lawson Memorial to the land in its curtilage the boundary shall be redrawn to include these areas within the settlement development area and allocated as open space.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Golspie MB Inset 2.1 Golspie		
	The above are illustrated on the attached copy of the Golspie Inset Map	
260 Ms Lesley Cranna Golspie	I suggest that the "blaize pitch" near the Primary School is protected as a space for a future community development such as a village hall with multiple use facilities. This site links the upper and lower village and would be a good site for such a venue which Golspie currently lacks.	As above
260 Ms Lesley Cranna Golspie	I object to the of areas identified as open space in the Golspie settlement map. Open space is an important recreational, wildlife and landscape resource which should be an integral part of the village, and protected in the long term. Significant areas in Golspie have been omitted and as a result do not receive the open space policy protection. Examples include: King George's Field Open space around the Primary School Seaforth House grounds The beach front to the east of the pier The woodland above the "Back Road" The land to the east of B1 and the land below MU2 -this has no shading at all and should be retained as open space.	As above
Inset Maps Brora G General Comment		
187 Bruce & Nessie Pitchford Brora	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Big increase in carbon footprint of Brora. I thought the world was trying to decrease not increase. 2. Employment where? Inverness more fuel for cars at our prices. I do not think so also increase of above. 3. Building site south end of Brora use it! Instead of upsetting our view, flatten disused mill and improve view of Brora. 4. We moved here for our view and because of the old cottage style of the street. Who are you to say what you will build on. You were voted in by the people to help us? 5. Retain croft land to south. How long for? 6. Disruption noise inconvenience and a decimated outlook. 7. A café refused to be a Chinese takeaway but you propose to destroy croft land. 8. WE do not want, need or support your plans for H2 H3 H5. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to supporting sustainable development the location of new housing development should be within areas that are served by existing infrastructure and services. The development of housing in existing settlements makes the best use of the available infrastructure and are also situated closer to main areas of employment. To not allocate sufficient land to meet housing demand would lead to ad hoc unplanned developments that are likely to place heavier burdens on services and have a greater impact on the environment. 2. The Local Plan continues to support the potential for further development at the industrial estate, with potential for developing exiting and new business. Development proposals at Scotia House are likely to lead to further opportunities for local employment. These two areas for

Inset Maps Brora G General Comment

development offer the opportunity for the provision of locally based employment and to decrease the need for travel to work.

3. The former Woollen Mill is currently occupied by various business enterprises offering a variety of services. Proposals are in place to further utilise the former mill building with the development of sustainable modular housing for delivery and erection in developments throughout Highlands and beyond.

4. The development of the area of land to the south of Academy Street would be the subject of more detailed consideration through a formal planning application. This would allow further consideration of the most appropriate form of development. The Council seeks to promote a choice of sites in various ownerships to help facilitate the future development of settlements throughout the Highlands.

5. The retention of croft land to the south of the settlement is intended to support the continuing tradition of the crofting lifestyle in Sutherland.

6. Planning conditions can control hours and days of construction on development sites.

7. Each case is considered on its merits.

8. Noted.

326 Scottish Natural Heritage
Golspie

Settlement Development Areas that overlap SSSIs/SACs P13, Brora. Inverbrora SSSI and Moray Firth SAC are not shown correctly as parts of them are omitted when they overlap with the Settlement Development Area. For Inverbrora SSSI, the areas involved are at c. NC 901309 on the south bank of the river and in the river mouth at c. NC 909039. Also a small area of the Moray Firth SAC needs to be added to the map in the river mouth at c NC 909039 where this overlaps with the Settlement Development Area (this overlaps

RETAIN BRORA SDA BUT REDUCE BOUNDARY EXTENT TO OMIT INVERBRORA SSSI AND THE MORAY FIRTH SSSI.

It is noted that the redrawing of the SDA will remove the Natural Heritage Designations from within the settlement boundary. The Council agree that the boundary should be redefined in this respect.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora G General Comment		
	<p>water and the Settlement Development Area).</p> <p>The SDA should be redrawn to exclude the Inverbrora SSSI and the Moray Firth SAC. For details of the precise location of this overlap see comments in mapping section at Annex 3.</p>	
<p>184 Mr John Ross Brora</p>	<p>Would like my field or at least lower end to be considered in plan. The area to the east at Stafford Terrace has been developed. My area would be a continuation of housing line. Access from existing road.</p>	<p>RETAIN BRORA SDA AND ENLARGE EXTENT OF BOUNDARY AT STAFFORD TERRACE.</p> <p>The site identified relates to the land identified for infill development in the existing adopted Local Plan, and if serviced by the same access would carry minimal impact to the existing development. The inclusion of this area within the Settlement Development Area would mark the end of incremental development in this area.</p>
<p>125 Tulloch Homes Ltd Inverness</p>	<p>Carol House, Brora - current application (05/00431/FULSU) for the development of 17 flats as part of an associated integrated leisure development to renovate the Royal Marine Hotel and demolish the unsightly Ice Rink at the rear.</p> <p>While the future of this site may be determined by current or pending planning applications you may wish to recognise the principle of redeveloping this "brownfield" site to appropriate residential/tourist type uses in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>INSERT NEW ALLOCATION FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AT "MU3 Carrol House, 0.3ha, Redevelopment opportunity for housing or tourist related accommodation. A contribution for affordable housing requirement will be expected. Proposals should be sympathetic to surrounding properties."</p>
Inset Maps Brora MB Development Factors		
<p>230 Mr Alistair Risk FHCIMA Brora</p>	<p>I have studied the above plan with interest-especially the Brora section, and have no formal objection to it in principal However I do have a number of observations:-</p> <p>1) To give a true reflection of the population of Brora it would be advisable to include its suburbs-i.e.... Ladies Loch, Mosshill, The Doll, Dalhalcham, Clyne (East and West) and Achrimsdale-as they probably contain a further 300 or more people all of whom consider themselves part of Brora and such information is critical to potential businesses considering a move to Brora.</p>	<p>INSERT ADDITIONAL TEXT AFTER SECOND PARAGRAPH OF BRORA INTRODUCTION "THE DEVELOPMENT IN THE SURROUNDING COUNTRYSIDE SUPPORTS A FURTHER POPULATION OF APPROXIMATELY 300 PEOPLE" The population figure given relates to the identified SDA, it is agreed that the wider environs are serviced by facilities in Brora and that this can be reflected in the general text.</p> <p>National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. It</p>

Inset Maps Brora MB Development Factors

2) I am concerned that there is little or no emphasis on job creation within the document Brora looks likely to have a considerable house building explosion on top of the 30 to 40 properties already for sale, and assuming that not all are to be bought by retired people or as holiday homes some real dynamic effort is going to be required to stimulate jobs and wealth generation i.e. IF supermarkets are to come to Easter Ross/Sutherland it may accelerate the closure of what shops we have so let Brora be the site of the supermarket and do not encourage every potential supermarket development to move to Tain Then hopefully "pavement traffic" may just stimulate craft and specialist shops and eateries to open in Brora.

The Scotia House development claims it will provide 60 new jobs creating prefabricated homes for Tulloch---but it has space for a good sized supermarket as well and perhaps a number of other units providing employment.

The local Learning Centre is under threat in Brora and it serves all of East Sutherland where a significant number of locals who are able and less able are attempting to improve their ability to find work through IT skills etc and we have a significant call centre in the village which depends on these skills being within the workforce and without that support they may consider leaving Sutherland!!

Golf Road and the Royal Marine Links Apartments should not be seen as the only Tourist development in Brora---Lower Brora has the potential to have a leisure development including a jetty for sea angling and sailing plus a chalet holiday development etc on the site of the x radio station and the defunct "Gleneagles Golf Course".

If immigrant workers are as alleged, flooding into Scotland why not encourage Polish skilled workers etc to move here and set up businesses as plumbers, joiners etc

3) The Braes Hotel building is a turn off to visitors and its unloved and degenerating appearance I condition is of concern and comment to all.

Can a compulsory purchase order not be sought and have it removed and replaced with a new property including commercial units and flats???

also acknowledges planning's role in advancing the vision for rural Scotland is to enable and create opportunities for development in sustainable locations wherever appropriate e.g. where infrastructure capacity and good access exist, or can be provided at reasonable cost, or to meet justifiable social and economic objectives.

The link between housing and economic development is made in national policy through SPP 1 which states that "The planning system supports economic prosperity by identifying land of a suitable quantity and quality in the right locations to meet the need for economic development and new housing."

The potential of Scotia House and the industrial estate to accommodate further economic development opportunities is acknowledged and forms an important element in the desire to see economic growth in Brora..

The potential for tourist growth in Brora is supported through the allocation of the former radio station site to accommodate uses compatible with recreational and outdoor uses.

The plan strategy section does anticipate the continuation of an aging population for the area as a whole. Consultation undertaken as part of plan preparation, involves key agencies and service providers and is aimed at identifying any potential shortfalls in service and infrastructure provision enabling programming of investment where required.

The allocation for land for housing development is informed by population and housing projections, the plan has a requirement to be able to accommodate the potential for the development on allocated land and make the best use of available infrastructure and services.

The Plan Strategy and Vision seeks to explain the Council's views on Sutherlands future development, the

Inset Maps Brora MB Development Factors

4) The centralisation of services within the council at Drummuie has the potential to further reduce employment in many of the Sutherland communities-Dornoch Lairg and Brora etc---a pro active strategy to stimulate employment is required.

5) As a huge building programme is planned and indeed is underway for Dornoch, Embo, Golspie and Brora I cannot anticipate that locals will fill them.

Is the council or the Enterprise company going to indulge in an advertising campaign which sings the praises of Sutherland as a place to live-a beautiful place, a smaller and caring community with wonderful open air leisure activity on hand (and if they ever reopen the swimming pool some indoor facilities too!!)

National statistics tend to indicate that people should move out of the cities at retirement time or earlier to less expensive property and no doubt we may get some or even a lot of retirement couple moving north BUT will we have the infrastructure to look after their needs as they have a growing need for Health and Welfare services and will need retail facilities as well as transport and all community services.

Does this draft plan anticipate this ????

Thank you for including me in the "internal group", I hope my comments are helpful and I look forward to hearing more

purpose of the development plan is to ensure that there is the capability to accommodate potential growth in settlements.

Inset Maps Brora MB Prospects

331 GH Johnston Building
Consultants Ltd

For: Brora Investments Ltd, Brora

In the Prospects section the second paragraph refers to the continued diversification of industrial and business uses at Scotia House providing an opportunity for a range of businesses to occupy the building. This reflects the views expressed in our letter of 13 December 2006. We can advise that almost half of the building and accommodation land is suitable and available for this purpose. The remainder of the land comprises an extensive landscape amenity buffer and parking. You will also be aware that the subdivision of the buildings has the benefit of a planning consent granted in October 2007. However, Brora investments Ltd feel that the Local Plan should go further and identify the relevant area for industrial and business uses together with the remainder of the property for other uses on the Inset Map and in the Site Allocations

INSERT NEW ALLOCATION FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AT SCOTIA HOUSE (MU2), "7.14 HA MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, POTENTIAL EXISTS AT SCOTIA HOUSE EXISTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A VARIETY OF USES. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF BUSINESS USES AT SCOTIA HOUSE, TO BE CONCENTRATED TO THE REAR. POTENTIAL FOR 10 HOUSES ON 0.5 HA OF LAND BETWEEN THE EXISTING BUND AND DUDGEON TERRACE, RELATED TO HOUSE BUILDING ACTIVITIES AT THE SCOTIA HOUSE. PROVISION OF HOUSING TO BE SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT FOR LONGER

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora MB Prospects	<p>table.</p> <p>The priority is to take forward proposals for conversion of the largest part of the existing factory (eastern most) to accommodate the Scottish Sustainable Homes (SSH) operation. SSH intend to produce finished modular houses in sections for onward transportation to prepared sites such as at Drummie, Golspie. Some of the initial workforce involved in establishing this operation will come from their current factory in Orkney and would need temporary accommodation. The preference is to house them within the site but in dwellings separated from the industrial activities by suitable screening and landscaping towards Dudgeon Drive. It is also intended that some of these houses double as show1 demonstration homes for the products made in the factory. This arrangement would therefore not place a burden upon the housing authority or other affordable housing providers in Brora to house the workers. There will be a connection between SSH, the Highland Housing Alliance and RSLs over the development of the various house sites away from the factory and as such there would be merit in a similar arrangement for the provision and management of the affordable element of a housing development which we seek an allocation for between the factory and Dudgeon Drive.</p> <p>The housing proposals are illustrated on the attached sketch plans and involve relocation of the existing tree planted bund towards the factory which together with additional housing over the intervening land should not lead to a loss in amenity for existing adjacent residents. The sketch layout plan indicates two main areas for around 15 houses divided by an open space/play area.</p> <p>Brora Investments Ltd. Consider that the site also has sufficient additional space and so offers potential to accommodate tourism and retail uses at this southern gateway to the village, but still within the Settlement Development Area. The original plans granted consent for the Woollen Mill included facilities for visitors -cafeteria, shop, etc. It is hoped that a similar Facility can be re-established in that part with the addition of an attractive glazed feature to the front of the existing building. This will be aimed at providing a key tourist stop on the A9 within the village boundary and encouraging more visitors to use other facilities and businesses in Brora and purchase local made products.</p>	<p>TERM MANAGEMENT. HOUSING SITE TO HAVE SEPARATE ACCESS FROM SCOTIA HOUSE.</p> <p>OPPORTUNITIES MAY EXIST FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF RETAIL AND/OR TOURIST RELATED DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE TO THE WIDER NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY. PROPOSALS FOR RETAIL USES WOULD NEED TO HAVE DUE REGARD TO GENERAL POLICY 17 COMMERCE AND TO THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH IDENTIFIED IN SPP8: TOWN CENTRES AND RETAILING.</p> <p>THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE ACCESS TO THE A9 (T) WILL NEED TO BE CONSIDERED"</p> <p>The inclusion of land behind the bund located within the curtilage of Scotia House was considered as part of the early preparation to the plan. The proximity of the site to the industrial type operations was one of the issues raised in terms of promoting the site for development. The bund provides a level of noise protection from the operations at Scotia House to the housing at Dudgeon Terrace. The relocation of the bund would bring housing closer to the existing and future uses on site. The existing bund is well established and recognised as fulfilling a screening sound reduction function.</p> <p>It is noted that the project to deliver modular houses from Scotia House is an innovative approach to housing supply and will supply to affordable housing projects within the Highland area. The potential for a level of development to accommodate an incoming workforce is acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposed movement of the existing bund appears to seek to accommodate a greater level of housing than that to be utilised by the modular houses with the provision of private plots. The existing area of land between Dudgeon</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora MB Prospects	<p>There is also a growing interest from discount food operators to build smaller stores in a number of key villages throughout the Highlands. Such retailers generally compliment rather than compete directly with conventional food stores in existing communities. You will be aware of the recent Lidl development on a brownfield site on the edge of Tain, which attracts customers from East Sutherland, including Brora and Helmsdale. The development of a similar store in Brora could therefore reduce the amount of travelling involved and so help regenerate the village as a service centre. In this respect a site for a small store of less than 1000 square metres gross floor area is identified on land between the existing factory and the north end of Dudgeon Park Road.</p> <p>In initial discussions with the roads authority on the potential intensification of uses at Scotia House, the close proximity of the existing access to the Dudgeon Park Road/A9 junction and its ability to allow separation between certain uses were flagged up as issues. However, we anticipate that a traffic assessment would be required to determine if there would be merit in relocating the access further to the south east. The sketch layout submitted how this might be achieved along with key pedestrian links to and within the site. For the present we are seeking to establish the principle of the allocation of various uses through the Local Plan and would welcome the addition of appropriate "Developer Requirements".</p> <p>In conclusion, we seek changes to the new Local Plan to identify Scotia House as a key location for a range of development opportunities and to allocate the land as follows: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing, 1.0 ha., 15 houses -the proposed allocation would be a modest addition to the housing land supply but would partly cater for a need generated by an incoming work force. 2. Open space, 1.54 ha. - landscape amenity buffer and bunding, including tree planting 3. Retail, 0.54 ha. For a discount food store 4. Tourism, 0.7 ha. For a visitor centre with restaurant and shop. 5. Business and industrial uses, 3.2 ha. -there is no intention to extend 	<p>Terrace appears to have sufficient scope to accommodate the required level of worker related housing. In consideration of the longer term use for housing there should be provision of a separate access than that currently serving Scotia House.</p> <p>The Local Plan is expected to provide an adequate supply of effective land for housing and economic development. The link between housing and economic development is made in national policy through SPP 1 which states that "The planning system supports economic prosperity by identifying land of a suitable quantity and quality in the right locations to meet the need for economic development and new housing."</p> <p>The Local Plan has a sufficient supply of land for the provision of general needs housing, the development of the land beyond the bunker can provide housing development related to the business development of Scotia House.</p> <p>In regard to the wider potential for expanding the development options of the site, the representation seek the inclusion of a variety of uses to be accommodated on site. These include the addition of retail and tourism uses as well as the potential expansion of business uses to be located to the rear of Scotia House. The case for the provision of a retail unit has some merit based on the current draw to large supermarkets located outwith the Plan area. The use of land within the curtilage of Scotia House is worth further investigation for a wider range of uses would seem appropriate. Proposals for retail uses would need to have due regard to General Policy 17 Commerce and to the sequential approach identified in SPP8: Town Centres and Retailing. Further suggested compatible uses are for tourist related development.</p> <p>Intensification of uses on site will have to have regard to the impact on the access to the A9 (T).</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora MB Prospects	<p>business industrial development in the direction of existing houses. This area also includes bunding and landscaping on the west side of the factory which would remain.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Mixed use for the whole site (7.14 ha.) with a range of uses specified in the Developer Requirements column of the table. We consider that there would be no overall loss of developable business industrial land or development opportunities. Most of the land to the north and east now sought for allocation as alternative uses forms part of a very generous landscape/amenity buffer between the factory and existing housing or the A9 Trunk Road or is laid out as car parking. It is proposed that most of the business and industrial related activities including parking, loading and external storage in connection with the use of the factory as well as potential future expansion of floorspace will be provided on land to the rear, between the buildings and the railway.</p>	
<hr/>		
Inset Maps Brora H 1 East Brora Muir		
19 Ms May Ross Brora	Support allocation	Support Noted.
<hr/>		
101 Wilma Ross Brora	Support allocation.	As above
<hr/>		
284 A B Rennie Brora	<p>In summary, my objections to the plan as previously detailed were that the siting of the proposed roads and the density of the housing would dictate that the buildings would be of more than single storey construction. This would have a devastating effect on the privacy of the dwellings in Ben Mailey Gardens a matter to which the Local Plan pays lip service. There would also be an adverse effect on house values and outlook from these dwellings. (I am aware that there is no "entitlement" to a view or outlook), but sympathetic planning should take such amenities into consideration.</p> <p>As a general observation, the numbers and type of housing for which permission is sought is out of keeping with a Highland Village. The three storey buildings which have been completed and those which are</p>	<p>AMEND TEXT OF REQUIREMENTS, ADD SENTENCE TO END OF PARAGRAPH "BEN MAILEY GARDENS TO SERVE AS MAIN ACCESS, LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT FROM MUIRFIELD GARDENS TO HAVE REGARD TO CARE FACILITIES"</p> <p>The concerns regarding traffic safety are noted. The presence of the Beachview Daycare Centre and Respite Centre is acknowledged, the primary access for the development shall be through Ben Mailey Gardens with limited development served through Muirfield Gardens. The use of appropriate traffic calming measures will be considered to assist in the management of vehicle</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora H 1 East Brora Muir	<p>planned would be more appropriate in a city centre and are singularly inappropriate for a village setting. In addition, since most have been bought as investments by absentees, it would seem that the benefits accruing to the area are fairly marginal & do not ease the stated housing shortage for young local families.</p> <p>Finally, the proposed developments in the East Brora Muir area and that at Carrol House will add to the existing problem of access to the A9. Further demand will be made to the infrastructure - particularly sewage and waste water. In the event that Brora's population does rise in line with the number of proposed houses what will be the effect on medical, educational and recreational provisions?</p>	<p>movement. It is proposed that the level of development is accessed from Muirfield Gardens is limited.</p> <p>The provision of adequate infrastructure is an issue that is the subject of consideration when allocating land. Further detail on improvements to be undertaken or contributed to by developers will for more detailed discussion when proposals are formed and submitted for consideration. These issues relate to all factors that are required to facilitate a development to proceed, ie adequacy of roads, pedestrian access, water and drainage provision, flood risk, service provision etc and also the consideration of the general amenity of existing properties. The preparation of the plan involves discussion with other agencies to allow consideration of the impact on services and allow for the programming of adequate provision. The access to the A9 (T) has not been raised as a concern by the Scottish Government.</p>
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	<p>Plan should allow for possibility of access adjacent to Day Centre for limited development (possibly for elderly/amenity). This to be clearly shown with access arrow on the plan for the avoidance of doubt</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 40 Suggested capacity: 40</p>	As above
20 The Highland Council Golspie	<p>I would like to express concern that the development of this site will result in the opening up of the current dead end at Muirfield Road. This would introduce traffic flow past the Beachview Day Care Centre and the Respite Centre. Can I take it that there will be the introduction of traffic calming measures as there may be conflict with traffic between pedestrian movements between the two centres?</p>	As above
108 R G Sim Brora	<p>How can this possibly be acceptable to any person with a modicum of common sense.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present roads cannot cope. 2. Present sewage system cannot cope. 3. Present access to A9 cannot cope. 	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora H 1 East Brora Muir		
	Yet this plus Carrol House plus Marine Hotel will go ahead when private requests at St Ronans and Little Wardie are refused it smells of something untoward.	
16 Mr & Mrs Violet and Harry Hastings Brora	Have concerns regarding the formation of access to the site from Muirfield Road. The existing traffic levels are busy at present serving both existing housing and to the Beachview Daycare Centre and Respite Centre. There are a lot of young children in the area and the playpark is situated on a blind corner. There is also a lot of on-street parking with little off-street parking available.	As above
267 S M Clarke Brora	The matter of access would be of some concern to us.	As above
26 Ms Fiona Holliday Brora	The volume of traffic already turning into the main A9 poses a hazard with numerous accidents happening on a regular basis. This access would be used by the new houses. This traffic then has a knock on effect through the whole Muirfield estate and with the amount of children on the estate it will be possibly dangerous unless traffic calming is put in place before building starts. The noise level would then be a problem and would undermine the value of the properties already in the area along with the reduction of our own personal view of the sea. There are more appropriate sites around Brora that don't cause the aforementioned problems.	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2 Flood Risk	In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."

Inset Maps Brora H 2 Tordale

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora H 2 Tordale		
231 Nancy Sutherland & William Tait Brora	As owners or part of area H2 we are happy for this land to be allocated for housing.	NO CHANGE TO H2 TORDALE The allocation of land at Tordale offers an element of choice of available housing land. The allocation provides opportunity for housing development to the northern side of the settlement that has the benefit of an existing access to the A9(T).

235 Mr James Scott Beattie Brora	Objecting	As above

Inset Maps Brora H 3 West of Masonic Hall		
235 Mr James Scott Beattie Brora	Objecting	RETAIN ALLOCATION The allocation of land West of the Masonic Hall offers an element of choice of available housing land. The allocation provides opportunity for housing development to the northern side of the settlement that has the benefit of an existing access to the A9(T).

Inset Maps Brora H 4 Rosslyn Street/former Mackays yard		
106 Alex Clarke Brora	I object to the development on the following grounds: 1. Physical disruption: My home is immediately adjacent to the proposed development. A large existing building in the former McKay's yard, scheduled for demolition, is less than three feet from my west garden wall. This wall is a traditional Scots rubble/dry stone wall to which mortar has been added in the past. The demolition of the existing building and the construction of new housing nearby will inevitably cause tremor, impact and other damage to this fragile wall. My property contains a number of mature trees and bushes immediately adjacent to the wall, I do not wish their roots and crowns to be damaged by demolition, delivery and building activity.	RETAIN ALLOCATION H4 ROSSLYN STREET BUT SPLIT SITE AND CREATE NEW ALLOCATION AT FORMER MACKAYS GARAGE INSERT TEXT "MU4 FORMER MACKAYS GARAGE, 0.4HA, POTENTIAL FOR REDEVELOPMENT LIES AT THE FORMER MACKAYS YARD FOR USES CONSISTENT WITH ITS LOCATION INCLUDING REUSE OF EXISTING BUSINESS UNIT, REDEVELOPMENT FOR RESIDENTIAL USE WOULD ALSO BE APPROPRIATE, SUBJECT TO SUITABLE ACCESS AND DESIGN, AN ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL CONTAMINATION ISSUES WILL BE REQUIRED."

Inset Maps Brora H 4 Rosslyn Street/former Mackays yard

I am concerned that my garden to the east of the site will be affected by dust, vibration and noise during demolition/construction.

2. Access; The east entrance to the proposed housing site is 20-25 yards from the access gate to my property. The road feeding both these entrances is the A9, narrowed to single lane traffic.

I am concerned about noise, vibration and dust/debris pollution from lorries accessing/exiting and loading/unloading next door to my gates.

I am concerned that the busy but narrow road running alongside our two properties will be blocked or choked by prolonged building work traffic on the McKay's Yard site.

I am concerned that dust/rubble/other physical pollution from the site and the lorries serving it will degrade the road and pavement outside my house.

I am concerned that access to the site will not conform to local and national regulations regarding access to arterial roads, thus compromising local traffic and pedestrian safety.

3. Noise; My house is less than 50 yards from the building site.

I am a writer and I both live and work at the Rockpool Cottage property.

I am concerned about disruption to my home and professional life from noise emanating from the site during demolition/delivery/construction.

4. Curtilage/Ambience; My house was built in 1840 and is a Grade B Listed property, and sits to the east of the site. To the west side of the site are other Victorian stone buildings. Facing the site are a row of old stone cottages and small houses.

I am concerned that the housing to be built in the new site will be out of character with other properties to the east and to the west of the site and facing it unless the new properties are constructed and decorated with the Victorian/Edwardian materials of the immediately surrounding properties.

DELETE SECOND SENTENCE FROM H4.

The former Mackays Garage site has lain disused sine vacation of the site by its former user, potential lies in the site for it's reuse for similar business type uses, however the potential for the redevelopment of the site for housing would be appropriate given surrounding uses. The delivery of any development on the site would be controlled by planning conditions and will respect the amenity of adjacent existing uses. The development has the benefit of an existing access to the trunk road that can be utilised. Proposals to utilise an alternative access will be subject to consultation with the Scottish Government Trunk Roads Authority.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora H 4 Rosslyn Street/former Mackays yard	I am worried that the financial value of my historic property - and that of surrounding properties - will be reduced by having a major new build constructed immediately adjacent to them.	
125 Tulloch Homes Ltd Inverness	Redevelopment of Rosslyn Yard, Brora for 20 residential flats. Outline application will be submitted this month. While the future of this site may be determined by current or pending planning applications you may wish to recognise the principle of redeveloping this "brownfield" site to appropriate residential/tourist type uses in the Deposit Plan.	As above
214 Scottish Water Glasgow	Thank you for the above report. We acknowledge receipt of this document and shall investigate further before making comment.	As above
158 Mary Fielding Brora	With reference to the planning application submitted by Tulloch Limited for the development at Rosslyn Yard, Rosslyn Street, Brora, as a neighbour I must object very strongly to this development, the position of flats in a residential neighbourhood is completely out of character, and not as previously listed in the Local Plan. The access road to the site - if you are not aware - is half way up a hill, and the traffic is already accelerating ready to leave the village - or has just entered the village. Living where I do - across the road - it is very obvious that any access to this site is very difficult, and the thoughts of 15 residential flats fill me with horror. I also note that Rockpool is a listed building, and flats next door will be completely out of character. One other point I must make that I think it is very bad of Tulloch's to submit this application over the Christmas and New Year period - what was said about putting these things out over holiday periods so they would go through on the nod!!	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora H 4 Rosslyn Street/former Mackays yard		
547 Mrs M Jaffrey Brora	I wish to object to the proposed housing planned to the entry to Brora from the South on Rosslyn Street. This is an incredibly dangerous part of the A9 Trunk road. If planning/trunk road authority will not allow housing on the entry to Brora from the north on the A9 (Victoria Road) East Brora Muir side where there are excellent sight lines, how on earth could they have granted permission for the south entry. There is something seriously amiss with the process of consideration and planning by both bodies.	As above
213 Mhari Scott & Darren MacLeod Brora	Support only if entrance to houses is located at the north end of the site, garage area. If entrance is at south end, beside 'Punta Alta', then we object. Also support houses being built on site - not flats.	As above
569 Sutherland Country Homes Brora	Apologies for delay in our response. We are currently in the process of developing the Rosslyn Street site and would hope to have the first house under construction within the next few months.	NOTED.
576 The Scottish Government Edinburgh	TS02 H4 at Brora Inset Plan 3.1 Inset Plan 3.1 for site H4 at Brora comprising of 15 housing units Given the strategic role of the trunk road network, there is a general presumption against new trunk road accesses, highlighted in SPP 17; therefore, a proposal for a new trunk road access for development must be appropriately appraised in terms of need, location and access, to determine the potential trunk road impact, public transport access and Travel Plan content. SPP 17 states in paragraph 21: Development Plan strategies should aim where appropriate to reduce the need to use strategic routes for short local journeys. Development at strategic road junctions should be resisted unless the development is integrated with existing settlements through local public transport, new and existing cycle and footpath networks and not be dependent for local	NOTED. The allocation at H4 Rosslyn Street/former Mackays yard is to split into two separate allocations. The westerly part of the site forms an allocation for a 9 house plots development. This site has the benefit of planning permission and a formed access to the A9(T), this has been the subject of consultation and agreement with the Trunk Roads Authority. The easterly portion of the site has the benefit of a pre-existing access to the A9(T), a currently submitted planning application considers the relocation of the access, this has been the subject of consultation with the Trunk Roads Authority.

Inset Maps Brora H 4 Rosslyn Street/former Mackays yard

journeys on the strategic road network. Other significant travel generating developments should be similarly integrated.

Moreover, paragraph 72 states:
direct access on to a strategic road should be avoided as far as practicable.
Additionally, PAN 66 Annex B states in paragraph 16:

there is a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road and motorway network.
Where access is proposed to be taken from the strategic road network, it will be recommended that alternative access should be taken from a local road, given the presumption against new accesses on the trunk road network.

Given the above, Transport Scotland would ask that the following statement be included within the Plan.

It should be noted that there is a Scottish Government policy of a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road network. Where a new or significantly improved junction is proposed to facilitate development, within the transport accessibility assessment for a specific land use allocation, appropriate justification of such a strategy will require to be provided in support of such an access strategy. This will enable Transport Scotland to determine if such a justification is sufficient to set aside this policy.

In addition, the Scottish Government policy of a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road network should be added as another physical constraint in Policy 10.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Dingwall

Category 2 Flood Risk

In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."

Inset Maps Brora H 5 South of Academy Street

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora H 5 South of Academy Street		
554 Mrs C I Gunn Brora	Owner of H5 Object to housing	DO NOT RETAIN ALLOCATION H5 SOUTH OF ACADEMY STREET BUT RETAIN LAND WITHIN SDA. The Council acknowledge the views of the landowner on the release of the site for housing development at this point. The site will be removed as an allocation but retained within the settlement boundary.
235 Mr James Scott Beattie Brora	Objecting	As above
525 Andrew Bridles & Lesley Graham Brora	We strongly object to any plans to build on the open fields near to our property (Rosemount). There are currently two large building sites in Brora, do we really need any more? The current Tulloch development will have a great impact on the village and just who can afford these new homes? We do not need any more holiday/2nd homes and clearly all the latest developments are priced well beyond the means of locals. Enough is enough, we cannot afford to loose any more greenfield land.	As above
Inset Maps Brora H 6 Old woollen mill		
11 Mr James Fraser Brora	The boundary depicted in the Deposit Draft Local Plan incorrectly indicates the extent of the development site that has the benefit of planning permission. The neighbour notification form obliterates the Mill Road, the approved planning application for the development shows no interference with the road.	The Deposit Draft Local Plan does not correctly reflect the extent of the development site at H6 the old woollen mill and does not concur with that of the approved scheme currently under development. The next draft of the plan will address this issue and correctly reflect the approved site boundary and the conditions attached therein. The approved development does not interfere with the continued use of the Mill Lane.
15 Mr Alistair Brian Risk Brora	The boundary depicted in the Deposit Draft Local Plan incorrectly indicates the extent of the development site that has the benefit of planning permission. The neighbour notification form obliterates the Mill Road, the approved planning application for the development shows no interference with the road.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora H 6 Old woollen mill		
125 Tulloch Homes Ltd Inverness	Brora H6 former Woollen Mill. I can advise that development has commenced on this site under planning permission as noted. At this time I anticipate that this site will be built-out within the provisions of these permissions.	Noted.

311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2 Flood Risk	In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."

Inset Maps Brora MU 1 Former radio station		
297 Mr Iain M Sutherland Brora	Support plan for housing at the former radio station. This is an area of Brora which is in need of upgrading and renovation. The only viable use for this area would in my view be housing given the amenity and attraction of the site.	NO CHANGE TO MU1 FORMER RADIO STATION The former radio station is allocated within the current draft plan for redevelopment for recreational type uses. The plan does not seek to develop the site for residential use, location and juxtaposition with wider recreational uses makes the location more appropriate for recreational related use. The potential for development of the site for housing raises concerns regarding issues on Coastal Defence and Flood Risk.

347 Sandi Grieve Brora	<p>We have read with interest the above report, particularly in relation to the former Radio Station site in Brora (site ref MU1). We object to some of the responses to the checklist questions in Appendix 3 SEA matrices for proposed site allocations.</p> <p>This is a very exposed and vulnerable site. The SEPA flood risk map shows the site to be immediately adjacent to the area at risk from coastal flooding. It is hard to find the exact height of the front of the radio station, but there is a 6m spot height above that elevation on Harbour Road as an indication of the height.</p> <p>I have attached the response to a proposed housing development on the site sent to the planning department by SEPA in 2005. Paragraph 2.1 is particularly appropriate</p>	As above

Inset Maps Brora MU 1 Former radio station

2.1 SEPA holds no records of historical flooding of the site but refers to recent research (Scottish Executive Central Research Unit Environment Group Research Programme: Research Findings No. 19 Climate Change. Flood Occurrences Review 2002) which suggests that coastal areas below the 5.0m contour to ordnance datum may be at risk of tidal flooding. SEPA would also wish to point out that, under the High Emissions" scenario of UKCIP02, sea levels along the east coast may rise by up to 0.62m by the 2080's.

There is evidence of coastal erosion both there and further along the coast at the far end of 'Gleneagles' golf course. Indeed it surprises me that this is not mapped as an area of potential flooding.

The environmental report raises the following questions:

Q21 : Is the allocation at risk from coastal or fluvial flooding?

Q26 : Will the allocation have a significant impact on the local landform

Q27 : Will the allocation affect or be affected by coastal erosion.

The answer to all these questions is given as no. We object to this because the combination of erosion and flooding risk makes this site very vulnerable and certainly not suitable for housing. This remains a future concern.

That car park area is being increasingly used by bird watchers. It seems to be a recognised 'Twitching' site these days. The area also has some industrial archaeological importance, yet to be assessed. I would have thought the response to Q16 and 19 could be stronger. The banking provides a habitat for sand martin nesting amongst other things. These last tie in well with the proposed environmental interpretive use of the site, protected in some way.

I do support that part of the local plan Brora 3.1 MU1 if any changes are in keeping with a very fragile environment. However I would be opposed to housing in that area on the rounds of instability, flood risk and dangers of erosion, sewage, waste and drainage disposal, erosion to the back dunes on Salt St if used for vehicle access during building and extra traffic, loss of habitat etc.

The following is an expansion of some of these points and some supplementary ideas.

Inset Maps Brora MU 1 Former radio station

Brora has much to offer visitors. Few know about the beautiful beaches though - indeed people can stay a week without finding the long sandy beach at the Golf Course. There really is a need for clear signing at an appropriate place on the main road telling what it has to offer, and good signposts. The Golf Beach, Town Beach, Back Beach, and the Dunrobin/Golspie walk, Brora Loch, Distillery, Comin Road walk, Heritage Centre, Ice House, Harbour, and something to do with the history of the Bell Pits etc to try to get people to stop in Brora which would help local business. One of the jewels is the Back Beach car park area. 'Twitchers' regularly come to the Back Beach car park en route from Loch Fleet and other places and there are seals and otters as well as birds. Even surfers are seen there, winter and summer! Many come and sit and watch the sea or walk along the coast towards Golspie. It is a busy wee car park.

It was good to see the signs improved and the fencing painted this year and was beginning to look a bit sad. Part of the charm of that area is that it is small so children and animals can run through there in safety. The access is not good for vehicles, the bend at Salt St from Market St or Harbour Rd copes with traffic at present but could not cope with an increase. Neither could the small road over the dunes - houses vibrate already if any heavy traffic goes in. There really needs to be another access from the town end of Market St to preserve the character of that lovely little car park/picnic area if any development takes place.

The radio station is the one blot on the landscape and it would be good if this area was put to a better use. Some kind of interpretative or recreational use would seem to be appropriate here, at the one place where visitors, especially disabled visitors, can easily access the sea. However it would need to be environmentally sensitive (as has happened in other areas), perhaps further back from the sea and not visible from coastal walks. At present the landscape from the beaches is ruined by this intrusive building. It would also be good if 'Gleneagles' golf course was reinstated. The land seems to have fallen into disrepair recently.

Visitors want to access the sea. It has been improving down there in Lower Brora. It is good the plan has the vision to keep it going that way.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora MU 1 Former radio station		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2 Flood Risk	In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application."
<hr/>		
Inset Maps Brora I 1 Adjoining industrial estate		
66 Mr Charles Sutherland Brora	Support allocation.	Support noted.
<hr/>		
238 Mr & Mrs Dennis & Isobel Pryde Brora	<p>I object to the proposal to include an extension to the existing Industrial Estate in Brora for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. The following statement is made in the written comments under Prospects :- "Although the existing industrial is not fully occupied". The statement is self explanatory and by extending the Industrial Estate before full occupation of the existing Industrial Estate is fully occupied is a nonsense, particularly at a time when Council expenditure is in dire straits with over expenditure on various projects now accepted as the norm.</p> <p>2. Yet again the Highland Council intend to impose Planning Blight on land in my ownership. For the avoidance of doubt I have attached a plan showing the land in my ownership. Planning often quote in their advice to Councillors that "if a scheme is not programmed and imminent the Council have no right to protect the land". It is worth noting that this proposed extension and environmental improvements existed in the Local Plan currently under revision for the full duration of that local plan and it may have existed in older local plans. Having been employed in Roads and Transport I was aware that the proposed extension had the support of the then Divisional Engineer as the extension would provide a convenient link for vehicles from the Council Depot located in the Industrial Estate to the proposed Brora Bypass which I note is at long last removed from the proposed local plan but a written statement is to be inserted. This statement requires the approval of the Scottish Executive as the Trunk Road Authority before it can be inserted in the revised local plan. The only change to the plan which would resolve my objection would be the removal of the proposed</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BRORA I1 ADJOINING INDUSTRIAL ESTATE BUT REDUCE EXTENT OF ALLOCATION TO WESTERN BOUNDARY.</p> <p>The intention of allocating additional land to the industrial estate is to ensure that there is adequate provision for potential future development. There is a need to ensure that there is scope for business to develop and expand, this goes hand in hand with the provision of a available housing land. Scotia House is seeing the growth of business users and the continued growth of business/industrial users here may see opportunities for downstream business development. Allocating land to accommodate business/industrial uses will set in place the principle of expansion of the industrial site. The provision of necessary infrastructure can then be provided as required.</p> <p>Given the level of allocation outwith the land in your ownership there is not a requirement for the inclusion of all the allocation.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora I 1 Adjoining industrial estate	extension from the proposed Local Plan or for the Council to enter negotiations to purchase the land in advance of the proposal	
183 Mr Colin MacKay Brora	I am objecting to this as the current units on the existing estate are sitting empty and you want to build more!! In the past you had a milk?? Factory which stank the whole area and I certainly don't want similar on the edge of my property or noise pollution. As I have lived on Park Terrace all my life I recall the Council telling everyone on Park Terrace that a belt of trees would be planted between the estate and the boundary fence, this was never done therefore I don't really believe your promises and am very sceptical as to what will happen once planning is through. I still have my reservations about the telephone mast which was installed without our consent and the health hazard that may be incurred.	<p>National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. It also acknowledges planning's role in advancing the vision for rural Scotland is to enable and create opportunities for development in sustainable locations wherever appropriate e.g. where infrastructure capacity and good access exist, or can be provided at reasonable cost, or to meet justifiable social and economic objectives.</p> <p>The link between housing and economic development is made in national policy through SPP 1 which states that "The planning system supports economic prosperity by identifying land of a suitable quantity and quality in the right locations to meet the need for economic development and new housing."</p> <p>The allocation of an effective land supply to accommodate growth in economic activity, available units may not be suitable for emerging business and there is a need to have flexibility to cater for differing needs. Any proposals forthcoming to extend the existing infrastructure at the industrial estate would be the subject of planning application, the need to address impact on neighbouring properties would be addressed through this process.</p>
266 Catherine Lambie Brora	Provided I get adequate screening between my boundary and any new development.	As above
246 Mr Stephen Price Brora	Provided that there is a buffer zone at the rear (bedroom area) of the adjacent houses in Park court. Perhaps, raised ground with trees to block noise & view from the industrial area. Remember, we have bedrooms on the ground floor.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora I 1 Adjoining industrial estate		
550 Mr & Mrs S Johnson Brora	<p>We wish to object to the above on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. The map provided is inaccurate in two pertinent respects:</p> <p>A) It completely omits the industrial unit currently used by Harry Gow for the production of Capaldi's ice cream, the refrigeration units of which operate on a twenty-four hour basis. This unit lies immediately to the rear of our property. If inserted, this unit would substantially narrow the strip of land shown on the map decreasing its width by approximately fifty per cent from Strathmore eastwards. We believe that the current distance between the rear of our property and this unit should be maintained with no further development therein.</p> <p>B) The area shown as H6 is not a projected area for development but is currently being developed by Tulloch. The western boundary of this site is actually fenced up to the eastern boundary of the industrial unit, currently being operated as a call centre, next to Harry Gow's. Hence the area between these two sites running southwards to the rear of numbers 1 to 3 Park Terrace, shown on the map as unused land not for development is in reality currently being developed for residential housing.</p> <p>2. There is, at present, unused business and industrial capacity in Brora, at its southern entrance at what was previously Hunter's Woollen Mill, now partly used by Edward MacKay, which is currently advertised as 'To Let'. Additionally, the area designated as H4 contains a current industrial site, previously used by Edward MacKay, on its eastern border. The reallocation of this for housing and the creation of a new area for business and industrial use at I1 would seem to unnecessarily concentrate business and industry at the rear of Park Terrace by either removing the extant site, part of H4, from Rosslyn Street or ignoring current overcapacity within Brora as identified above.</p> <p>3. When the map is corrected to include the omissions detailed in [1] above and taking into account the concentration of land for business and industrial use to the rear of Park Terrace as detailed in [2] above, we feel that this would place an undue pressure upon Stafford Terrace and the junctions between it and the A9 and it and the new development presently being built and showing as H6 on the map.</p>	As above

Inset Maps Brora I 1 Adjoining industrial estate

When taken into account, this new development will have a significant impact on the traffic flow within this area. We believe, but stand to be corrected, that on completion a one-way system will come into force directing traffic from Park Terrace through this new development and on to the A9 via Stafford Terrace the junction of which will be to the rear of the property 'Belmont' as shown on the map. This traffic will of course combine with the new residential traffic created by the H6 residential development, which is not insignificant, and both will be in addition to the traffic currently using this exit on to the A9 from the existing industrial estate.

The proposed local plan aims to increase potential business and industrial development by about one hundred and fifty per cent around the existing industrial estate. The sole entrance to and exit from any new development would be via Stafford Terrace and its junction with the A9. Given all of the above, we do not believe that the impact of the potential extra pressure, which would be placed on Stafford Terrace and its current and soon to be created junctions by this size of development, has been properly evaluated.

4. Environmentally, it would appear to make sense not to create such a large block of land for industrial development in this area [1] especially given existing overcapacity which already exists in Brora as detailed in [2] above. We do not feel that such a large development as proposed, added to the existing industrial estate, would be commensurate with the general balance which exists within Brora. All unused land would disappear from behind Park Terrace and any balance of residential / business and industrial / and unused land would be lost with the ensuing effects of a disproportionate deterioration in the quality of life for the residents of Park and Stafford Terrace and the loss of habitat for local flora and fauna.

Inset Maps Brora MB Inset 3.1 Brora

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Brora MB Inset 3.1 Brora		
297 Mr Iain M Sutherland Brora	<p>I refer to the meeting I attended in Brora when the draft local plan for the area was shown and discussed.</p> <p>I did mention at that meeting as to whether the area next to 3. West of the Masonic Hall could include the area between the hall and the field earmarked for housing. This I have marked on the enclosed aerial photograph. I own this piece of land and would like in the future to see the 2 buildings namely the old School Canteen and adjoining Workshop removed and perhaps a house or housing put in their place.</p>	The potential for the redevelopment on this area of land can be pursued within the context of the general policies of the plan.
Inset Maps Helmsdale G General Comment		
243 HSCHT Dornoch	The 4 industrial units sited at the entrance to Rockview Place are unsightly and in poor condition, and I would suggest inappropriately sited. It would enhance the area if these sites could be included for housing, and industrial units provided on a more suitable and less visible site e.g. 11.	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that the relocation of industrial and business units to a more suitable location on land allocated for industry and business 11 North of Industrial Estate. The redevelopment of these sites will likely depend on potential redevelopment of the site. In terms of the suitability of redeveloping the site for housing, without an allocation, it is likely that this would be considered appropriate given surrounding uses. At present, however, the existing uses of the site are business/industrial and the reallocation of the site for housing would be inappropriate at this time. The Prospects section of Helmsdale highlights the potential for relocation of businesses.</p>
5 Mr Grahame Lippitt Helmsdale	General support for all allocations subject to suitable access at H2	Support Noted.
Inset Maps Helmsdale H 1 North of Rockview Place		
149 Mr & Mrs S Amey Helmsdale	Support allocation. Your letter Sulp Deposit draft dated 29th Nov 2007 refers.	Support noted.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Helmsdale H 1 North of Rockview Place		
64 Mr John Innes Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
208 Leonnie Keith Helmsdale	Supporting	As above
167 Carol Sutherland Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
85 Agnes Sutherland Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
534 Miss Diane M Bell Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
70 Jane MacDonald Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
83 Mrs Anne Sutherland Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
523 S Blance Associates Helmsdale	<p>I would like to express the following comments with regard to it on behalf of Mr & Mrs Blance.</p> <p>I note that part of the field owned by Mr & Mrs Blance has been included in the plan as an area for possible housing sites ie part of H1 on the plan and the field that is contiguous with the Council owned fields in that section. (marked in red in the attached plan)</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Blance are surprised and disappointed that the entire field that they own has not been included not least because the current proposal will potentially pose significant problems for access to the part of the field that has not been included.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE TO H1 NORTH OF ROCKVIEW PLACE</p> <p>There is a need to allocate a sufficient supply of effective land to provide for the future housing development needs of the settlement. The potential for developing on brownfield locations are limited and appropriate greenfield locations have been identified, with proximity to existing development and services. The allocation consists of land previously allocated in the South East Sutherland Local Plan with the addition of areas of underutilised croft land to the east. The allocation is located immediately to existing housing development and can be readily serviced and accessed from Rockview Place/Simpson Crescent.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Helmsdale H 1 North of Rockview Place		
	To leave just over half an acre of land in that location makes little sense to them. I refer to my previous correspondence which I believe makes their views clear.	The consideration of a detailed application will include issues such as traffic safety and safe routes to school.
186 Mrs Margaret Sutherland Helmsdale	The proposal is to extend housing into an area which has long been greenbelt, thus extending the boundary of the village. Very concerned about the increase in traffic density for an area which is currently housing the local playpark. Pedestrian routes to and from playpark are also a concern. Concerns about the value of our properties which at the moment enjoy open outlooks.	As above
243 HSCHT Dornoch	To allow for better use of this area we would suggest incorporating the current play area for housing use, which would allow improved play provision to be sited more suitably within the area as part of any development.	RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 NORTH OF ROCKVIEW PLACE BUT AMEND TEXT. INSERT AT END OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS "Developer to provide of an overall layout for the development of the site. Potential may exist for the inclusion of the adjacent play area within the development subject to the early provision of adequate replacement in the overall scheme. " The Council agree that the development of the allocation at Rockview Place could usefully integrate the play area land within an overall scheme for the delivery of housing and required provision of play facilities. At this point in time it would not be appropriate to allocate the play area for housing development , however, the developer requirements can include reference to the potential to embrace the play area as part of a overall layout including provision of adequate compensatory play facilities.
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Consideration should be given to extending the area of H1 to include the play area making it clear that the development of the revised H1 will include a rationalised and improved play provision.	As above

Inset Maps Helmsdale H 2 West of primary school

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Helmsdale H 2 West of primary school		
105 Mr John A Sinclair Helmsdale	<p>I have noticed from your H2 plan that you have half my garden ground marked off for development on the north west side of my house.</p> <p>According to my title deeds my garden ground extends from the boundary wall of Sunnyhill property to the boundary fence on the northside, which I have shaded off on the map and is already fenced off and surrounded by Fir Trees. I object to the development on the grounds of, views, privacy, increase in traffic, noise and devaluation of existing property.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H2 WEST OF PRIMARY SCHOOL BUT AMEND BOUNDARY TO EXCLUDE GARDEN GROUND.</p> <p>The identification of the allocation did not intend to allocate land that is unavailable for development or that forms part of existing garden ground unless sought by the owner. The next draft of the Sutherland Plan will remove the areas indicated on your objection plan.</p> <p>The detail of any proposals for the remainder of the allocation will be the subject of a detailed planning application that addresses details relating to amenity of existing properties as well as access provision, traffic management, design, layout and issues relating to surface water drainage (See General Policy 14) .</p>
289 Jennifer MacLeod Belgium	<p>Attached map shows ground next to "Andene" as part of H2. As council is aware this is not available, and is only vehicular access to "Ardene".</p> <p>Consider building development on H2 would constitute risk of flooding from hill behind.</p>	As above
5 Mr Grahame Lippitt Helmsdale	Proposal acceptable subject to suitable access being provided.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION WEST OF PRIMARY SCHOOL BUT CHANGE ALLOCATION TO LONGER TERM AND COJOIN WITH EXISTING LT NORTH HELMSDALE.</p> <p>The provision of a suitable access to serve this allocation cannot be provided from Strath Road, potential options would include improvement to the school access or from the golf course road as part of a wider allocation. This will require more significant investment and is for consideration in the longer term.</p>
3 Mr Rod Harrison Helmsdale	Proposal acceptable subject to suitable access being provided.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Helmsdale H 3 St John's Church		
150 Mrs Anne Sutherland Helmsdale	Support allocation.	Support noted.
27 G H Sutherland Helmsdale	Helmsdale is in need of housing and work for locals, the more you build the better as long as they are done tastefully I have no objections.	As above
100 L.L Philip Brora	Planning already granted for 5 units.	AMEND TEXT OF H3 ST JOHN'S CHURCH CHANGE Housing Capacity to "5 units" Noted. The capacity of the revised planning permission will be amended in the text.
121 Mr John S Bell Helmsdale	To see flats being built is very good it is an eyesore and to see it being developed is very exciting must say I am in favour. Access to main road is a number one priority.	Noted.
Inset Maps Helmsdale H 4 Simpson Crescent		
149 Mr & Mrs S Amey Helmsdale	Support allocation. Your letter Sulp Deposit draft dated 29th Nov 2007 refers.	Support noted.
208 Leonnie Keith Helmsdale	Supporting	As above
534 Miss Diane M Bell Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
83 Mrs Anne Sutherland Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
70 Jane MacDonald Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Helmsdale H 4 Simpson Crescent		
167 Carol Sutherland Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
64 Mr John Innes Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
85 Agnes Sutherland Helmsdale	Support allocation.	As above
24 Ms Jane MacNicol Helmsdale	Please can we have more information about this?	NO CHANGE
		The intention of the allocation at H4 Simpson Crescent at this stage in the Local Plan process is to determine the appropriateness of the location for development in consultation with the general public on public and private bodies. The requirement section of the allocation indicates the anticipated level of development that may take place on the site along with further development considerations. The actual form of development will be guided by the site requirements although proposals may come forward for a different form of development, this would be assessed on its merits.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	4.1 Helmsdale In relation to allocation H4 SNH supports the inclusion of the relevant text in the Developer Requirements to safeguard the scenic qualities of the raised beach formation.	NOTED.
Inset Maps Helmsdale MU 1 Shore Street		
495 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	There is a Category A listed bridge (Helmsdale Bridge) to the north-west of this land allocation. Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation. However, the scale and density of this development will be key to protecting the setting of the bridge and retaining it as a focal point within views of the town. We therefore recommend that text is included in the Developer Requirements for this site so that such effects can be avoided and	RETAIN ALLOCATION MU1 SHORE STREET BUT AMEND TEXT OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO ADD AFTER LAST SENTENCE, "THE DESIGN OF THE SITE SHOULD ADDRESS ANY POTENTIAL IMPACT ON THE SETTING OF THE A-LISTED HELMSDALE BRIDGE".

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Helmsdale MU 1 Shore Street	suggest: "The design of the site should address any potential impact on the setting of the A-listed Helmsdale Bridge".	General Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage takes account of the potential impact of development on heritage features. It is accepted that this can be highlighted within the allocation requirements.
500 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	There is a Category A listed bridge (Helmsdale Bridge) to the north-west of this land allocation. Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation. However, the scale and density of this development will be key to protecting the setting of the bridge and retaining it as a focal point within views of the town. We therefore recommend that text is included in the Developer Requirements for this site so that such effects can be avoided and suggest: "The design of the site should address any potential impact on the setting of the A-listed Helmsdale Bridge".	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 1 Flood Risk	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION ADD TEXT IN RELATION TO FLOOD RISK AND DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS AT LAST SENTENCE "Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid identified flood risk area. Proposals for the redevelopment of the site will be expected to produce a masterplan addressing issues in regard to land assembly, relocation of existing uses, topographical issues and visual appearance"</p> <p>The existing business use on site would ideally be located along with other similar uses on the industrial uses this would give opportunity for the redevelopment of the site for a variety of uses. The potential to expand visitor interpretation, business and residential development all to the benefit of the wider community. Difficulties over land assembly and the relocation of the garage, the delivery of development of on a sloping site and visual appearance of the development would benefit from the preparation of overall guidance. Built development will avoid identified flood risk areas.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Helmsdale MU 1 Shore Street		
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	The draft should emphasise the importance of this site for the continuing development of Helmsdale. Consideration should be given to the preparation of a development brief for this area. Local plan should be used to consider the benefits of rationalising the provision of industrial premises generally including inappropriate uses of sites such as the residential area around Rockview Place.	As above

280 Mr John Audsley Helmsdale	I have only lived here for 3 and a half years and in all that time the garage has never been a problem. I think when you are coming over the bridge it's the first sight of Helmsdale and the village and it's nice to see all the old houses and river. I feel the space should be used for landscaping or picnic area. The area is a great place to sit in the summer and my family enjoy the view. I would hate for there to be more business units or new house built. I think it would be great to use the space for the markets that go on everywhere except Helmsdale.	As above

3 Mr Rod Harrison Helmsdale	Support redevelopment of site to improve approach to Helmsdale and also remove vehicles from the river front.	As above

Inset Maps Helmsdale I 1 North of industrial estate		
523 S Blance Associates Helmsdale	<p>I note that it is proposed that the area marked 11 on the plan, which is currently used for industrial purposes, could be used to address additional industrial requirements including office premises. It would therefore appear more logical to include in the plan the top part of their field, which is contiguous with L1, possibly for that purpose.</p> <p>As you will be aware there is not just a shortage of housing in the village but there are no office premises in the village and as an example my business faces the prospect of having to use the croft land that I work just now for that purpose in the future. Inclusion of the entire field would give Mr & Mrs Blance the option of using the field for mixed housing and office purposes and thus address a very real requirement in the village.</p> <p>As it stands the owners would not be inclined to sell just under half of the field for building purposes as the field would be of greater use to them, for other purposes, as a complete field. I would suggest that it</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION HELMSDALE I1, EXTEND BOUNDARY TO EAST TO INCLUDE FURTHER LAND FOR POTENTIAL BUSINESS/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT. EXTEND SDA TO INCORPORATE EXTENSION.</p> <p>The allocation of croft land adjacent to Rockview Place seeks to provide an effective site for housing development. The extension of the allocation of the boundary to the A9 would not be appropriate for residential use. The access of croft land to the rear of the allocation may be addressed by including a vehicular access to the croft land to be included as a requirement of residential development.</p> <p>In regard to the lack of office accommodation within the settlement there are opportunities within existing buildings</p>

Inset Maps Helmsdale I 1 North of industrial estate

makes more sense and is of greater benefit to the wider community for the entire field to be used for these purposes and would ask that the area shaded in blue in the attached plan is also included in the Local Plan.

within the settlement. The existing allocations do have capacity for the development of various business' related buildings. The development of this business/industrial land should be accessed via Glebe Terrace to avoid conflict with residential development where possible, any extension to the industrial site would be encouraged to utilise the same access.

Inset Maps Helmsdale LT North Helmsdale

329 Mr & Mrs Wood
Helmsdale

This is croft land and is still used as such.
2. The site is unsuitable as there is no access.
3. There is insufficient demand for housing on this scale in the village.
4. There is insufficient employment in the village to sustain a development of this size.
5. There is no infrastructure to support the development.
6. This development would be a strain on the village's limited resources and the local economy.
7. With the recent closure of one of two food shops in the village, the remaining one has now been re-classed as a convenience store and already does not meet the needs of the village.
8. There is no police presence in the village. With trouble being caused by some young people the situation would only be exacerbated by a substantial increase in population, particularly if it brought with it large numbers of unemployed.

RETAIN ALLOCATION LT NORTH HELMSDALE BUT INCLUDE WITH EXISTING H2 WEST OF PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The plan has allocated the land at North Helmsdale for Long Term provision looking to the potential future expansion of the site and the ability to provide housing land for the longer term development of the settlement. The development of a site of this size would take a considerable time given the low level of demand within the community, but there is a need to consider options for the longer term development of the settlement. The provision of an appropriate access for the development of this area of land is likely to require the development of the adjacent area of allocated land H2 West of Primary School. The development of H2 will require the provision of an adequate access, potentially utilising the access to the school. This will require more significant investment and is for consideration in the longer term.

National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. It also acknowledges planning's role in advancing the vision for rural Scotland is to enable and create opportunities for development in sustainable locations wherever appropriate e.g. where infrastructure capacity and good access exist, or can be provided at reasonable cost, or to meet justifiable social and economic objectives.

The link between housing and economic development is

Inset Maps Helmsdale LT North Helmsdale

made in national policy through SPP 1 which states that "The planning system supports economic prosperity by identifying land of a suitable quantity and quality in the right locations to meet the need for economic development and new housing."

The provision of an effective land supply for both housing and employment is aimed at having the ability to deliver development opportunities to meet the needs of the development industry and to meet projected needs. The plans objectives are broadly to support existing communities through the identification of development opportunities in locations that can assist in sustaining communities and their services, infrastructure and population. The loss of local shops is symptomatic of a general decline in the vibrancy of the community and the provisions of the plan seek to promote the growth of communities and secure existing services.

Inset Maps Helmsdale MB Inset 4.1 Helmsdale

576 The Scottish Government
Edinburgh

The site reference OS indicated on the Inset Plan 4.1 for Helmsdale identifies an Opportunity Site adjacent to the A9 indicating a potential access to the A9. It should be made clear in the Plan that in the event of road-based access emerging from an appropriate appraisal, that such access should be taken from the local road network.

Given the strategic role of the trunk road network, there is a general presumption against new trunk road accesses, highlighted in SPP 17; therefore, a proposal for a new trunk road access for development must be appropriately appraised in terms of need, location and access, to determine the potential trunk road impact, public transport access and Travel Plan content.

SPP 17 states in paragraph 21:

Development Plan strategies should aim where appropriate to reduce the need to use strategic routes for short local journeys. Development at strategic road junctions should be resisted unless the development is integrated with existing settlements through local public transport, new and existing cycle and footpath networks and not be dependent for local

NOTED. NO CHANGE.

The plan reference OS refers to pre-existing open space that is offered policy protection from development. The site is currently served by an existing access to the A9(T).

Inset Maps Helmsdale MB Inset 4.1 Helmsdale

journeys on the strategic road network. Other significant travel generating developments should be similarly integrated.

Moreover, paragraph 72 states:
 direct access on to a strategic road should be avoided as far as practicable.
 Additionally, PAN 66 Annex B states in paragraph 16:

there is a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road and motorway network.
 Where access is proposed to be taken from the strategic road network, it will be recommended that alternative access should be taken from a local road, given the presumption against new accesses on the trunk road network.

Given the above, Transport Scotland would ask that the following statement be included within the Plan.

It should be noted that there is a Scottish Government policy of a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road network. Where a new or significantly improved junction is proposed to facilitate development, within the transport accessibility assessment for a specific land use allocation, appropriate justification of such a strategy will require to be provided in support of such an access strategy. This will enable Transport Scotland to determine if such a justification is sufficient to set aside this policy.

In addition, the Scottish Government policy of a presumption against new junctions on the trunk road network should be added as another physical constraint in Policy 10.

Inset Maps Edderton MB Development Factors

295 Edderton Community Council
 Edderton

Edderton Community Council welcomes the flexibility in the deposit draft Sutherland local plan regarding the settlement of Edderton in contrast to earlier plans. In particular it appreciates that area along Manse Road that is designated for mixed business/ housing development.

We wish the following matters be taken into consideration in compiling

SUPPORT NOTED.

The impact of individual development proposals are assessed on relevant infrastructure and service impacts. The provision of, or contribution to, improved infrastructure and service provision are included as conditions of approval of planning applications.

Inset Maps Edderton MB Development Factors

the
final draft:

That consideration of infrastructure changes be included to accommodate the transport demands that new housing would make, in particular the need to upgrade single-track road from the top of School Brae to the Struie Road by Aultnamain.

Inset Maps Edderton MB Prospects

147 Mr Michael A S Brown
Edderton

Further to the meeting held in Edderton Village Haft Tuesday 29th November 2006, I am writing to confirm the comments, recommendations and suggestions that I made.

Building and Development-

I support a policy of home building within the community. However, it is very important that such development is phased in stages. This will allow the Village, its character and inhabitants, to grow and integrate with change. As part of this growth careful consideration should, first, be given to existing services, such as electricity, potable and wastewater. A dialogue between Planners, Service Providers, Developers and the Community setting out the immediate needs and that of the future should be agreed prior to any planning consent being granted. Roads and Transport should also be considered with particular attention being given to the increased burden that will be placed on link roads between the Village and the A9, at the Meikle Ferry Roundabout, (A836) and the B9176 Struie Road. The Highland Council must pledge a commitment for improvement and time scale. Consideration should also be made to making better use of the Railway, such as the establishment of a "Request Stop." An area should also be set aside for industrial development. This will encourage new employment opportunities and provide some sustainability for existing jobs within (the) community. Without job creation the Village will become a "Dormitory Village,"

Crofting and Land Use-

The Local Plan should consider the promotion of Crofting, and the establishment of new homes, particularly for young people wishing to enter into farming. The control of forestry, and its spread, should also be examined. The use of land for recreational pursuits should form an

The approval of the development proposal for is tied to conditions relating to the need for improved infrastructure to be in place or agreements prior to development taking place. Planning applications are the subject of consultation with other service providers to establish if there are deficiencies to address. In relation to Edderton the application has helped stimulate progress in the provision of adequate waste water provision, the contribution of 25% affordable housing forming one phase of development and a contribution towards Edderton Primary School improvement in addition to other on-site requirements.

The Council continues to support the development of commuter rail services on the Far North Line and the continued development of the Invernet Commuter Service.

The Plan does make provision for the development of small scale business units or workplace homes to assist in the development of the economic base of the community.

The Plan Objectives and General Policies give support for the development of new crofting opportunities, as well as for the protection and enhancement of the Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage of the area, General Policy 4. The promotion of renewable energy is supported in the plan objectives section of the Plan.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Edderton MB Prospects	<p>important part of the Plan's structure.</p> <p>Care for the Environment & Renewable Energy- Care for the environment and renewable energy should be supported within the Local Plan.</p> <p>History & Tourism- Edderton and the surrounding districts are rich in history. This is an asset that should be promoted and actively encouraged, increased awareness and accessibility will encourage Tourism and bring some stimulus to Edderton and neighbour communities.</p> <p>I trust my comments and suggestions will be given careful consideration. The Sutherland Futures questionnaire is enclosed.</p>	
<hr/>		
Inset Maps Edderton H 1 West of Station Road		
501 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>There are two Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM) to the north-east of this land allocation.</p> <p>The first, Clach Chairidh or Clach Biorach (Index No. 1673), comprises a symbol stone (referred to as a Pictish standing stone in the Developer Requirements).</p> <p>The second, Carriblair (Index No. 2971) is a stone circle and cist (shown as a cairn on Inset 6.1).</p> <p>Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation. However, there is potential for the design of the development to have an adverse effect on the setting of this nationally important site. We note that wording has been included in the Developer Requirements regarding the setting of the Pictish standing stone and recommend that it be strengthened as follows: "The setting of the symbol stone (a Scheduled Ancient Monument) should be protected by an area of open space around the monument. An area of open space along the northwest edge of the plot should also be left to protect the line of sight from the stone circle (also a Scheduled Ancient Monument) and symbol stone to the hills to the west and south-west. This area of open space should also protect the peripheral views of that line of sight."</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT AMEND TEXT WITH THE INSERTION OF "The setting of the symbol stone (a Scheduled Ancient Monument) should be protected by an area of open space around the monument. An area of open space along the northwest edge of the plot should also be left to protect the line of sight from the stone circle (also a Scheduled Ancient Monument) and symbol stone to the hills to the west and south-west. This area of open space should also protect the peripheral views of that line of sight."</p> <p>The Council accept that there is a need to indicate the requirement for developers to consider the impact on the scheduled ancient monuments that exist in close proximity to the site. The existing planning permission for the development of the site has considered this issue but in the event that this permission is not implemented this should be reflected in the plan requirements.</p>

Inset Maps Edderton H 1 West of Station Road

495 Historic Scotland
Edinburgh

There are two Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM) to the north-east of this land allocation.
The first, Clach Chairidh or Clach Biorach (Index No. 1673), comprises a symbol stone (referred to as a Pictish standing stone in the Developer Requirements). The second, Carriblair (Index No. 2971) is a stone circle and cist (shown as a cairn on Inset 6.1).

As above

Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation.
However, there is potential for the design of the development to have an adverse effect on the setting of this nationally important site. We note that wording has been included in the Developer Requirements regarding the setting of the Pictish standing stone and recommend that it be strengthened as follows: "The setting of the symbol stone (a Scheduled Ancient Monument) should be protected by an area of open space around the monument. An area of open space along the northwest edge of the plot should also be left to protect the line of sight from the stone circle (also a Scheduled Ancient Monument) and symbol stone to the hills to the west and south-west. This area of open space should also protect the peripheral views of that line of sight."

114 Mr Jonathan Wotherspoon
For: For Caledonian Forestry,
Inverness

Anticipated scheme will be for 37/40 units.

RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT AMEND HOUSING
CAPACITY FIGURE TO READ "40 units"

It is noted that the planning permission granted for development of the site indicates 40 units.

Inset Maps Edderton MU 1 Adjacent Glebe Cottage

324 The Curch of Scotland General
Trustees
Edinburgh

I would confirm that the trustees support the principle of development on the two sites which you have identified at Tongue under the reference LT1 and MU2 as well as that at Edderton (ref MU1). They would certainly be willing to consider releasing them for development within the timescales set out in your letter subject to their reaching agreement with their respective tenants.

SUPPORT NOTED.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Edderton MU 1 Adjacent Glebe Cottage		
514 Mr William Ritchie Edderton	I have no wish to have any industrial units of any kind so near to our house as you propose.	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>There is a need for Local Plans to identify opportunities for housing and economic development opportunities. National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. It also acknowledged planning's role in advancing the vision for rural Scotland is to enable and create opportunities for development in sustainable locations wherever appropriate e.g. where infrastructure capacity and good access exist, or can be provided at reasonable cost, or to meet justifiable social and economic objectives.</p> <p>The link between housing and economic development is made in national policy through SPP 1 which states that "The planning system supports economic prosperity by identifying land of a suitable quantity and quality in the right locations to meet the need for economic development and new housing."</p> <p>The loss of previously allocated industrial land to housing use has set a precedent for the mix of uses; with demand existing for this style of development in the area. It is therefore necessary to identify land suitable for business development within the settlement to allow opportunity for economic growth in addition to the identified opportunities for housing. The allocation allows for the development of small scale business units or workplace units. Proposals should be compatible with surrounding uses.</p> <p>Developer requirements indicate the need for improved access to service the development.</p>
572 Mr Ross Sutherland Tain	After approximately two years of appealing against Easter Ross local plans to be granted permission to build a small house on my own land next to the proposed development site, there would seem to be a total contradiction to now allow further developments in this area? Also would it not be a waste of the councils funds to develop industrial units when there are so many units elsewhere in the Highlands lying empty?	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Edderton MU 1 Adjacent Glebe Cottage		
	With the proposed development on the other side of the village, in the region of thirty or more homes, where is the need for further development??	
543 Alister I Sutherland & Son Ltd Edderton	Land would possibly be suitable for one small workshop - existing right of way crosses through this site. Access is very narrow single track road not suitable for larger vehicles. Large area of land near station road zoned for housing - is this not enough?	As above
507 R & R Urquhart For: George Sutherland, Edderton	<p>We are instructed by George Sutherland the proprietor of Woodlands House Edderton.</p> <p>We hereby on his behalf object to any proposals to develop site MU1 as proposed by you. Mr Sutherland considers that this will have a significant adverse affect on the local amenity and in particular his property Woodlands House.</p> <p>The location for development is inappropriate.</p> <p>Please confirm that the proposed development will therefore be removed from the Deposit Plan.</p>	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 3 Flood Risk	For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a Flood Risk Assessment, however the amended policy (GP9) states that, "A Flood Risk Assessment may be necessary where a site is partially within, bordering or adjacent to the medium to high flood risk area, a small unmodelled watercourse flows within or adjacent to the site, there is historical flooding known on the site or the development may have an impact on flooding elsewhere e.g. "down slope"."

Inset Maps Edderton MB Inset 6.1 Edderton

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
<p>Inset Maps Edderton MB Inset 6.1 Edderton</p> <p>294 Mr Robin Ashby Edderton</p>	<p>I propose that the settlement area in the deposit draft Sutherland local plan be extended NW to the point where the road to Ardmore crosses the railway line. In the present proposal area H1 is realistically the only area where we can expect large enough development so that affordable housing is included. Currently there is planning permission for this site, but that does not guarantee that that the housing will be erected. If the area close to the hotel was added it would make it more attractive for another developer to provide affordable housing if the present plans do not go ahead. As the proposal is the area by the railway will most likely only attract infill housing.</p> <p>Also Inset plan 6:1 may soon be inaccurate if a submitted planning application is granted as expected. This will block access from the lane behind Carriclair Crescent to sites closer to the railway. An extension of the area would allow more flexibility of planning access from Station Road</p>	<p>The Settlement Development Area provides opportunity for infill development within the defined area subject to consideration of relevant policy issues. This provides opportunity for development of infill sites. Access to land to the east of Station Road will be available from a point to the north of Struie View. This will allow opportunity for further infill opportunities and give choice outwith the main allocation. Regard will need to be taken to the stone circle and cist Scheduled Ancient Monument at Carriclair.</p>
<p>247 Mr Brian Small Peterborough</p>	<p>I wish to object to the old croft house site and garden, called Burnside, being excluded from the Settlement Development area in Edderton. This plot of land is adjacent to the proposed mixed use site MU1, on the edge of the development area.</p> <p>The Edderton Community Council support my planning application (05/00294/OUTSU), for one house on the site. (ref: minutes 6th Sept 2005). I have deferred this application awaiting the outcome of the new development plan for Edderton.</p> <p>I would like you to consider changing the boundary of the development area to include this site.</p>	<p>AMEND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY TO INCLUDE THE EXTENT OF IDENTIFIED SITE WITHIN THE EDDERTON SDA.</p> <p>The area of land identified lies within the identified amenity land of the existing adopted local plan. The area is overgrown and the existence of previous built development is not immediately apparent. The redevelopment of existing buildings is covered by the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy although the potential for this form of development is dependant on the physical state of the existing building. Given the proximity of the site to the settlement it would be reasonable to extend the settlement development area to include the area indicated, this would not result in the loss of the open space that characterises the settlement. Proposals on the site would have to assessed against the general policies of the plan against an application and the ability of the site to be appropriately serviced and deliver satisfactory siting and design.</p>
<p>Inset Maps Pittentrail H 1 Opposite the garage</p>		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Pittentrail H 1 Opposite the garage		
562 D MacKay Rogurt	<p>Smithy House is a traditional granite stone listed building, all the other houses in this part of the village are also granite stone built.</p> <p>I can not see how modern type affordable houses could blend in with the traditional houses.</p> <p>As this land is part of my croft, it is used for crofting and grazing cows and sheep.</p> <p>It is also used for holding animals when I have to work at them in the Steading next to it.</p>	<p>DO NOT RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 OPPOSITE THE GARAGE AND AMEND SDA.</p> <p>This area has been identified to us as prime crofting land and the crofter is not keen to have it developed.</p>
536 Mr George M Murray Rogurt	<p>I really feel that this is such a dangerous site for building houses I have to object to it. This is not from a NIMBY angle but for children as there are so many vehicle movements to the garage and smithy, cars, tractors, ATVs and also the blind corner to the east where there is a lot of heavy lorries carrying timber. It may be well suited for services already there but I feel public safety must come first. There are other more suitable sites around here.</p>	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	The developability of H1 is questioned.	As above
563 J D & H MacKay Rogurt	<p>This house is used for holiday lets.</p> <p>I am concerned visitors to house in a country village would be disappointed their view and privacy would be restricted by houses which would not blend in with the tradition granite stone buildings in the area.</p> <p>The result could be a loss of visitors to the area, which would mean a loss of income to our business and other business in the village.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Pittentrail H 1 Opposite the garage		
564 Mackay Engineering Rogart	I operate an engineering and contracting business. I have to repair and move machines early mornings and late at night. I fear occupiers of the site would complain about the noise and disturb their peace, which would upset the running of my business.	As above
301 Dr & Mrs A M Cooper Rogart	We welcome the housing allocation H1. It is well located with respect to local services and consolidates the existing historical pattern of development.	Support Noted
302 Trish Rannie & Colin Philson Pittentrail	Housing allocation H1 is located within the existing historical settlement pattern of Pittentrail and is adjacent to existing local services and consequently we offer no objection to it.	As above
Inset Maps Pittentrail MU 1 Mart and adjoining land		
302 Trish Rannie & Colin Philson Pittentrail	MU1 is located within the existing historical settlement pattern of Pittentrail and is adjacent to existing local services and consequently offer no objection to it.	Support noted.
171 Mr Martin Mackay Dingwall	Our clients are supportive of the principal of development of the former auction mart site at Pittentrail. It is confirmed that the full extant of the site is not owned by our clients and a plan is enclosed showing the extent of our client's ownership.	As above
301 Dr & Mrs A M Cooper Rogart	We welcome allocation MU1.	As above
278 Mr William Thomson Perth	I would like to suggest the Local Plan is amended to include the area coloured pink on the map thereby extending the area MU1. It would provide development close to the heart of the village on the other side of the main road opposite to existing housing and better access to MU1. The area has not had sheep pens on it and therefore there is less risk of possible ground contamination.	RETAIN ALLOCATION MU1 MART AND ADJOINING LAND BUT EXTEND BOUNDARY OF ALLOCATION TO THE SOUTH EAST. The allocation boundary will be extended to the south east to land that is already included within the SDA. It will provide additional land for development close to the centre of the village. This addition to the allocation is

Subject / Individual / Organisation Summary of Representation**Recommendation****Inset Maps Pittentrail MU 1 Mart and adjoining land**

already within the SDA and it may increase the viability of any development.

The site is allocated for a mix of housing, business and community use. The local plan has a general policy which states that when 4 or more houses are proposed, 25% of them of them must be affordable.

We will add a developer requirement to the allocation: “ This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application”.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Category 2

As above

Dingwall

82 Mr Hector Miller

Would prefer affordable housing for local young people.

As above

Rogart

499 Albyn Housing

Could be 100% housing but infrastructure and ground conditions limit opportunity to develop in excess of 25% affordable.

As above

Invergordon

Capacity as per draft: 10 Suggested capacity: 10

Inset Maps Pittentrail MB Inset 5.1 Pittentrail

272 Mr Alexander B Mearns

4.4.2:

RETAIN SDA AT MACDONALD PLACE BUT REDUCE IN SIZE.

Rogart

There is a much greater need to recognise Sutherland's linguistic heritage and the need to support and encourage learning and everyday use of Gaelic. Engagement with community based language re- vivalisation programmes is essential.

We will reduce the size of the SDA around MacDonald Place by removing the two fields in front of Heath Cottage. The strip of land running parallel to the north east of the existing MacDonald Place houses will remain within the SDA. It is not included as a housing allocation, but would instead be considered for infill development.

Pittentrail: Personally as and chairman of the East Sutherland Branch of the Scottish crofting Foundation, I wish to support the submission by the Southside Strathfleet grazing Committee: Two representatives from the Southside Strathfleet Grazing committee attended initial discussion with members of the Planning Department to discuss the draft Local

The suggested area to the north east of the playing field,

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Pittentrail MB Inset 5.1 Pittentrail	<p>Plan and a number of issues were raised during this discussion, mainly centred on the inclusion of good croft land in the areas scheduled for housing development and we identified alternative areas which we believe would be suitable. We are disappointed to find that there has been no change in the areas identified for housing development in the current plan, Area H1 on the attached map is prime crofting land and the use of this land for housing will be further exacerbated by any future development on the area to the East of Macdonald Place, identified as a future settlement development area, (hatched in red on the attached plan). There are areas to the north of Macdonald Place unfit for cultivation (highlighted in orange) which we think are viable alternatives for housing as is an area to the north east of the playing field north of Corrie View (not visible on map). This area is also unsuitable for cultivation and is within relatively easy reach of the centre of the village. These alternatives were also pointed out to a representative from the Planning Department at a recent consultation event in Rogart village hall. If it would prove helpful, we would be happy to meet with representatives from the Planning department, on the ground, to discuss the options suggested.</p> <p>(was a map attached to this rep?).</p>	<p>north of Corrie View falls into the wider countryside and development proposals could still be submitted for the area.</p>
243 HSCHT Dornoch	An allocation for provision of future housing should be made within the envelope at Macdonald Place.	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Natural site for development of mixed tenure scheme. Consideration should be given to showing this as a housing site rather than simply within the settlement development area. Suggested capacity: 10	As above
301 Dr & Mrs A M Cooper Rogart	We wish to register our concern to the extent of the Settlement Development Area to the east of MacDonald Place. To include the whole of the two fields in front of Heath Cottage is contrary to Policy 1 Settlement Development Areas and other statements which recognise the strong link between croft houses and the land which has led to locally distinct patterns of settlement development in Sutherland. These fields have a strong connection with the old croft house (Heath Cottage) which sits above them on this south facing slope, a pattern	As above

Inset Maps Pittentrail MB Inset 5.1 Pittentrail

which is replicated westwards along Strath Fleet and forms an important part of the character of settlement pattern in this area. The existing houses at MacDonald Place and Fleet Terrace are contrary to that pattern and this high-density cluster of housing is out of character with dispersed pattern of housing in this part of the Strath and should not be replicated.

302 Trish Rannie & Colin Philson
Pittentrail

We strongly object to the allocation of the crofting land east of MacDonald Place, Pittentrail for development. We feel this would drastically alter the landscape character as the area. Heath Cottage is set within the fields and hills of the crofting landscape and this attractive and historic settlement pattern is the defining feature of Rogart parish. If the fields in front of the cottage were to be built on then this would be lost for ever. The draft local plan (p47) acknowledges that areas of land close to the edges of settlements can "contribute significantly and positively to the intrinsic setting of the environment and to be part of its character worthy of attention". Exiting settlement at MacDonald Place is unsympathetic to the traditional local landscape patterns and should not be used to justify further erosion of its character. Moreover, reallocation of this land would result in the "loss of locally important croft land" (Policy 3: Wider Countryside). We trust these objections will be taken into account in a revised plan.

As above

Inset Maps Ardgay G General Comment

274 Mr David J Allan MRICS
Bonar Bridge

New local development plan, Kincardine, Ardgay. Please find enclosed a 1:25,000 scale map of this area. This shows the existing houses and church in red and house sites with recent Planning Permissions granted in blue. My client, Mrs Gaye Hart, Ardgay, has recently had Planning Permission for two house sites, shown green, refused. Within the yellow line beside the three houses, shown blue to be built, 2 marked red have just been completed and occupied, a third marked red is under construction and 4 of the others have been built, or renovated within the past 15 years. This is clearly a developing settlement and we would suggest it should be zoned to permit development within the yellow line. There are 3 areas zoned for development around Ardgay but the fact is that no development has taken place there. This is perhaps the reason this hamlet has developed the way it has.

REJECT SUGGESTED SDA AT KINCARDINE. The area of Kincardine is within the wider countryside and there is a general policy in the Local Plan for development in the wider countryside. Any development would also be considered against all the general policies in the Local Plan. The area in question falls within the settlement setting for Ardgay which is of local/regional importance in general policy 4 of the Local Plan. It states that we will allow developments if we believe that they will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity and heritage resource.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay G General Comment		
322 Mr Robbie Rowntree Brora	<p>A number of those in attendance were concerned that the removal or change in use of the identified sites would lead to a lack of available land with presumption for development becoming available, especially in the affordable or social rented sector. The community is keen to see this sector more represented in the housing mix of the village as there is a strongly identified need to encourage younger residents and their families to stay, or return, to the area.</p>	<p>ENLARGE SDA TO SOUTH OF MANSE ROAD. The site adjacent to the Ardgayhill Road was identified as a site option in the Sutherland Futures document. It was removed due to drainage problems and proximity to overhead electricity line. We are not identifying land along the road between Ardgay and Lower Gledfield as we do not want to encourage ribbon development.</p>
581 Mr & Mrs Ian & Gillian Glennie Ardgay	<p>We have been advised by our councillor to request that our land to the south of the Kyle of Sutherland Hatchery (including our small field) be included in an extension of the SDA. All this would mean, in effect, would be to move the current boundary line from the edge of the Hatchery land further along the road to the Kincardine Burn. Our house used to be part of the Hatchery in any case, and some local people still refer to it as 'the Hatchery House'.</p> <p>As the new Sutherland Plan is, apparently, still emerging and having attended several meetings in the Ardgay Village Hall in respect of this plan, we would be grateful for your consideration of our proposal.</p> <p>We look forward to your reply in due course.</p>	<p>REJECT SUGGESTED EXTENSION TO SDA SOUTH OF THE KYLE HATCHERY. This is within the wider countryside and there is a general policy in the Local Plan for development in the wider countryside. Any development would also be considered against all the general policies in the Local Plan. The area in question falls within the settlement setting for Ardgay which is of local/regional importance in general policy 4 of the Local Plan. It states that we will allow developments if we believe that they will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity and heritage resource.</p>
517 Mr Derek Matheson Ardgay	<p>Personally I would have hoped to see many other areas, given a mixed-use classification, such as the areas between Ardgay and Gledfield/Church Street, the areas between Ardgay and Kincardine/Ardchronie, and also areas in Ardgay Hill. All these areas are within reasonable distance of Ardgay village.</p> <p>I am aware that much of the land suggested represents agricultural land, but it must be recorded that affordable housing, in whatever form, linked with mixed use premises, (small business units) would better serve the indigenous inhabitants of Ardgay, and those wishing- to settle locally.</p>	<p>The areas listed are all within the wider countryside and there is a general policy in the Local Plan for development in the wider countryside. Any development would also be considered against all the general policies in the Local Plan.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay G General Comment		
322 Mr Robbie Rowntree Brora	<p>It was proposed that other areas be identified. Three proposals from the meeting were agreed.</p> <p>i. The area of land between the A836 and Manse Road, near to the "Ice House".</p> <p>ii. The area to the South West, above the main settlement on the road to Ardgayhill. The proximity of the High Tension electricity lines may be an issue.</p> <p>iii. The area of land on either side of the road connecting Ardgay to Gledfield, there is reasonable infrastructure in place along this corridor.</p>	<p>(i) There is a small extension to the SDA.</p> <p>(ii) This was identified as a site option in Sutherland Futures but was removed due to objections to drainage and the proximity to the electricity line.</p> <p>(iii) We want to discourage ribbon development along either side of this road as it could potentially land block areas for development in the longer term.</p>
517 Mr Derek Matheson Ardgay	<p>Prolific single site applications are also being thwarted due to the lack of infrastructure, as well as existing businesses, with inflexible planning ideals.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has a general policy on development in the wider countryside.</p>
Inset Maps Ardgay MB Prospects		
314 Mr Davy Ross Ardgay	<p>I refer to the recent meeting held in Ardgay on Monday 28 January regarding concerns over the plan for the Ardgay Area and list my points as follows:</p> <p>4) I am aware we require further housing; and talking as a young local person I feel we especially need some sort of affordable housing or building plots so we are able to stay in the area. Two areas which I feel could be developed further would be land between No1 Church Street and Gledfield Primary School. This land has already been coloured brown but I would stress that it is important to not infringe the existing buildings as much as possible and keep any new dwelling aesthetically in accordance with the other older buildings in the area. I also believe that it is very important not to connect up Lower Gledfield with the main village of Ardgay and that housing should not be built along the south side of the road parallel with Loch nah-Atha and adjacent to the Church. Jubilee View, The Old School House, Lochside Cottage etc. The second area which I feel could be developed further is Kincardine. This area has seen one or two developments recently and I think it could offer further potential for more housing or business opportunities. I am aware of at least 2 people who own land in this proximity and</p>	<p>The allocation H2 Adjacent to Primary School will be decreased in size so the boundary is not beside the older buildings in the village. The area of Kincardine is within the wider countryside and there is a general policy in the Local Plan for development in the wider countryside. Any development would also be considered against all the general policies in the Local Plan. The area in question falls within the settlement setting for Ardgay which is of local/regional importance in general policy 4 of the Local Plan. It states that we will allow developments if we believe that they will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity and heritage resource.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay MB Prospects		
	would be willing to develop it. I think the area offers easy access to the village of Ardgay or to neighbouring villages south and east of Ardgay such as Tain etc. However, again I would stress that in any development I think it is very important for people to recognise and abide by the fact that it's positioning should be considerate to any of the old buildings within that area and be in keeping with them.	
356 V Wardrop & P Whittock Ardgay	Some of the area highlighted is woodland which contains wildlife and trees which needs to be protected.	Allocation H1 South of Oakwood Place is not being retained.
Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place		
156 Macloan Ardgay Ltd Ardgay	Support.	Support noted.
119 M G Ross Ardgay	Support.	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	7.1 Ardgay H.1 Most of this allocation appears as "Inventoried Ancient Woodland.. " on the Ancient Woodland Inventory and still supports continuous cover of native woodland. Therefore to include this area within a housing allocation or indeed within a SDA is contrary to the Council's own policy (Policy 4) for safeguarding nationally important features. It also adjoins the Gearrhoile Community Woodland, with access to the latter being through this site. In addition, it falls within the Dornoch Firth NSA and forms an important part of the setting to the existing settlement, contributing to the sense of arrival when approaching Ardgay from the south. SNH acknowledges that this site has previously been allocated for housing and understands that this has been the case for around thirty years. Given the history of this allocation and the fact that it still remains undeveloped this must raise questions about its availability and desirability. SNH therefore strongly recommends that this site is removed from the SDA and alternatives are considered. An Appropriate Assessment is likely to be required here and so SNH objects until the results of the Council's appropriate assessment can be considered.	DO NOT RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 SOUTH OF OAKWOOD PLACE AND REVISE SDA TO EXCLUDE ALLOCATION. Following consideration of the objections to this allocation and new information made available to the Council, this allocation is not being retained and the SDA will be redrawn accordingly.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place		
513 Mr Phil Olson Ardgay	It is now known this site is of historical importance and it should be preserved with the adjacent woodland. This site has been reserved for housing over multiple cycles of zoning and local plans with no activity ever forthcoming. This site designation for housing should be considered extinct. It would be intolerable if site H1 were retained as housing solely over fears of legal action from the owners. That would render this entire democratic consultation process an invalid waste of public money.	As above
341 Catherine Smith Ardgay	I have no objections to homes being built in the area - it is a very beautiful part of the country and are blessed with wonderful views - we take great pride in our homes and land and have invested heavily in our properties.	As above
546 Ardgay & District Community Council Ardgay	<p>The community council had a meeting attended by 32 members of the community and we have been asked to write to you regarding objections.</p> <p>The community also has objections to the zoning of H1 for housing. This area is adjacent to the Gearrhoille Community Wood which is an ancient oak woodland. The area zoned for housing is in fact a rare woodland pasture and Tree Preservation Orders are in the process of being placed. It also allows access to the Gearrhoille Wood from the village. The Gearrhoille and the land zoned H1 are valuable amenity sites for the village and not a suitable place for housing.</p>	As above
124 Mrs R A Copley Ardgay	I write to inform you of my grave concerns regarding the above site designation. Please make no mistake, I do not wish to see a total ban on housing in this area, but I do wish to ensure that the significant archaeology thereon is, at least, properly recorded and if deemed of sufficient significance, protected. The proposed building density of 20 units implies, to me, unavoidable disturbance of the ground over the entire surface of the site. This will inevitably destroy any extant archaeological evidence of past use of the area, including the already recognised route of the old drove road. I consider a number of the extant trees in this field are important as elements of the historic landscape and as living evidence of past woodland management. I feel these trees are in jeopardy too. You are the guardians of the Highland	As above

Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place

Heritage. I therefore appeal to you to have the archaeology in the area designated Ardgay H1/Housing investigated and then implement action to protect that which proves valuable.

I am aware that this area has been designated as building land in previous local plans. But I think it is only in recent years that the potential of this area as an historic landscape; a natural resource and a tangible link to the community's heritage has been recognised. In light of that I feel that area designated Ardgay H1/Housing should be fully investigated and professionally recorded, and those elements which are deemed important protected before any planning application is lodged. I understand "the preferred access for this allocated land is from the existing Oakwood Place road and not extending the existing Oakwood Place road on to the south-west corner". I support that proposal with the proviso that - any significant trees and/or archaeology are protected all the way along the access route and that any construction company is made fully aware that stiff penalties will be enforced for "accidental" damage. Maintaining the access to the community wood is also imperative. I understand that "the entire site of H1 is allocated in the draft local plan as entirely for housing". I support that proposal with the proviso that - the proposed building density of 20 units is reconsidered and reduced to accommodate the archaeological/natural heritage that is extant and indigenous to the site. And that there is no commercial/business building allowed.

320 Bridgitte Geddes MITI, BA
Hons, STGA

Ardgay

First I have to declare an interest: My property is directly adjacent to H1. However, having recently completed a BSc Honours degree in Environment & Heritage Studies (UHI Millennium Institute), I base my objections entirely on factual reasons:

a) Objection on ecological grounds

The site, currently owned by Balnagown Estate, is a historical part of the ancient Gearrchoille semi-natural woodland. The Biodiversity Action Plan for Sutherland (2004) acknowledges that Sutherland has "small areas of native, mainly deciduous woodland" and goes on to state that "their importance to the biodiversity of the area greatly outweighs their coverage". The ecological value of oakwoods is acknowledged by Wonell & Mackenzie (Smout, The Future, People and Woods in Scotland, 2003). The OS

As above

Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place

map of 1907, 2nd edition, gives the size of the woodland as approx. 25 ha. Since then, the woodland has shrunk to roughly half its size. To contemplate building a housing scheme of whatever kind in whatever is left of the woodland would further diminish the habitat available to the ecosystems found in the woodland. It would thus impair its natural heritage value as a very rare type of wet woodland of which there is less than 2% left in Scotland (FC pie chart). In terms of landscape ecology, H1 provides essential connectivity elements for the Gearrhoille woodland and other woodland remnants to the south on Kincardine Hill and to the east below the railway line. I would therefore object most strongly on ecological grounds to any zoning of H1 for housing. I attended a meeting of Ardgay Community Council on 28-01-08 when alternative possibilities for housing were indicated (cf. also my objection to B 1).

B) Objection on environmental grounds

When the current zoning proposals were first conceived, we were all largely unaware of the way in which human activities have been exacerbating global problems with climate change, but we all now have a duty to make every effort at both private and public level, to work and live according to the principles of sustainable development, and that includes every individual involved in the planning process.

The Scottish Executive Sustainable Development Strategy (2005) was published in December 2005. As far as I know the Highland Council pursues a sustainable development policy which is broadly in line with this document. Building houses on former economic forestry land (old planting schemes with e.g. Alaskan lodge pole pin, Sitca spruce and other exotic conifers that have proved useless as commercial crops) is to be welcomed, with the concept of forest crofts a shining example. However, to build dwellings on land that serves as one of the last refuges for complex native plant and animal communities, including deep-rooting oak trees that help to prevent erosion on a wet-woodland site, at the same time serving as a much needed carbon sink is tantamount to ecological and environmental vandalism. It can hardly be considered compatible with the principles of sustainable development. Whilst it might be considered as fulfilling a housing need in the short term, it diminishes the area's potential as a long-term resource of general importance to the community and the environment. Apart from an environmentally friendly building (or two) strictly for the purpose of community activities (e.g. educational, leisure, crafts, meetings,

Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place

woodschoole) in line with Gearrhoille Community Wood Ardgay's mission statement, there should not be any buildings erected in H1. The GCWA's mission statement makes it incumbent on us to reconcile the protection and enhancement of the woodland's wildlife value with its Map and text as studied at Bonar Bridge Service Point in January 2008 recreational and educational role as a community woodland. The proposed housing scheme, although not on GCWA ground, would be in direct conflict with this mission statement.

C) Objection on educational grounds

The more we diminish the extent of the woodland, the greater the impact on its value as an educational resource. The Gearrhoille Community Wood Ardgay has recently commissioned an Environmental Audit (publication pending) which highlights the great value of the woodland in its entirety as a natural, cultural and thus educational resource, in terms of e.g. school visits, ornithological and lichen surveys, bird ringing projects, bumblebee and moth research, resource for school children of the rich droving history of the Gearrhoille in connection with the history of the Feille Edeichan (quartz market stone) history of old Kincardine, now Ardgay.

D) Objection for reasons of physical impacts of housing developments on 'protected' trees

A well-known housing development at Inshes, Inverness (I believe it is called Nine Oaks), ended up removing most of the remaining mature oak trees arguing that insurance companies would perceive them as a risk to people and dwellings. It is therefore illusory to argue that one could protect individual trees by building in between them. Besides, trees do not thrive when their roots are damaged or built on, even if the actual dwelling is erected at some distance from the tree concerned. The wet ground also seems hardly suitable for private properties. The garden at Tigh an Daraich is continually water-logged owing to several natural wells situated further up on Ardgay Hill. To counteract this problem by means of additional drainage systems above the woodland might jeopardise its existing ecosystems.

E) Objection on the grounds of cultural heritage

As identified by HC Archaeology Dept. (Hilary White, Dorothy Maxwell and others) and according to a provisional survey in November 2005 by members of NOSAS (North of Scotland Archaeological Society, report

Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place

and map lodged with the Archaeology Dept., mailing both to your email address under separate cover), HI covers the exact area which served as a droving stance for possibly 150 years in the history of the Gearchoille. A recent report by Peter Quelch (available from NHFT, Golspie), an authority on woodland pasture, has indicated that the ancient oak trees growing on top of some of dykes in HI are likely to be remnants of some kind of stock containment hedge which was used in ancient times. Peter Quelch has stated that some of the tree may be in excess of 200 years old. It is very rare to find such striking evidence, apart from which these trees are also of great aesthetic and biodiversity value. They are essential links with the historical evidence of pollarding, coppicing and other ancient management techniques that can be found throughout the Gearchoille. Trees of such rarity and importance to the cultural and natural heritage of Sutherland should be declared 'green monuments'.

The importance of old Kincardine (now Ardgay) as a market and droving stance is documented in the two Statistical Accounts for the area; in a 1934 hook by Alisdair Alpin MacGregor: The Goat- Wye: Portrait of a Village; and the Inverness Courier which reported in 1827 that "This route" was "unquestionably the principal one as proceeding direct from two of the greatest market stances in the North of Scotland". There cannot be any doubt that the Gearchoille must have played a pivotal role in the Great Northern Drove Road, one of the essential elements of Highland agriculture and thus Scotland's economy for several centuries.

318 Elizabeth Wright
Ardgay

The part of the local plan to which I object is the area zoned for housing, HI, in the Ardgay village envelope. I understand that this has been zoned for housing through quite a number of years, and several local plans. I would suggest that it's suitability for development for housing (in particular 20 units) should now be seriously reconsidered. The reason is the proximity of the Gearchoille Oakwood, which lies along the southern borders of the areas in question. In fact, the area H1 could quite easily be considered as part of the Oakwood, as it contains several mature oaks, which when gathering acorns generally give the best yield in terms of both size and number. All these trees should be protected. There should be no felling of trees in this field. The Gearchoille Oakwood is at present under Community Management.

As above

Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place

There is access across H1 from Oakwood Place to the Community Woodland. While access is to be maintained, there is no assurance that it will follow the current path. At present the path follows the old drove road, which has several interesting features: the road itself, which continues through the Gearrhoille, and mature oak trees within H1 which are growing on the bank enclosing the drove road. These are thought to be of note as they would have been grazed by animals using the drove road & have been repeatedly pollarded. There is one particularly fine example, which is a double pollard, which would have grown up from multi stemmed stool, is reckoned to be more than 200 years old. The interest in this feature would be shared by both archaeologists and woodland enthusiasts (Peten Quelch, one of Scotland's foremost scholars of woodland history was very interested in this area)

Our interest and appreciation of 'Ancient Woodland' (which is the designation of the Gearrhoille) has greatly increased over the last 20 years - the small remnants now in our care must be rigorously protected. This area contains lovely oak trees, which provide a 'buffer zone' between the village and the Gearrhoille, and is of itself an interesting area of woodland pasture. It should be left undeveloped.

As I understand the matter, all of the areas around Ardgay zoned for housing all have the same owner, so there would be no financial implications of using the other areas. My preference would be for the area LTI, currently zoned Long Term. The whole area around Manse Road could be protected by a 20 mph speed limit.

368 Mr David J Laver MRICS
FCIOB
Suffolk

No objection assuming a large proportion of all new dwellings be targeted at the first time buyer and rentable sectors. Access as previously stated.

As above

533 Mr & Mrs E K Dunbar
Ardgay

On consulting our local councillor we understand other more suitable land is available for housing which would allow the approach land to Gearrhoille Wood and to Ardgay village in general to remain unspoilt - an area of natural beauty and of historical interest as it includes one of the few drovers paths and several oak trees which give the wood its name. These are irreplaceable and should be protected. Could this

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place	land not be used to enhance and attract more visitors to this beautiful area which is so in need of revitalising?	
123 Mrs Doreen Dunbar Ardgay	Regarding the Sutherland Local Plan Deposit Draft which I received recently and which I approve of in general, a few questions arise regarding landscaping of the area designated for houses. Can you assure me that this would include several of the beautiful old oak trees from which this area is named? Their roots assist drainage and for this development to blend with its surrounding I feel that preservation is essential. A few questions also arise regarding the existing access path from Oakwood Place to Gearrhoille Wood. As this path is one of the original drovers' roads, it is of both historical and archaeological significance. Can I be assured that this path will remain the access route from Oakwood Place to the wood?	As above
141 Mr W A Stobo Ardgay	<p>I would like to draw your attention to the fact that it is proposed to build 20 houses in the area H1 between the Gearrhoille Community Wood and Oakwood Place and would seek the support of your organisation in objecting to this proposed scheme.</p> <p>This area originally part of the Gearrhoille Wood which is listed in the Ancient Woodland Inventory as Ancient Woodland of Semi-natural Origin (ASN01750/NH58/19 and 00RM1750/NH5) possibly dating back to the old market fair (Feill Eiteachan), which traditionally was held twice yearly in Ardgay. It also contains several examples of Culturally Modified Trees which could well qualify for Green Monuments status and should be protected.</p> <p>The area has been designed for housing in earlier draft plans for the past 30 years and has not been implemented by the landowners and in my view should be removed from the plan.</p> <p>The full Archaeological significance of the site has only recently been realised by the community and I feel that it was not taken into account when previous decisions re. planning were made.</p> <p>I fully appreciate the need for housing especially low cost suitable for rental or part ownership to encourage young local people to remain in the area if they can find suitable employment but at what cost.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place		
512 Marion Turner Ardgay	<p>H1 (adjacent Gearrhoille Wood) should be taken out of housing for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is of historical/archaeological importance (drove stance/drove road) 2) It is a biological/environmental importance. 3) It is a scarce example of woodland pasture. 4) As a potential allocation for housing it should be considered as "extinct". See quote below from South East Sutherland Local Plan, Deposit Draft with Modifications (1) May 1999., " The land at South Oakwood Place has been allocated for housing since 1984. Between 1977 and 1984 it was allocated for a mix of housing, light industry and caravan park". <p>At the first local plan an 1983 light industry use was taken out - relocated to the other side of main road. Alison Magee (Councillor) made the point to council that the site has not been taken up for housing and should be dropped (March 2007). The removal of this H1 allocation could be resolved by bringing forward site LT1 (behind Manse Crescent) or allocating the site below the Manse in the field with the ice house. Land east of the ice house if used would give planning gain by improving link road to Manse Place.</p>	As above
517 Mr Derek Matheson Ardgay	One area coloured brown, representing housing, has been shown in previous local plans for some considerable time, but never actually developed, and is now considered a community woodland.	As above
135 Mary Stobo Ardgay	The area covered includes an ancient drove road which is much wider than normal probably because of gathering cattle for the local market. This is of important archaeological significance and should be preserved. Also there are several trees showing evidence of cultivation which should not be cut down. This area has already been designated as of National Importance and the importance of this must be recognised and maintained.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place		
561 Miss Hilda Buchanan Ardgay	I object strongly to the zoning on area B1, B2, H1 and LT1. H1 - a valuable amenity at present. The zoning should be removed.	As above
335 Mrs Diane Sinclair Ardgay	Objecting	As above
314 Mr Davy Ross Ardgay	I refer to the recent meeting held in Ardgay on Monday 28 January regarding concerns over the plan for the Ardgay Area and list my points as follows: 2) Generally it has been felt that the housing area marked brown on the south-east side of the village next to the wood should be removed as the oak wood should be preserved as it makes up a very small percentage of this type of wood in Scotland.	As above
90 Mr Stephen Copely Ardgay	If we are talking of low-density housing in keeping with the other developments already existing in the Ardgay area then in principle I have no basic objection, subject to the following caveats: A) The developer requirements outlined above are met. B) The access to the site is appropriate. C) The remnants of the ancient oak woodland still extant, as a few now isolated large trees, are preserved. D) The probable rare example of a remnant of a possibly ancient trackway/roadway that crosses the entire site is fully investigated and as necessary excavated to ascertain its important, or otherwise, (at the developers expense) prior to any final planning permission being granted and particularly before any site works are allowed to commence. (N.B. If the possible ancient track way/roadway is found to be, after full and proper investigation/excavation: a) of significance and it is then made a planning requirement that it is properly preserved and not allowed to be built on, paved over or otherwise disturbed. Or (b) if it is to be of no actual significance, then I would be pleased to withdraw any objection, concerning this matter.)	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place		
322 Mr Robbie Rowntree Brora	The area identified on the map in light brown and circled as H1 is identified as "Housing". This land is regarded as being of high amenity value by the community. It incorporates trees of value that are a natural extension of the community woodland at Gearrhoille. It has cultural and archaeological structures that are of value and is a good historic example of woodland pasture.	As above
130 Mr & Mrs Miller Ardgay	<p>(1) The area as marked by you covers a traditional ancient forest used by most members of the local community which encompasses an historic "drovers" road and contains trees afforded "tree preservation orders".</p> <p>(2) The current supply of mains water is not sufficient at present to cater for this area and therefore not practical to supply an increase in additional units.</p> <p>(3) The amenities in the village are sparse and again could not service additional home owners/units.</p> <p>(4) I believe this land is not yours to offer for development and current investigations are underway by the Ardgay & District Community Council.</p> <p>(5) A petition from local existing residents will be conducted opposing all such future development of this area.</p>	As above
136 M Munro Ardgay	Having tagged along to Peter Quelche's pastoral woodland day in the Gearrhoille, I am now aware of the importance of some of our trees that may have historic value as pollarded oaks and coppiced shoals in a grazed woodland. I would like to see them protected. The drove road is also historic and I am told unusual due to the width at the start. I am not opposed to all housing but feel 20 units too many by at least 15. If each household had 2 cars (as many do) that would mean an increase of 40 cars up our quiet road. I am also concerned about displacement of water as the field is quite wet.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay H 1 South of Oakwood Place		
577 Mrs Morag Brownlow Ardgay	<p>We attended the meeting in Ardgay on Wednesday June 25th and understand we can still write to make representations on the site near to Ardgay Hill and Oakwood Place.</p> <p>1) Point of site is occupied by the Wood which includes a number of ancient oak trees and special flora which survives in boggy conditions.</p> <p>2) The wood and field is a haven for Scottish wildlife some of which are endangered species.</p> <p>3) The field and land are subject to flooding from above.</p> <p>4) We understand there may be a problem with sewage on the site which may have to return up the hill.</p> <p>We would therefore ask you to reconsider the plan.</p>	As above
Inset Maps Ardgay H 2 Adjacent to primary school		
269 Mr & Mrs Fay Ardgay	<p>1) Boundary adjustment (map attached).</p> <p>2) H2 is an area of rough grassland/pasture which absorbs a lot of surface water at times of heavy rain. It floods easily and when the small lochan north of H2 fills it spreads across the H2 area - see photo 2. The eastern part of H2 also becomes waterlogged and drains towards the corner of H2 nearest the church - see photo 1 marked x on the map - this shows water cascading off the field surface into a trench which had been dug for great pump ground loops. We fear that if H2 is built on and the area for water absorption reduced by concrete and tarmac, the risk of flooding in our area of ground will be increased. Careful attention to drainage would need to be made if H2 is developed. Water does not drain easily from this area.</p> <p>3) H2 is split by a farm road. Would this be closed off and all traffic, including farm vehicles, made to use a new access beside the primary school? The present farm road, which is narrow and has no passing places, could become a short cut for a lot of extra traffic. The proposed access beside the primary school is on a bend and the existing farm road access onto Church Street has poor visibility.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H2 ADJACENT TO PRIMARY SCHOOL BUT REDUCE BOUNDARY TO EASTERN SIDE OF FARM LANE AND REVISE SDA TO EXCLUDE THIS REDUCTION.</p> <p>We will reduce the size of this allocation by bringing the boundary to the eastern side of the farm lane and the SDA will be revised accordingly. Therefore the farm lane is no longer within the allocation. The preferred access is on the bend to the east of the Primary School.</p> <p>A robust drainage system will be required. There is a general policy in the local plan that covers Surface Water Drainage; it states that all development must be drained by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</p> <p>We will avoid or minimise any impact on adjacent properties by good siting, design, layout, planting and setback. These will all be dealt with during the planning application process.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay H 2 Adjacent to primary school	<p>4) To preserve our amenity we would expect any development to be low density, low level and to be well space away from The Old School and Old Schoolhouse which are listed buildings.</p> <p>5)We are also concerned about light pollution from street lights. We are building a free standing astronomical observatory which has planning permission. Our amenity of this will be affected by more local lighting. Its position has been chosen because of the lack of light pollution around our property. The street lighting on Church Street is shielded from our garden by mature trees. There are no mature trees between us and any new development.</p>	Impact from light pollution can be minimised by planting and via the Council's policy to install low, downward emission lighting.
567 Alison Yeoman Ardgay	<p>Our concerns are largely with the loss of open views and amenity to our property at 3 Church Street.</p> <p>The field has flooding towards the north side of it and would need careful drainage with any works not going to adversely affect our properties in the future.</p> <p>The plan does not reflect the traditional 'linear development' of rural Scotland. We would be happier if only the area directly adjacent to the school was developed and not the area to the rear of our property and our neighbours.</p>	As above
270 Mrs G B Pollock Ardgay	<p>1) Boundary adjustment (map attached).</p> <p>2) H2 is an area of rough grassland/pasture which absorbs a lot of surface water at times of heavy rain. It floods easily and when the small lochan north of H2 fills it spreads across the H2 area - see photo 2. The eastern part of H2 also becomes waterlogged and drains towards the corner of H2 nearest the church - see photo 1 marked x on the map - this shows water cascading off the field surface into a trench which had been dug for great pump ground loops. We fear that if H2 is built on and the area for water absorption reduced by concrete and tarmac, the risk of flooding in our area of ground will be increased. Careful attention to drainage would need to be made if H2 is developed. Water does not drain easily from this area.</p> <p>3) H2 is split by a farm road. Would this be closed off and all traffic, including farm vehicles, made to use a new access beside the primary</p>	As above

Inset Maps Ardgay H 2 Adjacent to primary school

school? The present farm road, which is narrow and has no passing places, could become a short cut for a lot of extra traffic. The proposed access beside the primary school is on a bend and the existing farm road access onto Church Street has poor visibility.

4) To preserve our amenity we would expect any development to be low density, low level and to be well space away from The Old School and Old Schoolhouse which are listed buildings.

5) We are also concerned about light pollution from street lights. We are building a free standing astronomical observatory which has planning permission. Our amenity of this will be affected by more local lighting. Its position has been chosen because of the lack of light pollution around our property. The street lighting on Church Street is shielded from our garden by mature trees. There are no mature trees between us and any new development.

279 Daniel & Carol Easton
Ardgay

1) The water shown in the draft, to the top side of H2 does not take "perimeters" into consideration. In the 15 years we have lived in our home the water level has risen to our fence many times. Flooding is something that happens all too often in our area. In the last year alone, the Council has spent a fortune on drainage around our area.

2) The farm road? Was the draft drawn up without any consideration for the farm? It is a very busy lane. The farm must have top priority at all times to go about their everyday business without interruptions of having to drive through a housing estate watching all the time for cars, people, children, animals and everyday activity a housing estate has. We the public depend on their produce. Very large vehicles use the lane on an everyday occurrence. Important foodstuffs being delivered. Animals being transported to and from the farm, being moved field to field. Very large bales of feeding and bedding being transported. Surely we don't need to go on describing the everyday activity on a busy farm, not only to give the farm priority, but, to have the farm lane kept open. Plus it is our one and only access/exit.

3) Entrance at blind corner? The speed of the traffic is a nightmare. The amount of traffic is increasing, some of the large vehicles are more intent on making deliveries on time, than adhering to road traffic safety

As above

Inset Maps Ardgay H 2 Adjacent to primary school

signs. The corner at the church is a blind corner, which in itself, should slow any thoughtful driver down. But doesn't. An opening to a housing estate with 10 new homes would mean approximately 20 cars, trying to exit and enter a dangerous road. By the way, we are not talking about a long stretch of road. The space is approx 85 metres. The entrance-exit for a 10 house estate, plus, very heavy traffic from a busy, working farm. All the traffic signs in the world will not slow the traffic down, especially the wood lorries. We honestly don't think the ground work has been very thorough. Our windows at the front of the house are never opened, due to the speed of the traffic.

4) The standard of buildings? WE, in this area are very much aware that we must maintain our homes in the context of their original build. They are of a high standard of workmanship even though, very old buildings. Would we, be guaranteed, the houses would be built using the highest standards of materials, planned in according with the area? Would they be limited to a certain height? One, or one and a half storeys? Would the buildings be just squeezed into areas so they fit, or would the position of the homes be built in consideration with sun, the wind, neighbours etc. Would we continue to be afforded the privacy at our back garden? Or would a house be sitting tight against our garden?

5) We have no objection to housing being built in the area, we have family of our own growing up who will need homes. What we do ask, is that lots of thought and planning go into the items we believe are seriously neglected in the draft.

275 CKD Galbraith

For: For The Gledfield Trust,
Inverness

I can confirm that all the land zoned as H2 is owned by the Gledfield Trust who would be interested and supportive of any plans to develop this land in the near future. The main constraints to developing this land at present is the limited capacity of the public water supply which we hope will soon be addressed by Scottish Water. This site is suitable for development and is undoubtedly the most practical location for infill development as it is flat ground, easily accessible and close to infrastructure and services.

As above

Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north		
156 Macloan Ardgay Ltd Ardgay	Support.	Support noted.
17 Ms J Stewart Ardgay	Support. Providing no contamination to Dornoch Firth Scenic Area.	As above
119 M G Ross Ardgay	Support.	As above
90 Mr Stephen Copely Ardgay	Provided that the "developer requirements" outlined above are met and access to the site is kept entirely to the existing, this is a site ready for sympathetic light industrial, low level (meaning: as in the height of the actual buildings/structures) development.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION B1 ARDGAY RAILWAY STATION YARD NORTH BUT REDUCE TO EXCLUDE LAND OWNED BY MR & MRS McNEILL. ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT THAT A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT WILL BE REQUIRED.</p> <p>The preferred access is through the existing station road, with some minor improvements. It is not intended to create a new access onto the A836.</p> <p>The site will remain as a business use (not industrial use). The railway sidings are still in use by Network Rail for maintenance and other support functions and this use is more likely to sit comfortably beside business use as housing. It is not being proposed that the allocation be used for industrial purposes. The adopted South East Sutherland Local Plan identifies the area for an aggregate depot connected with the transport of material from Ardchronie Quarry. The draft Sutherland Plan does not propose this use.</p> <p>The land owned by Mr and Mrs McNeill will be removed from the allocation.</p>
356 V Wardrop & P Whiitock Ardgay	We think this should be housing and small business not industrial.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north		
368 Mr David J Laver MRICS FCIOB Suffolk	<p>Basically there are no objections to the proposals in principle however the access to sites B1, H1 and B2 give cause for concern.</p> <p>B1: If access is to be via the existing station yard, this will cause a major traffic hazard when joining the existing highway. Moreover, if the sole access is through the privately owned station yard development would be impaired. It is therefore respectfully suggested that access (regardless of levels) be via a new roundabout including Oakwood Place (cost to be equally borne between development of H2 and B1).</p>	As above

320 Bridgitte Geddes MITI, BA Hons, STGA Ardgay	<p>As a point of clarification, the area is incorrectly marked B1 if it is proposed to be zoned for the deposition of aggregates from Ardchronie Quarry. It should have been marked I1. However, at a Community Council meeting on 28-01-08 attended by two Highland Councillors, Mr Robbie Rowantree and Mr George Farlow, the well-attended meeting came to the conclusion that neither B1 nor B2 would be tolerated by the community as suitable for the proposed deposition of aggregates from Ardchronie Quarry. It was felt that, in view of the heavy-vehicle transport, dust and noise involved, this would result in an unacceptable encroachment of industrial activity on village life, both at the railway station and along the old A9. I would welcome the continued operation of Ardchronie Quarry, especially if it offers job opportunities to village residents, but not at the expense of people who have spent their hard-earned cash on settling in what they considered a pleasant, fairly quiet neighbourhood. The noise created as a result of railway traffic is perfectly acceptable by comparison. We are indeed fortunat to have railway services available in the village. However, the idea of transporting aggregates by lorry north from Ardchronie in order to load them on to trains for railway transport back south right past Ardchronie makes absolutely no sense in terms of transport miles and sustainable development. I understand that Bardon Aggregates have argued in the past that it would not be economical to establish a siding on a site where the railway passes close by Ardchronie Quarry. I would suggest that the company examine their own sustainable development policy and find a suitable way of creating a siding right next to Ardchronie Quarry.</p> <p>The Community Council meeting on 28-01-08 felt that it might allow more planning flexibility to allocate 'mixed use' to the area now zoned</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north

as B1. I understand that, as in Lairg, zoning for mixed use would allow a combination of housing, business and light industrial use subject to individual proposals fulfilling planning and environmental requirements. Each case should be judged on its merits.

Alternatively, it might be feasible to rezone B1 for housing, i.e. zoning it as H1. I understand that Mr Brown's property (the former filling station) has already been granted permission for 6 dwellings. I also know that the owners (McNeill & Cunningham) of the two adjacent properties south of that one have themselves applied for permission to develop those sites for housing, but their applications were turned down. Would it not make good sense to reconsider those rejections and give permission to build houses there, so that the gap between Mr Brown's housing scheme and the three extant bungalows on that side of the road between B1 and B2 would eventually be closed, thus achieving the homogeneous effect the planning authorities seem to desire by not encouraging "piecemeal development"? It is conceivable that, if approached jointly by the three owners of properties in what is now B1, housing association might look favourably on a housing development in that area.

124 Mrs R A Copley
Ardgay

I understand that "The preferred access for site B1 is from the existing station road, however, it would have to be brought up to adopted road standard." I support the proposal that Ardgay railway station yard north is used for business purpose with the proviso that the stated preferred access is the only vehicular access ie not directly from the A838.

As above

273 Mr Andrew Cunningham
Ardgay

I object very strongly on the environmental impact that a business and industry development would have on the adjacent existing and proposed dwellings ie pollution by noise, dust fumes etc from additional commercial traffic and operational machinery. Whatever use industrial units may be put to, there will be the inevitable clutter of old vehicles, waste in many forms and stock piling of materials and a general scene of untidiness and certainly not in keeping with to the near proximity to this part of the Dornoch Firth National Scenic Area and the approaches to Ardgay village. I would have no objection to site B1 being used for residential use.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north		
322 Mr Robbie Rowntree Brora	<p>I attended the regular meeting of the Ardgay Community Council on Monday 28th January; one of the Agenda items was submissions to the Local plan. You can imagine my surprise when I found the meeting room packed with about fifty people, all there to make comments on the Plan.</p> <p>There was a robust and frank discussion on the merits of the draft deposit as it stands currently, and on how reflective of the community's views the consultation process was. I was asked to write on behalf of all the Ward Councillors to reinforce the views of the meeting, which I am sure will be coming from them, to you before the closing date for submissions.</p> <p>The views of the meeting were as follows: Page 21, Map titled INSET 7.1: ARDGAY Areas identified on the map in pale blue and circled as B1 and B2 are identified as "Business". The respective owners and the community regard this as too prescriptive and would want to see this identified for "Mixed Use".</p> <p>It was made clear to me, in no uncertain terms, that any form of use by the quarry at Ardchronie for the handling of aggregates within the environs of the village was unacceptable.</p>	As above
314 Mr Davy Ross Ardgay	<p>I refer to the recent meeting held in Ardgay on Monday 28 January regarding concerns over the plan for the Ardgay Area and list my points as follows:</p> <p>1) It was suggested and I agree that the areas marked blue for business use within the village should be marked for mixed use to allow the opportunity for local people to be able to build either business or domestic properties within the heart of the village.</p>	As above
522 Mrs Gillian Glennie Ardgay	<p>I would like the areas B1 and B2 to be for mixed use business and housing and not industrial use. I feel that an industrial site in the village would not be appealing to look at and would be a danger when large vehicles turn into the station areas.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north		
335 Mrs Diane Sinclair Ardgay	Objecting	As above
341 Catherine Smith Ardgay	<p>It is hard enough having a depot at the south side without having more on the north side.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Large transportation with dust atmosphere. 2. Driving through a speed limit of 60 miles. 3. There are small children, disabled children and adults and elderly people living in these houses. <p>We take pride in our home and land - We have tried very hard to improve the area and have invested everything in our properties - We are very concerned about the devalue of our homes - As well as our homes the proposed sights are near elderly peoples homes and a children's play area.</p>	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
136 M Munro Ardgay	My concern is over the access point for the business park. Not only is there a play park to be aware of, there is also the issue of speed on that straight stretch of road. The 30mph limit sign in my opinion needs to be resited beyond the B2 position as few do 30 through the village.	As above
196 Mr & Mrs John & Yvonne McNeill Ardgay	As owners of part of the area B1 on the local plan, this land was purchased by us with the view to build a house for our retirement. We strongly object to our land being used for any other purpose - a consultation with the planners would have been appreciated, not find they go ahead willy nilly to develop an area without ownership - why have businesses in the middle of the village amid the housing area. We strongly object to our land being used for a business park? And suggest the planners consult with us. Enclosing title and plan of area.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north		
561 Miss Hilda Buchanan Ardgay	<p>I object strongly to the zoning on area B1, B2, H1 and LT1.</p> <p>B1 is zoned for business. It would be of more benefit to the community if this area had mixed use of housing and light business. This will allow small business's to be created and for people perhaps to be able to live above or beside their business. This will enable enterprise and hopefully improve the economic status of the community. It also gives land owners more flexibility with the use of the land re. planning consents.</p> <p>For both B1 and B2 no heavy industry should be allowed on the A836 main road into the village.</p>	As above
546 Ardgay & District Community Council Ardgay	<p>The community council had a meeting attended by 32 members of the community and we have been asked to write to you regarding objections.</p> <p>The community would like the zoning of areas B1 and B2 to be changed from business/industrial use to a mixed use of light business and residential. This would allow flexibility to the owners of the land and also encompass any planning applications for light business use or housing. This would be more valuable to the community as it would allow much needed housing and small business enterprises leaving open the door to economic growth for the village. Given that the sites on either side of B, which is in the centre of the village, are residential it does not make sense to have an industrial/business site there. This also applies to site B2. The community would strongly object to any movement of aggregate from Ardchronie Quarry to be transported through the village. The railway line is close to the quarry and it is not ecological to transport aggregate by lorry to Ardgay only for it to pass the quarry again by train.</p>	As above
541 Network Rail Glasgow	Further to our recent conversation I can confirm that we have no objections in principle to the inclusion of reference to Site B1 at Ardgay as having potential for development for Business use. However that should not preclude further rail-related development of the site if required. I note various references within the Plan recognising the importance of the railway to the area. The efficient operation of the railway is very much dependant on the availability of suitable sites for	As above

Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north

maintenance and other support functions and we need to retain some flexibility in our use of these.

As discussed we do still use the site at Ardgay for operational purposes and have not identified it as surplus to requirements. Therefore we would seek reassurance that the zoning would not inhibit future railway-related development of the site should that become necessary. As you will be aware Network Rail benefits from various permitted development rights which means that some operational works do not require planning consent. However from time to time we do need to carry out works which are clearly related to our statutory function but do not fall within our permitted development rights meaning that full planning consent is required. In these circumstances we would want to be assured that any new zoning would not rule out railway development. There does not appear to be any policy wording in the draft plan associated with the Business and Industry zoning which clarifies the range of uses which might be acceptable. I would welcome your comments on this.

I am aware that we have not provided comments by the stated deadline but hope that will not preclude further discussion.

533 Mr & Mrs E K Dunbar
Ardgay

This area is adjacent to a sheltered housing complex for elderly people - many of whom have medical conditions including asthma and so any commercial activity would be detrimental to their well-being apart from the safety aspect of increased traffic on a road which has to be crossed both for the railway station and for the bus south. Increased noise would also be detrimental to general health. Apart from these reasons the aesthetic beauty of the location would not be enhanced.

As above

517 Mr Derek Matheson
Ardgay

I base my comments and reasons having attended meetings in Ardgay Hall where members of the community have expressed various suggestions and concerns, as well as general conversations with locals who recognise the desire to retain a vibrant younger workforce able to live within their expectations.

As above

On the proposed Local Plan, two areas coloured blue, representing business use, would better serve the community if it were reclassified as a mixed use. (Colour yellow?).

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 1 Ardgay railway station yard north		
147 Mr Michael A S Brown Edderton	In order to provide some flexibility in use I would recommend that the area be designated mixed use.	As above
Inset Maps Ardgay B 2 Ardgay railway station yard south		
335 Mrs Diane Sinclair Ardgay	Support.	Support noted.
273 Mr Andrew Cunningham Ardgay	The only reason I support this is because of its existence for a number of years. We are troubled by excess noisy from both machinery and heavy vehicles but suffer it because of its essential to the community.	As above
17 Ms J Stewart Ardgay	Support	As above
119 M G Ross Ardgay	Support	As above
156 Macloan Ardgay Ltd Ardgay	Support.	As above
124 Mrs R A Copley Ardgay	I support the proposal that Ardgay railway station yard south continues in use for business purpose with the proviso that the extant trees between it and the A836 are retained and that any future development does not expand the total area currently used for commercial activity.	RETAIN ALLOCATION B2 ARDGAY RAILWAY STATION YARD SOUTH AND ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT FOR TREES BETWEEN THE SITE AND THE A836 TO BE RETAINED.
		This allocation is a continuance of exiting use. It is not intended to expand the area from what is currently there. We will add to the developer requirements, "Trees between the site and the A836 to be retained". Both access points remain acceptable.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 2 Ardgay railway station yard south		
322 Mr Robbie Rowntree Brora	<p>Areas identified on the map in pale blue and circled as B1 and 82 are identified as "Business". The respective owners and the community regard this as too prescriptive and would want to see this identified for "Mixed Use".</p> <p>It was made clear to me, in no uncertain terms, that any form of use by the quarry at Ardchronie for the handling of aggregates within the environs of the village was unacceptable.</p>	As above
368 Mr David J Laver MRICS FCIOB Suffolk	This clearly shows two access points, it is assumed that this will be one way in and out.	As above
136 M Munro Ardgay	Resite 30mph sign to beginning of B2.	As above
561 Miss Hilda Buchanan Ardgay	<p>I object strongly to the zoning on area B1, B2, H1 and LT1.</p> <p>B1 similar to B1 - again a mixed use would be more beneficial.</p> <p>For both B1 and B2 no heavy industry should be allowed on the A836 main road into the village.</p>	As above
90 Mr Stephen Copely Ardgay	I am objecting with proviso, as I cannot be certain whether I would support or object to any actual proposal, as a proposal as presented here is far too vague. If we are talking of the continuance and even possible modest expansion of the existing facilities within this area then I am supportive. If however, there is a move to further develop this area by introducing more industrialisation then I feel the area would be being overburdened and I would object.	As above
517 Mr Derek Matheson Ardgay	On the proposed Local Plan, two areas coloured blue, representing business use, would better serve the community if it were reclassified as a mixed use. (Colour yellow?).	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 2 Ardgay railway station yard south		
320 Bridgitte Geddes MITI, BA Hons, STGA Ardgay	<p>I have no problem with current use of this area by the two depots. I find the noise created by activities in the Council Yard bearable in the knowledge that it provides welcome employment to local people and it fulfils a useful public service because, among other things, it keeps our roads safe in winter.</p> <p>However, I would have to raise strong objections, were it ever to occur to Highland Council to close the Council Yard and sell the ground to Bardon Aggregates for the purpose currently allocated to B1. The impacts on Marvoni, my own property and the Gearrchoilie Community Wood would make life unbearable for local residents and would diminish the recreational, educational and biodiversity value of this ancient, semi-natural woodland.</p> <p>I see that Brindavan is not included in B2, but I still would like to comment that I find it unfair that permission was granted for the erection of two buildings across the road at Kincardine Cemetery, but is not being granted to the owners of Brindavan who have submitted an application for planning permission for a similar modest scheme at the far end of their own property, at a height above sea level which cannot be very much lower than across the road where two houses were completed in 2007.</p>	As above
341 Catherine Smith Ardgay	<p>It is already very hard to live next to the depot:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The noise n the early hours of the morning and very large transporters. 2. The depot is unsightly next to private homes. 3. There are small children, disabled children and adults and elderly people living in the houses in the area and it is also a very dangerous road (60 speed limit). <p>We do see the need for the services of the depot - yet feel it is positioned in the wrong area.</p> <p>The irony is we have the most beautiful views anywhere in the country. Yet have the proposals of these depots blocking out wonderful views - it</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay B 2 Ardgay railway station yard south	doesn't make sense.	
533 Mr & Mrs E K Dunbar Ardgay	Whether we object or support would depend entirely on the nature and landscaping of the development.	As above
546 Ardgay & District Community Council Ardgay	<p>The community council had a meeting attended by 32 members of the community and we have been asked to write to you regarding objections.</p> <p>The community would like the zoning of areas B1 and B2 to be changed from business/industrial use to a mixed use of light business and residential. This would allow flexibility to the owners of the land and also encompass any planning applications for light business use or housing. This would be more valuable to the community as it would allow much needed housing and small business enterprises leaving open the door to economic growth for the village. Given that the sites on either side of B, which is in the centre of the village, are residential it does not make sense to have an industrial/business site there. This also applies to site B2. The community would strongly object to any movement of aggregate from Ardchronie Quarry to be transported through the village. The railway line is close to the quarry and it is not ecological to transport aggregate by lorry to Ardgay only for it to pass the quarry again by train.</p>	As above
148 N Lawson Ardgay	Please supply more information as to the nature of Business in B2.	As above
522 Mrs Gillian Glennie Ardgay	I would like the areas B1 and B2 to be for mixed use business and housing and not industrial use. I feel that an industrial site in the village would not be appealing to look at and would be a danger when large vehicles turn into the station areas.	As above
356 V Wardrop & P Whiitock Ardgay	We think this should be housing and small business not industrial.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay LT 1 North of Manse Road		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>LT.1 An Appropriate Assessment is also likely to be required here and so SNH objects until the results of the Council's appropriate assessment can be considered.</p> <p>If this site passes this test then it could replace H1 during this plan period.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION LT1 NORTH OF MANSE ROAD BUT CHANGE ALLOCATED LAND USE FROM LONG TERM TO HOUSING.</p> <p>This allocation will have an Appropriate Assessment completed for it prior to the adoption of the Plan.</p> <p>The Council can not determine who houses are sold to. For social rented housing, applicants to the housing waiting list should not be debarred because they have no local connection to an area, but it can determine priority. Highland Council waiting list policy is that anyone can apply to be on the list but priority is given to people who need to reside in an area.</p> <p>The access from the A836 would need to be double tracked towards the main road. The railway bridge would be just for pedestrian use.</p> <p>Generally development in an area creates growth which in turn supports the creation of new infrastructure and amenities and helps to support existing facilities. The Local Plan has a general policy on developer contributions which helps to ensure that there is mitigation for the impact of new development. The Local Plan also takes account of the ageing population in Sutherland and where housing for varying needs or sheltered housing has been identified we have allocated sites that are close to community facilities. This allocation has not been specifically identified as being for this kind of housing.</p> <p>This allocation is required as replacement for H1 South of Oakwood Place which has not been retained and the lack of suitable alternatives. It is our understanding that the landowner is willing to develop the site.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay LT 1 North of Manse Road		
548 Mrs Antionette McDonnell Ardgay	1) This area is not suitable for housing as it's prone to flooding. 2) There is no suitable access (roads) There is already 24 houses in close proximity any more overload facilities. The present utilities are at maximum capacity now.	As above
322 Mr Robbie Rowntree Brora	The area identified on the map in light grey and circled as LTI is identified as "Long Term". This land is under active agricultural management and is likely to remain so in the foreseeable future.	As above
517 Mr Derek Matheson Ardgay	Another One area coloured grey, representing possible future housing, could also be reclassified as a mixed use. This area however lacks the infrastructure needed to compensate neighbours and other users of their concerns.	As above
299 Steven & Alison MacInnes Ardgay	We are concerned that the development would ruin the Manse Road area. It has always been a nice and quiet area and adding to this would cause that to change. A big concern is who the houses would be given to. Houses in neighbouring villages seem to be given to non-locals! Which seems terribly unfair as there always seems to be locals on the waiting list but they are always pushed to the bottom. Or this is the way to comes across anyhow!	As above
314 Mr Davy Ross Ardgay	I refer to the recent meeting held in Ardgay on Monday 28 January regarding concerns over the plan for the Ardgay Area and list my points as follows: 3) The long term housing area behind Manse Road I feel is a perfectly good acceptable site but would require a new road infrastructure leading into it; as carrying on the existing access into this area would prove too hidden and narrow for the volume of new properties.	As above
124 Mrs R A Copley Ardgay	I would like to see provision for a local amenity within this scheme eg small football pitch.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay LT 1 North of Manse Road		
334 Mr William MacLaren Ardgay	I object to land north of Manse road being used for housing as it is regularly cultivated and is the only access to land I rent from Balnagown Estate which I can move livestock to the farm for veterinary purposes. Any other movement would involve going through housing estate (open plan). I have recently put up new fencing to make fields a more even acreage, and this would be a great inconvenience. There is land south of manse road which has not been cultivated for many years, is close to the main road, water main and sewage scheme. Also land next to Ardgay Garage which I believe got planning permission for housing and is now for sale. There are fields up Ardgay hill which have not been cultivated for many years also. My objection is to good agricultural land being used when other land is not cultivated. Also many of the houses in Manse Road are now privately owned and I am sure they would object to being surrounded.	As above
180 Mrs Vera MacDonald Ardgay	I hope when these or any other houses are built in Ardgay you will study the infrastructure first. Schools, roads leading out of the village, shopping facilities, water, sewerage and power. Also where you place houses meant for elderly persons and not as they are where I live, a long walk from the road.	As above
546 Ardgay & District Community Council Ardgay	The community council had a meeting attended by 32 members of the community and we have been asked to write to you regarding objections. Objecting to zone LT1. Access to this site would be very difficult and create great difficulties for the farmer who works the land who has no alternative route for moving stock. The community would suggest that residential zones could be made north of the railway line adjacent to the A836, at Kincardine and on the road to Gledfield.	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Capacity looks low compared to adjacent development. Land the East of Manse road is in Council ownership and is available for development. Consideration should be given to including this area within the settlement boundary. Site B1 is incorrectly marked as this site appears to have had a planning permission for housing.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Ardgay LT 1 North of Manse Road		
561 Miss Hilda Buchanan Ardgay	I object strongly to the zoning on area B1, B2, H1 and LT1. LT1 access very difficult for housing. This zone should be removed. Housing would be more suitable north on A836 at Kincardine or on Gledfield Road.	As above

86 Creich Parish Church Bonar Bridge	Support	Support Noted

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge G General Comment		
253 Mr Brian Coghil Ardgay	There is no possible reason that land behind No 1 to No 12 Tulloch Road cannot be developed. If you can give me a good cause I would be interested to hear it.	<p>REJECT SUGGESTED EXTENSION TO SDA BEHIND TULLOCH ROAD.</p> <p>The local plan does not say that land behind Nos 1 to 12 Tulloch Road cannot be developed. It is outwith the Settlement Development Area for Bonar Bridge, which is the preferred area for development; the area in question however if development is proposed, would be assessed against all the general policies in the local plan. However, the area in question falls within the settlement setting for Bonar Bridge which is of local/regional importance in general policy 4 of the Local Plan. It states that we will allow developments if we believe that they will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity and heritage resource. We will not extend the SDA behind the houses on Tulloch Road. There are other housing allocations in Bonar Bridge and this area can be looked at during the next review of the Local Plan in 5 years time when we will be able to assess if the housing allocation at Cherry Grove has been effective. There has been an outline planning permission for one house refused within this area of land.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge G General Comment		
222 Mr & Mrs Sawyer Bonar Bridge	I would like to object to only allowing housing on the Dornoch side of the village. How come the village can not extend to the Lairg side and upon ground behind the Tulloch Road. Housing there is adequate area for new housing and allowing the village to grow northwards and eastwards.	As above
253 Mr Brian Coghill Ardgay	I am writing to you to ask you to reconsider the Eastern Village Boundary behind Tulloch Road Bonar-Bridge. As I would like to build a house on this land which we already own. I would be grateful if it could be even realigned with Robert Grant's Coal Yard and only between no. 1 to no.6 Tulloch Road to allow for development. I look forward to hearing your response.	As above
6 Mr Donald Morrison Rosehall	I would like something done about Scottish Water ignoring what they have caused in Bonar Bridge Rosehall area. We have to get water to build housing to develop the little we have.	The granting of planning permission does not secure connection to the public water supply, but applicants are advised by the Council that they must seek consent from Scottish Water for a water connection. Scottish Water will not, other than in exceptional circumstances, object to a planning application. The absence of an objection should not be interpreted as acceptance that the proposed development can currently be serviced. Scottish Water takes into consideration the views and development priorities expressed by the Planning Authority, and planning permissions that have been granted, when preparing its investment programme. They have been consulted on the Local Plan and are aware of the allocations and they will use this when programming their investment priorities. Scottish Water advises the Council on the current and programmed capability to accommodate development.
134 Mackenzie & Cormack For: For Sheila Thomson, Ardgay	Water Capacity Our client is aware that there is a lack of water supply capacity for domestic purposes from Scottish Water. Accordingly, Scottish Water could not cope with any further demand for water for other housing units. This is obviously an important issue in terms of resource planning if there is not in fact enough water to serve any additional dwellings or properties.	As above

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge G General Comment

134 Mackenzie & Cormack For: For Sheila Thomson, Ardgay	Sewerage/Foul Drainage Our client is of the opinion and view that the foul drainage in Bonar Bridge could not cope with the increased capacity and is currently in a very poor state at the present time. The drainage system has ruptured twice in the last eighteen months. Our client has grave concerns if further capacity was added to the existing poor drainage system.	We have used information on capacities from Scottish Water when drafting the Local Plan and we are in ongoing liaison with Scottish Water. We have a revised general policy in the Plan which deals with drainage. The granting of planning permission does not secure connection to the public water supply, but applicants are advised by the Council that they must seek consent from Scottish Water for a water connection. Scottish Water will not, other than in exceptional circumstances, object to a planning application. The absence of an objection should not be interpreted as acceptance that the proposed development can currently be serviced. Scottish Water takes into consideration the views and development priorities expressed by the Planning Authority, and planning permissions that have been granted, when preparing its investment programme. They have been consulted on the Local Plan and are aware of the allocations and they will use this when programming their investment priorities. Scottish Water advises the Council on the current and programmed capability to accommodate development.
204 Carole Milligan Bonar Bridge	I would propose the use of vacant square of land adjacent to 11 Migdale Road Bonar Bridge to be developed as a play/recreation area for under 7 year old children. There is a playpark in Carnmhor Road but a safe play area for this age group is required. Children living/or with childminders nearby have to play in the designated car parking area. Seats could be provided for adults.	The area of land identified is within the SDA for Bonar Bridge; therefore in principle this area would be a preferred area for development if in the future funding or need was identified.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	All Bonar Bridge allocations are likely to require Appropriate Assessments, individually and cumulatively in relation to their possible effect on the River Oykel SAC and so SNH objects until the results of the Council's appropriate assessment can be considered.	Appropriate Assessment will be completed prior to adoption of the Local Plan.

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge H 1 Swordale

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge H 1 Swordale		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	8.1 Bonar Bridge H.1 SNH objects to the extent of this allocation as currently drawn. This objection will be withdrawn if the area of the allocation H1 and the corresponding SDA are reduced to an appropriate size to reflect the identified capacity of four houses. This site also falls within the Dornoch Firth NSA and contributes to the setting of Bonar Bridge. We understand this area has been allocated previously for four houses and a chalet/caravan site but the latter has not been developed, thereby questioning the justification for this allocation. Consequently it is recommended that an alternative location for the housing be considered with a view to this site being removed in total or in part from the SDA.	DO NOT RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 SWORDALE AND REDUCE SDA IN LINE WITH NEW PROPOSED 30 MPH SIGN More housing on the site would require substantial expenditure on improving the existing access road or a separate access road would be required to the southern end of the site. The SDA will be amended to coincide with the proposed new 30 mph sign and the existing housing already on the site.
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 3	As above
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge MU 1 Cherry Grove		
61 Mr Karol Horvath Bonar Bridge	These houses will be an asset for the village.	Support noted.
7 R Davies Bonar Bridge	Support	As above
516 J MacNeil Bonar Bridge	Support.	As above
236 Mr Ian Smith Ardgay	Support.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge MU 1 Cherry Grove		
91 Mr Norman J MacDonald Bonar Bridge	<p>New Local Plan is at odds with previous plans which stood for 30 years (at least).</p> <p>(1) Why is there a reduction in units for the area from "up to 90" down to 30.</p> <p>(2) Why is area to rear of 2, 3, & 4 Cherry Grove removed from the development area.</p> <p>(3) Why has "distributor road" from previous plans from Dornoch Road to Migdale Road been watered down to "reserve pedestrian access onto Migdale Road." This will only exacerbate problems at Migdale Road, Lairg Road, Dornoch Road junction.</p> <p>(4) What are the grounds for suspecting "archaeological remains in the area".</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION MU1 CHERRY GROVE BUT AMEND BOUNDARY ALONG REAR OF 2, 3 AND 4 CHERRY GROVE. ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS FOR PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO BE MAINTAINED FROM SWORDALE ROAD, ACCESS TO BE MAINTAINED ONTO MIGDALE ROAD FOR FUTURE PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR USE AND ACCESS POINT TO BE RESERVED FOR FUTURE ACCESS ONTO ALLOCATION LT1 SOUTH OF CHERRY GROVE.</p> <p>The Site is for a community use (potentially a hospital) and for housing. If private housing is put on the site there is an affordable housing policy in the Plan which states that when 4 or more houses are built, 25% of them must be affordable.</p> <p>There is a reduction in the number of units from previous local plans as the site is no longer just for housing, but also for a community use. However the housing capacities are only indicative and will be refined during the planning application stage. The area to the rear of 2, 3 and 4 Cherry Grove will also be included within the allocation. We hold information that there are remains of a Pillbox on the site and this would also need to be investigated during planning application stage.</p> <p>The preferred access is through Cherry Grove, although there may be later potential to provide a link through to the Migdale Road. Detailed access arrangements will be developed through the planning application stage.</p> <p>Pedestrian access from Swordale Road must be maintained and will be added to the developer requirements.</p> <p>The granting of planning permission does not secure connection to the public water supply, but applicants are advised by the Council that they must seek consent from Scottish Water for a water connection. Scottish Water will</p>

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge MU 1 Cherry Grove

not, other than in exceptional circumstances, object to a planning application. The absence of an objection should not be interpreted as acceptance that the proposed development can currently be serviced. Scottish Water takes into consideration the views and development priorities expressed by the Planning Authority, and planning permissions that have been granted, when preparing its investment programme. They have been consulted on the Local Plan and are aware of the allocations and they will use this when programming their investment priorities. Scottish Water advises the Council on the current and programmed capability to accommodate development.

We will not include a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment to be submitted with a planning application. However General Policy 9 on Flood Risk states that a Flood Risk Assessment may be necessary even where a site is not within a medium to high flood risk area.

Design and Layout Standards deal with issues such a lowered curbs and are dealt with at individual development proposals.

60 Ms Jenny Mackenzie
Ardgay

This site would be ideal for a hospital - if such a thing is in the pipeline. It would be easier for patients to get there. I would also like to see some private houses there.

As above

I take it that the plan would be to make a road from the Bradbury Centre to join Swordale Road - otherwise there would be too much traffic for Cherry Grove to cope with.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Category 3

As above

Dingwall

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge MU 1 Cherry Grove		
191 Mr Graeme Askew Bonar Bridge	Only concerns are the proximity of road access to area on the east side of our property and adequate water and sewerage provision given ongoing supply difficulties.	As above

69 Mrs J Gordon Bonar Bridge	The last time new houses were built in Bonar Bridge lowered curbs were replaced by high curbs at the access road. This causes problems for mothers with prams and makes it impossible for disabled people to negotiate the pavement. Please ensure that at all crossing points there are lowered curbs on both sides of the road.	As above

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge I 1 South Bonar Industrial Estate		
71 Mr Ian Smith Bonar Bridge	Support.	Support noted.

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge LT 1 South of Cherry Grove		
33 Ms Morag Watt Bonar Bridge	It is requested that the allocation be changes to MU1 for the following reasons: there is little or no land available for current housing provision; services are currently available in LT1 supplying the new development at the north end of H1; the change of designation to include "community use" which would allow the site to be considered for the new Migdale Hospital as an interest has been expressed by the area Health Board.	RETAIN ALLOCATION LT1 SOUTH OF CHERRY GROVE
		This land will remain as long term. At present the allocation at Cherry Grove appears to be effective. If however when the Local Plan is being reviewed in 5 years time and the allocation at Cherry Grove has not been effective, the allocation South of Cherry Grove will be considered for a housing allocation.
		Access, drainage and sewage would all be addressed when a proposal came forward as a planning application. The Local Plan has general policies which cover these areas. Any problems with septic tanks in the area would need to be resolved at planning application stage to the satisfaction of the Council and SEPA.
		Issues of privacy can be minimised by good siting, design, layout, planting and set back. This would all be considered in further detail at planning application stage.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge LT 1 South of Cherry Grove		The indicative capacity of 30 units is only indicative and actual site capacity would be agreed at planning application stage.
86 Creich Parish Church Bonar Bridge	I have forwarded the proposed plan, for east end of Bonar Bridge, to the appropriate department of the Church of Scotland in Edinburgh. I fully appreciate that this is a long term view of what may or may not happen here in this village. The young lady I spoke to on Monday in Bonar Bridge Hall was very helpful, but appeared to have no past history of troubles affecting the manse and the field LT1 behind that building and Kyle House (Mrs Thomson). Are you aware that there is an old septic tank in this field (marked LT) and overflows from this has, in quite recent times caused sewage and other unsavoury odours to "invade" the ground and driveway of the Manse? Some drainage was undertaken but with the continuous heavy rainfall there is a strong possibility that further influx of water etc may recur. Access, drainage, sewage etc must all be addressed before further plans can be carried out.	As above
91 Mr Norman J MacDonald Bonar Bridge	If issues such as access, drainage and sewerage are satisfactorily clarified/addressed, objection would not be maintained.	As above
134 Mackenzie & Cormack For: For Sheila Thomson, Ardgay	<p>Surface Water Issues</p> <p>Our client incurred considerable and real problems with the issue of surface water coming from the fields behind or to the east of her house and situated in field LT1 and beyond. The current drainage system cannot cope with the situation and this can only get worse if the fields to the east of her property are developed particularly given the upward gradient of the field behind Kyle House. This, in the recent past, has resulted in flooding of her garden ground at Kyle House and flooding of the property itself due to the volume of water coming off the hill. The current surface water drains in situ are under Mrs Thomson's house and frequently get clogged up and blocked. This means our client has to manually unblock the drains herself. If the land behind her house is developed there will be even less of a natural sponge to soak up the water but instead there will be a greater receptacle to catch the water and channelled it downwards to our client's house. Our client would like to remind the council that the council itself had to supply Kyle House</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge LT 1 South of Cherry Grove	<p>with a number of sandbags to prevent damage to her property from flooding.</p> <p>Privacy Finally, our client has concerns that her privacy at Kyle House will be considerably compromised. Our client lives in a large period property on the edge of the village with unobstructed views to the front and is surrounded by farmland to the rear. If an additional 30 houses are to be built in field LT1 this will considerably compromise her privacy particularly given that the development is likely to be on a slope with tiers of properties overlooking hers.</p> <p>Our client would also question whether there is an over density in supplying 30 houses in this field.</p>	
7 R Davies Bonar Bridge	Support	Support Noted
Inset Maps Bonar Bridge MB Inset 8.1 Bonar Bridge	<p>We wish to make representations in objection to the land use for Tulloch, Bonar bridge, related to in the attached documents. Specifically, we believe that the block of land designated 7546 would be of value to the community for low density housing, which is in keeping with the needs of families and rural land use in such an area. It is in accordance with the existing settlement pattern and meets the identified needs for housing proposals as outlined in Policies 3 and 4.1 of the Deposit Draft Sutherland Local Plan. Details of these are enclosed in the attached documents.</p> <p>1, Introduction The substance of this objection relates to the requirement to allocate a block of land in Tulloch by Bonar Bridge, namely 7546 adjacent to Drumliah Road for low density housing in keeping with the Tulloch Community.</p> <p>It is believed that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy 3 as detailed below and would enhance and improve the viability of the community, whilst providing opportunities for resident families to enjoy</p>	<p>REJECT SUGGESTED ALLOCATION AT TULLOCH, BONAR BRIDGE. This piece of land is beyond the SDA for Bonar Bridge and as such falls within the wider countryside. The Local Plan does not generally allocate land for a small number of houses outwith SDAs, instead any proposals would be assessed against the general policies of the Local Plan through the planning application process. The area in question is also covered by the settlement setting for Bonar Bridge which is of local/regional importance in general policy 4 of the Local Plan. It states that we will allow developments if we believe that they will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity and heritage resource.</p>

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge MB Inset 8.1 Bonar Bridge

and participate in rural activities.

One house adjacent to this as shown on the attached plan, is planned and ready for construction.

2. Reasons for Objection

There is no specific allocation of land for housing for repopulating the Tulloch Community, which is well provided for with utility and road services and offers an opportunity for rural living and livelihood in accordance with the existing settlement and character of the community.

The land offered and for which a change of allocation is sought provides a benefit for the area as follows:

Low density housing, typically 2-3 on a hectare, to help repopulate the community by provision of land use activities for families in conjunction with other employments.

This is in keeping with the settlement pattern of rural and light commercial use of the land parcels in Tulloch by the existing residents.

The low density also affords the opportunity for residents to sustain their living through their land and adjacent land, whose use can be shared by agreement.

This maintains and improves the viability of the community and helps to attract people with wide skill sets to the area.

The character of the community would be maintained by suitable choice of houses and land use. The land we own along the Kyle from Tulloch to Bonar, will continue to support the wild nature of the area and provide access for the local community.

The slope of the land and the wall at the top provide for an ideal backdrop to avoid any sky-lining of the proposed properties and hindrance to residents higher up the brae.

Internal tracks provide for access to the various parcels of land in the area, for movement of stock and vehicles.

Inset Maps Bonar Bridge MB Inset 8.1 Bonar Bridge

Access is from the side road to Drumliah for which a service bay and recessed access have been allocated with the planning of the adjacent property. This is some 120m off the main Lairg Road.

There are 11 kV electricity supplies within the boundary, off which a transformer supplies 230v sufficient for the one planned house and spare.

There are two 125 mm water mains within the boundary, off which there are supplies for 3-4 houses, including the existing one.

The land is on a light slope, which affords good drainage to a main culvert, which is provided under Lairg Road for outflow to the Kyle.

Porosity tests show a good response.

There is no significant loss of main agricultural land use. The land provides rough grazing and although it has been cultivated briefly in the past, results were not good, due to a limited tithe.

The land in question is not crofted.

The land is not part of the hinterland as defined.

There are no cultural or historical objects in the area under consideration.

3. Changes sought

A. Allocation of block 7546 for housing in the Bonar Bridge section 8.1 of the Deposit Draft Sutherland Plan

B. Amend the map Inset 8.1 accordingly.

C. Add the Site allocation in the Section 8.1 Site Allocation table to read Site Ref H2 , Site Area 1 Ha, Location Tulloch, Capacity 2 units, Requirements To be determined.

Inset Maps South Bonar Industrial Estate I 1 South Bonar Industrial Estate

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps South Bonar Industrial Estate I 1 South Bonar Industrial Estate		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	8.2 South Bonar Industrial Estate I.1 This site occupies a prominent location on the flat and low-lying floodplain of the River Oykel and falls just outside the boundary of the Dornoch Firth NSA. SNH strongly recommends that alternative sites are considered within the areas identified for business and mixed use in the neighbouring villages of Bonar Bridge and Ardgay which might provide a more sustainable location for this allocation. SNH is particularly concerned about the potential visual impact of land raising and on the possible impacts on the adjacent SAC and SPA from additional discharge from the site. An Appropriate Assessment is also likely to be required here, for the same reason as for Bonar Bridge and Ardgay above, and so SNH objects until the results of the Council's appropriate assessment can be considered.	RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT REDUCE BOUNDARY TO EXISTING INDUSTRIAL ESTATE SITE. AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS. The allocation will be decreased in size to remove the proposed extension to the west. However, the existing Industrial Estate will remain as an allocation. There are existing businesses located on the Industrial Estate which need to be supported. We accept that an Appropriate Assessment will be required for this allocation and this will be completed prior to adoption of the Plan. We will also amend the developer requirements to state that a Flood Risk Assessment will be necessary when submitting a planning application.
90 Mr Stephen Copely Ardgay	This site is a complete waste of time and money as by 2030 it will be inundated by rising sea levels. Move units to higher ground (Ardgay?) and raise the causeway by 3 metres (ten feet).	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 1	As above
124 Mrs R A Copley Ardgay	In view of the immense expenditure that would be incurred in the not too distant future to defend this area from the rising water table I object to further development of the site. I believe the investment should be made in other local sites - prime amongst them Ardgay station north.	As above
Inset Maps Rosehall H 1 Rear of the post office		
75 A C Snody Rosehall	Need to know more about the housing - private, rental, council? Do the houses have to be so close to Cassley Drive? To enclosing on housing already there - surrounding houses in Cassley Drive - with all the space available do they have to back onto gardens in Casley Drive? What's happening to Rosehall Trails Path? Appears to have disappeared!	RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 REAR OF THE POST OFFICE AND AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO STATE ACCESS TO ROSEHALL TRAILS PATH MUST BE RETAINED. At this stage it is impossible to say what kind of housing would be provided on the site. This would be determined by the landowner/developer and would be tested through

Inset Maps Rosehall H 1 Rear of the post office

a planning application. The local plan has an affordable housing policy which states that when 4 or more houses are built 25% of them must be affordable. Design, siting, layout, planting and set-back from other properties would also be dealt with in detail at planning application stage.

The following will be added to developer requirements: “ Access must be maintained to Rosehall Trails Path”.

National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. The Local Plan aims to identify areas of land for development that will meet the existing and projected need for each settlement and its catchment. There is a need to ensure that there is an adequate supply of effective land readily available to develop.

The development factors for Rosehall state that local road improvements will be required where a network deficiency is created or worsened by a particular proposal and development must be proportionate to the capacity of the mainly single track A837.

376 E Smith
Rosehall

Have to say no to Local Development, would rather have Rosehall stay as it is, quiet and crime free and to be able to look out to see fields and the hills rather than houses.

As above

551 Lord Marks of Broughton
Rosehall

Rosehall is a small, local hamlet whose only facilities are a tiny shop and post office, a fishing hotel and a small primary school at nearby Altass. There is virtually no work available in the immediate area and access to the two nearest towns, Bonar Bridge and Lairg, is largely by single track road (which is liable to flooding). Whilst there may be an argument for allowing the construction of a few extra houses in Rosehall, any large scale development would be quite inappropriate in view of the present very limited infrastructure. Such development would be virtually impossible to implement without destroying the peaceful rural character of this existing community.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Rosehall H 1 Rear of the post office		
257 Mrs Ramona Robertson Lairg	My reasons for objecting are the same as the reasons I have written on the other sheet (H2). This is far too nice an area to be spoilt with more housing or any other development. The reason I live here is because it is so lovely and a very important point is no crime. I am getting older and wish that to continue.	As above
42 Mrs Sharron Baillie Rosehall	I think it would greatly benefit the community to have more houses in Rosehall, especially the shop, school and pub. Otherwise it will slowly die as the young people will just move away if there are no amenities and I feel we need more young families in the area.	Support noted
110 Dr R W Sendall Rosehall	Support.	As above
Inset Maps Rosehall H 2 Opposite the post office		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>8.5 Rosehall</p> <p>H.2 SNH is concerned at the extent of this allocation in relation to its proximity to the River Cassley (part of the River Oykel SAC). An appropriate assessment of the impacts on the interest features of the River Oykel SAC will be required for this site and SNH objects until the results of the Council's appropriate assessment can be considered.</p> <p>SNH also strongly recommends that this area is reduced in size by at least half from the east. In addition to impacts on the SAC, it is our opinion that any development in this location should be located along the roadside north and south of the existing house and kennels. We would also recommend that the area north of H2 and on the east side of the road is removed from the SDA due to its proximity to the river and the important views from the road over the river on the appch to the settlement from the bridge to the north.</p>	<p>DO NOT RETAIN ALLOCATION H2 OPPOSITE THE POST OFFICE BUT RETAIN NORTH EAST SECTION ADJACENT TO THE KENNELS IN THE SDA. REDUCE SDA AT NORTH EAST OF VILLAGE. MODIFY SDA BOUNDARY AROUND INVERCASSLEY HOUSE.</p> <p>After the allocation is reduced in size to take into account the effects on the setting of Invercassley House and impact on its proximity to the River Oykel SAC, we are left with two small areas of unlinked land, on either side of the kennels. The small piece of land south west of the kennels is directly opposite the proposed access point to allocation H1 and would therefore not have a suitable access point. The area of land to the north east of the kennels will remain within the SDA as suitable for infill development. The housing allocation at H1 Rear of the Post Office, will continue to provide land for development.</p> <p>The SDA to the north east of the village, across the road from Cassley Drive, will be amended to exclude the area of land between the River Cassley and the A837. It is accepted that this land would not be suitable for infill</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Rosehall H 2 Opposite the post office		development due to its proximity to the River Oykel SAC and the important views from the road over the river on the approach to the settlement from the bridge to the north.
257 Mrs Ramona Robertson Lairg	This a lovely quiet peaceful place and I look out over my back window into fields and hills in the background, in other words countryside. I'm sorry but I do not want to look out onto houses. They in my opinion, will not help keep the area, there is very little work around here for the people already here, we have no crime etc here and I don't want that to change, so I have to say no, to housing or any other development.	As above
110 Dr R W Sendall Rosehall	An increase in housing could only be of benefit to the village, there would however require to be an upgrading of the road system particularly the A837.	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
551 Lord Marks of Broughton Rosehall	Rosehall is a small, local hamlet whose only facilities are a tiny shop and post office, a fishing hotel and a small primary school at nearby Altass. There is virtually no work available in the immediate area and access to the two nearest towns,, Bonar Bridge and Lairg, is largely by single track road, which is liable to flooding. Whilst there may be an argument for allowing the construction of a few extra houses in Rosehall, any large-scale development would be quite inappropriate in view of the present very limited infrastructure. Such development would be virtually impossible to implement without destroying the peaceful rural character of the existing community.	As above
376 E Smith Rosehall	Have to say no to houses. Rosehall much better the way it is. Quiet and crime free and to see fields and hills from windows.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Rosehall H 2 Opposite the post office		
75 A C Snody Rosehall	Need to know more about housing - private, rental, council?	As above
42 Mrs Sharron Baillie Rosehall	I think it would greatly benefit the community to have more houses in Rosehall especially the shop, school and pub otherwise it will slowly die as the young people will just move away if there are no amenities. And I feel we need more young families in the area.	Support noted
Inset Maps Invershin H 1 Former Balblair workings		
112 Mr Peter C Campbell Bonar Bridge	I am the owner and prospective developer of this site. The original intention had been for the "zoned" area to extend to the line drawn in pencil on the map. This would allow a larger area to be allocated to the 12 house sites planned. I am not requesting additional sites.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 FORMER BALBLAIR WORKINGS BUT ENLARGE ALLOCATION TO SOUTH EAST WITH NO ADDITIONAL UNITS. AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS.</p> <p>Boundary to be amended to include additional land to the south-east. The indicative capacity of the site will remain at 12 units with the additional land to be allocated to the houses.</p> <p>We will add the following developer requirements: "Housing must be kept back from the river" and "A design brief must be prepared." The developer requirement on flood risk will be amended to read, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application".</p> <p>Appropriate Assessment will be completed for this allocation.</p>
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
582 Mr Phil Hawthorne Liverpool		As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Invershin H 1 Former Balblair workings		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	8.3 Invershin H.1 SNH is concerned at the proximity of this location to the River Oykel SAC. We recommend that additional wording is included to keep housing back from the river. This should be compatible with the objective of providing land holdings in association with the housing. We would also recommend that a design brief is prepared to ensure these concerns are overcome. An Appropriate Assessment is also likely to be required here and so SNH objects until the results of the Council's appropriate assessment can be considered.	As above
Inset Maps Invershin MB Inset 8.3 Invershin		
362 Sandy Chalmers Invershin	On 22/1/08 the Invershin Hall Committee met to discuss the plan. The unanimous view was the need for affordable housing and affordable building plots. Also appropriate small scale housing in our village. The Committee pointed out that the Balblair development was not in the boundary of our village and did not reflect local needs.	ENLARGE SDA TO NORTH BUT RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 FORMER BALBLAIR WORKINGS WITHIN SDA. We will enlarge the SDA to the north as suggested however the allocation of H1 Former Balblair Workings will remain within the SDA. General policy 1 Settlement Development Areas supports appropriate infill development within a Settlement Development Boundary, therefore appropriate infill for affordable housing or plots will not be affected by the allocation within the SDA.
102 Invershin Hall Committee Invershin	A map is enclosed with a change to the village boundaries for Invershin.	As above
Inset Maps Lairg H 1 South-west of main street		
169 Mr Robert Sharkey Lairg	Support.	Support noted.
22 Mr Offor Lairg	I support this cautiously - development of such a large area for housing should only be considered if facilities, amenities and public transport is up to a respectable standard at this time it absolutely is not - there are no local jobs to sustain the housing.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg H 1 South-west of main street		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	9.1 Lairg H.1 This is a substantial area which SNH recommends should be the subject of a design brief to meet the challenges of the undulating landform on the approach to the village from the west.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H1 SOUTH WEST OF MAIN STREET. AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO INCLUDE REQUIREMENT FOR A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND A MASTER PLAN.</p> <p>We will remove, "Houses must be carefully designed to fit landform", and replace with, "Master plan required to ensure houses are carefully designed to fit with the undulating landform. This Master Plan should also take account of the allocation at MU1". Any proposed development will be judged against its compatibility with existing and adjacent land uses and impact on adjacent properties will be avoided or minimised by siting, design, layout, planting or set-back.</p> <p>A robust drainage system will be required. We will add a developer requirement, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application".</p> <p>Preferred access to the site is via the A836. The current access via The Terrace is substandard for any additional units. It is not intended for access to be taken via the tennis courts.</p> <p>Housing capacity for allocations is only indicative and will be negotiated during the planning applications process.</p> <p>National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. A choice of housing has a direct impact on an area's ability to grow and prosper and hence on the ability to attract jobs.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg H 1 South-west of main street		
103 Morag MacDonald Lairg	The small part of ground in front of The Terrace and between the two bungalows on Station Road - do not wish to see building on this small area. Access from The Terrace can be quite dangerous and more housing would make this worse with either extra traffic on The Terrace on onto the A836. Building above the two bungalows area very marshy and wet and there has been problems already with water here. No objection to the rest of the area being utilised. Although would wish to see more business into the area to bring jobs than houses.	As above
107 Mr & Mrs Quinn Lairg	Supported as long as the buildings are in keeping with the locality and there are no tall buildings next to our property at Cnoc Grianach.	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Master plan required. Consideration should be given to whether sites MU1 and H1 should be considered as one site for masterplanning purposes. Also consideration should be given to how the development of MU1 which is a key site in the economic future of the village can best be promoted. Capacity as per draft: 70 + MU1 Suggested capacity: 70 + MU1	As above
153 Lairg Estate Bonar Bridge	It is acknowledged that the housing capacity is indicative only. The owner would wish to be able via negotiation during the planning application process to establish the proper housing capacity for the site.	As above
182 Mr A MacKay Lairg	Access to site "H1" via the tennis court is not suitable for large number of vehicles and access from the side of the Loch will need careful planning for access and suitable vision arcs for drivers.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg H 1 South-west of main street		
46 Mrs M Ross Lairg	Lairg is a small village with an eradicated community spirit. 70 houses would be too many houses for the village for a host of reasons. Drainage is already a problem with the road along the front of Loch Shin from Main Street to corner of Ord Place bridge flooding in places during periods of heavy rain. The burn at the back of Glenburn which goes underground is overgrown and would be a flooding problem during excavation and building. The area has very little work so incomers would be retired or otherwise and would not be adding anything to the local economy. It would add to the burden of the local GP, nursing staff, police etc. It is already difficult to get a dentist.	As above
49 R M Anderson Lairg	The land is too waterlogged for housing.	As above
188 Lairg Community Council Lairg	The council object to future development of these areas until employment is created within Lairg. Should development go ahead this would put a strain on infrastructure ie medical, care of the elderly services etc. As it is most likely that housing would be occupied by ageing/retiring population and as second homes.	As above
251 Mrs A M MacKay Lairg	Please consider how work would be generated for people moving into Lairg's new houses. There is not enough work for inhabitants at present, far less work for occupants of up to 70 new homes. What is to be done about this?? I think this is a major consideration and look forward to the Council's plans and suggestions regarding this problem.	As above
345 Sutherland Sporting Tweed Company Lairg	Where are the jobs to support this need for housing? Jobs first, houses second. Or else, who do you suppose is going to live in the houses - over the last 10 years, virtually all buying houses here are not working in/or bringing anything into the community.	As above
344 Elizabeth Ross Lairg	I do not think Lairg can sustain a larger population as there is no work.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg H 1 South-west of main street		
189 Mr & Mrs D A Walker Lairg	We object to the proposed development of area H1 until employment is created within the village of Lairg to support development. Otherwise it will only become a retirement/2nd home area which in turn will put a further strain of local infrastructure (medical and care of the elderly services).	As above
333 Mr & Mrs J D MacKay Lairg	Our only concern with regard to housing to the rear of dwellings on Main Street, Lairg would be how close to the existing gardens would any new housing and gardens be built. Would it be intended to have gardens/houses back to back with existing housing?	As above
Inset Maps Lairg H 2 North of Manse Road		
29 Mr R Young Lairg	Support	Support noted.
379 Joan Munro Lairg	We own part of this site. We envisage being willing to release the site for development at some point in the future.	As above
228 Mr & Mrs James Kay Lairg	Support.	As above
195 Mr Alexander Skinner Lairg	Object to part of site H2 (as shown on map provided) as this is part of house named Tynron and is not available for development.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H2 NORTH OF MANSE ROAD BUT REDUCE TO REMOVE THE LAND BELONGING TO SPRINGFIELD AND TYNRON.</p> <p>National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. A choice of housing has a direct impact on an area's ability to grow and prosper and hence on its ability to attract jobs. There are two business sites allocated in Lairg and Lairg Station is also mentioned in the settlement text as an area for further business growth.</p> <p>The boundary will be amended to remove the land at Springfield and its access from the allocation and also the</p>

Inset Maps Lairg H 2 North of Manse Road

land at Tynron.

Re-routing or under grounding of electricity supply would be preferable; this would be at the expense of the developer. A robust drainage system will be required. Siting, design, layout, planting and set-back will all be dealt with during the planning application process.

We cannot tie the provision of additional parking to this allocation to resolve on street parking problems on Manse Road.

188 Lairg Community Council
Lairg

The council object to future development of these areas until employment is created within Lairg. Should development go ahead this would put a strain on infrastructure ie medical, care of the elderly services etc. As it is most likely that housing would be occupied by ageing/retiring population and as second homes.

As above

193 Mr James B H & Kirsteen
Norton
Lairg

- 1) Area H2 does not show access to Springfield or is it intended to provide a different access within the planning consent.
- 2) How is electrical MU Supply line to be diverted that crosses the site.
- 3) Land requires extensive draining and water course diversion.
- 4) On street parking on Manse Road to be resolved by provision of lay-bys or alternative parking areas (off street).
- 5) Redevelopment limited to 1.5 storey or less?

As above

211 A M Hart
Lairg

There is over provision for houses in Lairg. Commercial/industrial provision is what is required with support for sustainable employment. This plan, if implemented, would greatly impinge on our visual amenities.

As above

Inset Maps Lairg H 3 East of Manse Road

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg H 3 East of Manse Road		
153 Lairg Estate Bonar Bridge	It is acknowledged that the housing capacity is indicative only. The owner would wish to be able via negotiation during the planning application process to establish the proper housing capacity for the site.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H3 EAST OF MANSE ROAD</p> <p>National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. A choice of housing has a direct impact on an area's ability to grow and prosper and hence on its ability to attract jobs.</p> <p>Housing capacity for allocations is only indicative and will be negotiated during the planning applications process.</p> <p>The issue of access arrangements with adjacent houses was not raised as an issue by the Council's Road Engineers.</p>
188 Lairg Community Council Lairg	The council object to future development of these areas until employment is created within Lairg. Should development go ahead this would put a strain on infrastructure ie medical, care of the elderly services etc. As it is most likely that housing would be occupied by ageing/retiring population and as second homes.	As above
379 Joan Munro Lairg	We would draw your attention to vehicle access arrangements. If the access remains as currently ie onto Manse Road this would be opposite our own point of access and become a very busy junction and safety to be considered.	As above
Inset Maps Lairg H 4 Ord Place		
160 Mr Trevor Hogarth Lairg	I am both objecting and supporting the plan. If the local authority (council) build these houses, then I support the plan. If the land is given over to a developer to build private housing then I object to the plan. There is a shortage of local authority housing and especially four bedroom houses, there are currently no four bed roomed houses in the whole of Sutherland council housing stock.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION H4 ORD PLACE AND AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO INCLUDE THE REQUIREMENT FOR A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT.</p> <p>The Council does not own the land so it is not within the Council's control who develops this site. The local plan does however have an affordable housing policy. This states that where 4 or more houses are built on a site, 25% of them must be affordable housing. It would however be very unlikely that The Council would build affordable housing; it is generally built by a Registered</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg H 4 Ord Place		<p>Social Landlord. The local plan can not determine what type of housing is on an allocation. This would be determined during the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. A choice of housing has a direct impact on an area's ability to grow and prosper and hence its ability to attract jobs.</p> <p>We will add a developer requirement, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application".</p>
343 Donald & Isabel MacLeod Lairg	Could do with more houses for O.A.P.s	As above
233 Sheila Legge Lairg	Flats for single people needed. Also small houses for elderly.	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
271 Mrs V A MacPhee Lairg	What Lairg needs is more jobs for our young people. Not more houses.	As above
511 Mrs Shirley Morrison Lairg	I strongly disagree with housing going on the Church Glebe beside Ord Place. What Lairg needs is work for all ages. What we don't need is more unemployed or retired people arriving in the village - having sold houses in more affordable areas and paying ridiculous prices here outbidding any local. As long as we don't have work there is a decline in our whole village which in turn will affect the few remaining small shops and village school.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg H 4 Ord Place		
188 Lairg Community Council Lairg	The council object to future development of these areas until employment is created within Lairg. Should development go ahead this would put a strain on infrastructure ie medical, care of the elderly services etc. As it is most likely that housing would be occupied by ageing/retiring population and as second homes.	As above
55 Mr Wolfgang Stein Lairg	Support.	Support Noted
51 C Anderson Lairg	Support.	As above
50 Mrs M Phillips Lairg	It may help bring more industry to the area.	As above
93 Forestry Commission Scotland Inverness	This land has been let to the Free Church adjacent for grazing. We have not discussed your proposed zoning with the Church and agreement would need to be reached with them about the proposed change of use. The Forestry Commission support this proposed use as housing.	As above
52 Mr Lindsay MacDonald Lairg	Support.	As above
Inset Maps Lairg MU 1 Former hotel/outbuildings		
344 Elizabeth Ross Lairg	Support.	Support noted.
333 Mr & Mrs J D MacKay Lairg	Support.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg MU 1 Former hotel/outbuildings		
169 Mr Robert Sharkey Lairg	Support.	As above
22 Mr Offor Lairg	Support. Also cautious - this land should only be developed in such a way the village will benefit from facilities and the creation of jobs. Housing in any form should be rejected.	As above
189 Mr & Mrs D A Walker Lairg	This area must only be developed for mixed use. Tourist accommodation/hotel. It is vital that jobs are created for the survival of the village of Lairg.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION MU1 FORMER HOTEL/OUTBUILDINGS AND AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIRMENTS TO INCLUDE THE REQUIREMENT FOR A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND A MASTER PLAN.</p> <p>The site is being retained as an allocation for Mixed Use (MU) for tourist accommodation and is not allocated for an industrial use. There is currently a Tree Preservation Order on the site.</p> <p>We will add to the developer requirements, "A master plan should be prepared for this site and it should take account of the allocation at H1" and "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application".</p>
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	<p>Master plan required. Consideration should be given to whether sites MU1 and H1 should be considered as one site for masterplanning purposes. Also consideration should be given to how the development of MU1 which is a key site in the economic future of the village can best be promoted.</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 70 + MU1 Suggested capacity: 70 + MU1</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg MU 1 Former hotel/outbuildings		
582 Mr Phil Hawthorne Liverpool	<p>Ref: Development Sites at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sutherland Arms Hotel, Lairg <li>b) Balblair Quarry <p>Further to our meeting with representatives of the planning department I am writing to express my interest in the above sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sutherland Arms Hotel <p>I have attached a copy of our latest draft proposal for a leisure development on the above site. This would include approx 24 apartments, a 10 bedroom boutique hotel, shop, restaurant and a media room. Meetings have been held with representatives of the local Lairg action group and their comments and requirements for the site have now been incorporated in the revised scheme.</p> <p>In addition we would look to invest in a new sailing 'marina' to encourage the villagers to make full use of the waterside facilities. I think it is fair to say that the Lairg Action Group are fully supportive of our proposals.</p> <p>The scheme will serve to regenerate Lairg, create new employment opportunities and provide 'all year round' visitors. It is envisaged that the accommodation will be of the Weber Haus or Huf Haus type and as such will represent the latest standards of innovation, design, sustainability and eco awareness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Balblair Quarry Site <p>Several meetings have been held to discuss the development of the site, with a further one scheduled for the 26th August with representatives of your department.</p> <p>Our proposal for the site would be the creation of an 'executive' lifestyle village of up to 12 x 5 bed detailed properties of the Huf Haus / Weber Haus design each sat in a plot of around 3-4 acres. The homes would represent the absolute pinnacle of stylish residential development. It is also proposed to include a series of leisure activities</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg MU 1 Former hotel/outbuildings	<p>on the site e.g. individual hot tubs, pool, tennis courts and equestrian facilities. The development would be 'world class' and a huge boost to the marketability of the region.</p> <p>I believe the above is a fair reflection of discussions and meetings held to date and hopefully will be of use in formulating your ideas for the area. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to call me.</p>	
251 Mrs A M MacKay Lairg	Mixed use is an ambiguous term but I can understand from note above that in this case it means tourist accommodation. Is this correct?	As above
49 R M Anderson Lairg	Do not want an industrial site on this spot.	As above
188 Lairg Community Council Lairg	The council requests that this area should be retained for commercial (leisure) development. For creation of essential jobs.	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
345 Sutherland Sporting Tweed Company Lairg	Having lost our only hotel (not public house) the village has suffered dramatically over the last 11 years. We need a quality hotel (and quality housing) on this site - not just for local employment, but to give the village the lift it needs to turn around.	As above
46 Mrs M Ross Lairg	Should encourage anything that would add to work and economy of village. Let the site be used and ignore thoughts of preserving old trees and such. We can grow plenty of these again where they could perhaps enhance the buildings etc. Economy of area and spirits of real villagers is very important.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg B 1 Former laundry		
188 Lairg Community Council Lairg	The council request that this site should be retained for commercial/business development only.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION B1 FORMER LAUNDRY BUT AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO STATE THAT A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT WILL BE REQUIRED, CURRENT PEDESTRIAN ACCESS FROM CLASH BREAC TO LAUNDRY ROAD SHOULD BE RETAINED OR ALTERNATIVE PROVISION PROVIDED AND ANY BUSINESS USE MUST BE COMPATIBLE WITH ADJACENT DOMESTIC BUILDINGS.</p> <p>The site is allocated for business use. We will add the following to the developer requirements, "Any business use must be compatible with adjacent domestic buildings" . We need to allocate sites for business use within the local plan in order to encourage economic development. There is a general policy in the local plan which covers development in the wider countryside; therefore other business proposals which come forward outwith allocated sites in the settlements will be assessed accordingly.</p> <p>We will add the developer requirements, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application" and " Current pedestrian access from Clash Breac to Laundry Road should be retained or alternative provision provided in any development".</p>
116 P&C Properties Alness	<p>Areas mapped on map:</p> <p>1) Built two semi detached houses on this site in 2006 and have since sold them.</p> <p>2) We still own this site and have detailed planning permission for a three bed house.</p>	As above
359 Mr Hugh & Robert Corbett Lairg	May I begin by emphasising that I cannot fully object or support any of the zoning which you present in the Sutherland Local Plan. Obviously the zone which directly affects my property is the former Laundry site (zoned as B1: Business). I fully appreciate that this site traditionally served as a hub of commercial activity to the village and county beyond, however times have changed and centralised services have given rise to a shift in social behaviour. There is no longer the demand for a	As above

Inset Maps Lairg B 1 Former laundry

laundry in Lairg, nor some may say a garage facility. The County services have once again centralised and streamlined with the former site now being occupied by Paul Renouf, a talented and willing Blacksmith; although how long his services will remain is questionable. I have in the past, along with a business tenant, applied for CASE assistance to develop the former laundry building into a factory workshop and showroom. My tenant was enticed by the offer of a higher rate of grant to build a new state-of-the-art building, the plans for the former Laundry fell by the wayside, his state-of-the-art building is now for sale! There are industrial units lying empty all over the county with no sustainable businesses to occupy them. My future plans for the Laundry, given the current economic climate are uncertain. I would love to re-instate the site with a viable and successful business from which the area can benefit, but this is appearing less and less likely. I also have concept plans to convert the building into self-contained affordable rented accommodation....the area lacks this! The "hanger" or old Lairg Coachworks building is well situated and suited to serving the area as a general garage; I would also like to resurrect this as a viable business in the future. So in general I fail to see the advantage of "zoning specific sites; however I do agree that certain areas need to be protected from money hungry developers, whose interests could not lie further from that of the local community. I also believe that the same level of assistance, if not more, should be made available to the development of old commercial buildings as opposed to the backing of new purpose built developments which as statistics tell us are more often than not doomed to failure.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency
Dingwall

Category 2

As above

Inset Maps Lairg B 2 West of Church Hill Road

188 Lairg Community Council
Lairg

The council requests that this site should be retained for commercial/business development only.

RETAIN ALLOCATION B2 WEST OF CHURCH HILL ROAD AND AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO INCLUDE THE REQUIREMENT FOR A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT.

The site is allocated for business use. Sewers on Main

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg B 2 West of Church Hill Road		
		<p>Street is a maintenance issue which the Local Plan does not deal with. We are working with SEPA on other wider sewerage issues.</p> <p>Any development on the site would be subject to the appropriate siting and design. We will add a developer requirement, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application".</p>
78 Mr John Corbett Lairg	Purchased piece of ground adjacent to the north-east boundary of site B2 (map supplied).	As above
34 Mr & Mrs Brinklow Lairg	Saddlers House already has problems with the sewerage. During periods of very heavy rain sewerage from Milnclarin/Church Hill Road causes back up on the drains of this property. Sewers on Main Street would need to be improved to cope with more buildings. Any building would need to be aesthetically pleasing as it would be near existing housing.	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
Inset Maps Lairg LT 1 North of Milnclarin		
182 Mr A MacKay Lairg	Both sites "LT1" and "B1" will have an impact on the drainage and surface water ways in the surrounding areas. This will affect the "Allt A' Choin Duinn" burn and so affect properties along its bank, so careful planning and installation of corrective systems to alleviate the problem need to be ensured.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION LT1 NORTH OF MILNCLARIN AND AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIRMENTS TO INCLUDE THE REQUIREMENT FOR A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT</p> <p>There is a general policy in the local plan that covers Surface Water Drainage; it states that all development must be drained by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</p> <p>Preferred access is via Milnclarin. The current access does limit the number of additional units on this site to 3.</p>

Inset Maps Lairg LT 1 North of Milnclarin

We will add a developer requirement, "This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application".

Issues with service damage during development are the responsibility of the developer who should consult with the service providers to identify services in an area. Any legal way leave for services should be shown in the title deeds for a property. The Council consults service providers during the Local Plan process, so they will be aware of allocated sites.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Category 2

As above

Dingwall

340 Mr & Mrs Sutherland

We attended the last local consultation and were relieved to be informed that the Council's Roads Department considered access to LT1 from Manse Road/Back Road to be unsuitable. This has been one of our concerns. We also understand that the present access from Milnclarin limits the number of houses which could be built in this area. From our letter of 20th November 2006 you will see our concerns regarding any excavations or vibrations in the area of our services. This concerns continues as services could be damaged unknown to us by access or building investigations and excavations.

As above

Lairg

Inset Maps Lairg LT 2 North-west of Lochside

531 A Francis

Support.

Support noted.

Lairg

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg LT 2 North-west of Lochside		
193 Mr James B H & Kirsteen Norton Lairg	<p>1) Manse Road is not suitable for an additional 50 to 75 vehicles as there is no full footpath both sides especially at bottom.</p> <p>2) Upper part of Manse Road (before Manse) has several vehicles parked on street as there is no provision for off street parking on Manse Road.</p> <p>3) Upper part of Manse Road (after Manse) is used during large funerals and development of LT2 would have to provide parking (off road) for 40 to 50 vehicles as a minimum and also provide additional parking at cemetery.</p> <p>4) Access of the low (Lochside Road) will be required to be designed with a prioritised junction access as a minimum to ensure safe ingress and egress and better sightlines provided.</p> <p>5) Is drainage (foul and storm) sufficient or will upgrade be required with general disruption.</p> <p>6) Additional facilities will be required for the young population so this development has potential for 50 to 75+ children and current education and youth facilities are inadequate.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION LT2 NORTH WEST OF LOCHSIDE</p> <p>A developer requirement is to extend the footpath on Manse Road. The preferred access would be via a roundabout off the A836. A Sustainable Drainage System will be required as per general policy 14 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>We cannot tie the provision of additional parking to this allocation to resolve on street parking problems on Manse Road.</p> <p>Generally development in an area creates growth which in turn supports the creation of new amenities and infrastructure and helps to support existing facilities. The Local Plan has a general policy on developer contributions which helps to ensure that there is mitigation for the impact of new development.</p> <p>We have been informed by Scottish Water that there is sufficient capacity in the waste water treatment plant.</p> <p>The impact on the cemetery or privacy of adjacent properties can be avoided or minimised by siting, design, layout, planting and set-back and would all be dealt with during the planning application process.</p> <p>The Council does not own the land so it is not within the Council's control who develops this site. The local plan does however have an affordable housing policy. This states that where 4 or more houses are built on a site, 25% of them must be affordable housing.</p> <p>National planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. A choice of housing has a direct impact on an area's ability to grow and prosper. The allocation is also for longer term. It is intended that this site will not be considered for development for housing during the lifetime of this plan unless some of the other allocated</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg LT 2 North-west of Lochside		sites become ineffective.
228 Mr & Mrs James Kay Lairg	We have no objections to any future housing developments as long as they conform to usual Council Planning and Guidelines. We would also consider it appropriate that any house development on the land topside of our north boundary wall should have a minimum six foot (2 metre) screening fence, not only to affect some privacy to new houses and ours but as a barrier and protection to existing stone dyke, which myself and adjoining house (Glencairn) have to maintain.	As above
178 Mrs V Willoughby Lairg	Lairg does not have the infrastructure to carry large housing development. 50 houses need to be built where they have shops and work in the area. This would be too far out for working people with the price of fuel. It would need bigger school/doctors/police/transport.	As above
530 Mr Alan J Hamilton Lairg	As a council tenant I am conscious of the need for more local authority housing, or genuinely "affordable" housing for first time buyers. As neither of these options is likely for the site, unless a housing association builds on the site, then I personally can't see any benefit to the village from a private developer.	As above
286 Mr & Mrs W Munro Lairg	We have lived at this address for 24 years. In that period the croft land (LT2) has been in full use everyday, throughout each year, with sheep, cattle or crops. It is recognised as being prime crofting land and would be a loss to the local environment. We also believe that additional housing in this area will put a strain on the present sewage system, which travels from here to terminate in the Ord Place area, at the opposite end of the village. As Lairg has very little employment now, an additional 50 houses would be a drain on the resources presently available and unsuitable for working families. This would suggest suitability for the elderly, of which we have no amenities for ie nursing homes or day care centres. There would also be an impact on the local cemetery, which is presently situated in a private and peaceful setting in Lairg.	As above
Inset Maps Lairg MB Inset 9.1 Lairg		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg MB Inset 9.1 Lairg		
116 P&C Properties Alness	We bought this site (opposite fire station) in early 2007 when it was to be included in the new local plan, therefore we object to its removal. We have been working on an application for 7 houses on this site and will be submitting it this week.	INSERT NEW ALLOCATION FOR HOUSING OPPOSITE THE FIRE STATION AND EXTEND SDA. The area of land opposite the fire station in Lairg was a site option in the Sutherland Futures document in autumn 2006. This document highlighted a number of site options for Lairg that could potentially be published in the pre-deposit draft of the local plan. There was never any guarantee that a site option featured in Sutherland Futures would go forward into the pre-deposit draft. The site in question was not taken forward as an allocation as it was unclear if the site would be effective. However, since the publication of the pre-deposit draft it has become clear that this is an effective site and we will amend the SDA to include this site as a housing allocation. It will have the following developer requirements: Requirements to be determined through planning application process.
161 Lairg & District Community Initiative Lairg	The Lairg and District Community Initiative wish to have the land (shaded on enclosed map) included in the Lairg Plan. The land in question is owned by the community and is to be developed into an amenity area for the local community in the near future.	INSERT NEW ALLOCATION FOR COMMUNITY USE TO NORTH WEST OF FERRYCROFT CENTRE AND EXTEND SDA. Amend map to include this proposed area as an allocation. It will be allocated as Community Use (C). This will allow for the amenity area to be potentially developed for community uses in the future. It is not being identified as Open Space (OS) as this would restrict any form of development on the area.
188 Lairg Community Council Lairg	The Council request that this area be kept for business use and future business development. (Map attached)	INSERT NEW ALLOCATION FOR BUSINESS USE TO SOUTH WEST OF ORD PLACE AND EXTEND SDA. This site will be included as an allocation for Business Use (B). It is an existing site of business use and it will allow for the area to continue as business use.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lairg MB Inset 9.1 Lairg		
340 Mr & Mrs Sutherland Lairg	Area of Gunn's Wood would be suitable for building. It has good solid foundation, easy access, is close to all services and suitable housing would enhance the look of Lairg. Would like the Council, Forestry and Crofters' Commission consulting each other in each parish to work out a suitable programme for housing, tree planting and agriculture to enable all three to work together and help revive our dying countryside. It would be reasonably easy to obtain other hill land for tree-planting but if good agricultural land is dug up and built on it is lost for all time. The Crofters' Commission is trying to obtain croft land for young entrants and it seems wrong to dig it up and build on it.	When we are drafting the Local Plan we take into account the Plans and Strategies of other agencies. They are also consulted during the Local Plan process and have identified pieces of land to us which we have assessed for suitability.
Inset Maps Lochinver G General Comment		
210 Mrs Heather MacDonald Lochinver	Industry - will units be built by Highland Council to sell to local people to promote growth of industry e.g. at Lochinver pier? 20 years is far too long to update local plans - this should be done every 5 years and it is essential that this does not lapse so long as it has done and recognise the need to adapt and diversify for all.	NO CHANGE There is a good point made about the need to update Local Plans regularly. The planning system is currently undergoing significant reform and the new Planning Act stipulates that Local Plans should be reviewed every five years. The Council are responding to this challenge and hope that through making changes, particularly through the amalgamation of Local plans so they cover much larger areas we can achieve this. There is land allocated for business/industrial use at the pier so these uses are encouraged. Anybody interested should pursue this through the Harbours department of the Council who own this land, and Highlands and Islands Enterprise who will provide advice and assistance perhaps including financial help.
133 Mrs E S Bakker Lochinver	Supporting allocations H1, H2 and H3. The plans for the housing seem to be ok as far as I can see. Housing is needed in Lochinver if only there was a way of getting more employment in the area.	NO CHANGE I note your support of the housing allocations. Attracting or creating employment in the area will hopefully follow and there is land identified at the harbour which is allocated for employment generating businesses.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lochinver G General Comment		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	10.1 Lochinver SNH welcomes the supporting wording included in the developer requirements for the allocations in this plan area which reflect the challenges of developing successfully within this part of the NSA.	NO CHANGE SNH's support here is noted and it is recommended that the developer requirements remain.

283 The Assynt Foundation Lochinver	<p>The area at Inveruplan has become available for purchase under community right to buy legislation.</p> <p>We would be grateful if this area could be added to the Sutherland Local plan deposit draft as being suitable for development and housing.</p> <p>H.C are currently looking for a site to build a new care centre and the A.F feel this could prove to be a perfect location.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Room to provide daycare, respite and residential care and ancillary facilities. 2. Ground to include high dependency units for supported living for a number of people. 3. Space for outdoor areas - Garden, seating and parking. 4. Peaceful and scenic location. <p>We would also be able to include a number of housed sites for private/affordable housing. All the buildings (housing and care centre) would be designed to blend in to the crocan landscape and to have low carbon footprint, high energy efficiency and dependant on planning approval, a district available as per existing house.</p> <p>Availability of housing in the area could make recruitment and retaining staff at the care facility easier. At an early stage, it is envisaged that some form of public transport could be provided.</p> <p>Inclusion of this area in the draft plan would complement the scheme proposed at Glencanisp to give appropriate mixes of housing type and density at both locations.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>The Assynt Foundation were unable to secure funding to purchase the land at Inveruplan. Therefore they no longer want to pursue the allocation of land here in this Local Plan review.</p>

Inset Maps Lochinver MB Development Factors		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lochinver MB Development Factors		
2 Mr M.B. Rochester Lochinver	Concerned about light pollution destroying the view of the night sky. Glac Mhor might reasonably be included in a review of lighting. The fish Quay has unnecessary light pollution and a more economic/aesthetically pleasing (perhaps movement triggered technology?). Main St/Culag road and council estate ditto.	NO CHANGE Mr Rochester's comment was submitted in support of the existing development factor for low downward emission street lights. We have passed on the comments raised over existing light pollution problems within the village to TEC's for their consideration. The owners intention is noted for three houses in this area and he also supports the SDA boundary and the development factor relating to the woodland at Glendarroch.
319 Mr Colin J T MacKenzie Helmsdale	I note with approval that the Plan continues to recognise the potential for further development at Glendarroch wood. The development of the site has already exhibited care for the environment, key servicing is available and the land is outwith crofting tenure. Over 1.5 acres still in my ownership lie within proposed Settlement Development Area, offering a low density for a further three units compatible with retention of key woodland features.	As above
Inset Maps Lochinver H 1 Sheep pens north of Inver Park		
249 Mr Graham Dougall Portknockie	Notes of concern/objections 1) taking away yet more natural landscape 2) Closeness of development to our property 3) Disruptions to our holiday letting Business in summer months particularly whilst building work taking place. 4) would developers wither install or fund screening e.g. wood fencing to east of our property 5) How long before development would see proposed detailed plans. 6) Would certainly raise objections of new builds more than 1 1/2 storey buildings 7) Disruption to water/electric/sewage supplies likelihood of.	RETAIN ALLOCATION The Council is satisfied that this site is well related to Lochinver and there is capacity within the landform, and SNH have supported this position by not recommending changes or objecting. Proposed development is usually adjacent to existing properties. However adequate spacing and privacy would be a concern that can be considered if/when a planning application is submitted. At the planning application stage there will be consideration of the design proposed. Also the disruption can be controlled by standard conditions on hours and access. Graham Dougall's letter has been forwarded to the landowner's representative so they are aware of the potential opportunity to acquire Tigh

Inset Maps Lochinver H 1 Sheep pens north of Inver Park

Guithais.

When/if you see detailed plans will depend on the landowners intentions. The Local Plan identifies suitable sites and gives the developers/landowners certainty that the principle of development is established on these sites. It is intended that Local Plans will be reviewed 5 yearly.

The drainage issues will be considered as part of a planning application. All development must meet the guidance set out in The SUDS Manual and in Sewers For Scotland, including the making of agreements for the on-going maintenance of surface water drainage systems.

For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment however the policy has been amended (see GP9),

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Category 3

As above

Dingwall

13 Ms Robertina Matheson

Supporting site H1 but pointing out that the culvert at the south west edge of the site has flooded many times over the past years resulting in the flooding of 33 Inver Park. The development should take into account the drainage problems experienced and the culvert and drainage should be upgraded.

As above

Lochinver

540 Bidwells

I refer to your letter of 2nd November 2007. As I indicated on the telephone recently, I have been awaiting further instruction from my client due to the fact the Estate is currently subject to appointment of executors. I therefore apologise for my delay in responding and trust that you will be able to incorporate the following comments within your formal consultation.

As above

For: Assynt Estate, Inverness

The areas identified within the deposit draft as Lochinver H1 and H2, within the ownership of my clients, remain areas within which my clients would be willing to see sympathetic housing development. We would

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Lochinver H 1 Sheep pens north of Inver Park

wish to continue to see the development of housing in this area in a traditional style and pattern in keeping with the existing dispersed nature of the village.

We look forward to hearing from you further regarding progress of the draft Local Plan.

44 Mr George MacLeod
Lochinver

Keep it simple we need housing enough and that means no more over cramped single dwellings it gives the wrong impression more two bedroom and three bedroom houses needed and thank you.

As above

Inset Maps Lochinver H 2 Cnoc A Mhuillin

540 Bidwells
For: Assynt Estate, Inverness

I refer to your letter of 2nd November 2007. As I indicated on the telephone recently, I have been awaiting further instruction from my client due to the fact the Estate is currently subject to appointment of executors. I therefore apologise for my delay in responding and trust that you will be able to incorporate the following comments within your formal consultation.

The areas identified within the deposit draft as Lochinver H1 and H2, within the ownership of my clients, remain areas within which my clients would be willing to see sympathetic housing development. We would wish to continue to see the development of housing in this area in a traditional style and pattern in keeping with the existing dispersed nature of the village.

We look forward to hearing from you further regarding progress of the draft Local Plan.

RETAIN ALLOCATION

The owners of Lochinver Transport are still operating from the yard and do not want to release it for housing at this point. The potential for housing on H2 is not prejudiced by this but the existing property at Hillhead and the yard were excluded from the allocation as a result.

The effect on the value of individual properties is not a planning consideration however amenity and privacy and the detail of access arrangements are issues which are considered if/when a planning application comes forward. Then the Highland Council will consider the detail of what is proposed, including the siting and design. At this point neighbours will be notified and there will be the opportunity to make representations for the Council's consideration.

The council appreciates the concern expressed by Durrant and Jayne MacLeod and SNH about the development of this site in terms of landscape impact. The sites prominent gateway position is recognised as is the need for sensitive siting, and good design. Therefore a design statement will need to be submitted with any planning application, and that the eastern area should be limited to 1, 1/2 storey housing. The removal of the areas

Inset Maps Lochinver H 2 Cnoc A Mhuillin

suggested by Durrant and Jayne MacLeod and SNH however is not considered necessary.

It is considered that development can be accommodated within the southern area of the allocation without breaking the ridge and can be visually contained. One house has already gained planning permission and has recently been built here. Furthermore with the appropriate design standards this is considered to be a suitable area to develop further.

Ordnance survey provides us with our map base and they periodically update this. Therefore this is the reason that there is recent development here that is not shown on our maps. However for our Local Plan purposes it is not necessary that these properties are shown or indeed that we have accurate feu boundaries.

508 Durrant & Jayne MacLeod
Lochinver

We show on this map the areas we do not approve of marked in shaded lines marked no (A) and (B)

As above

On the entrance to our beautiful Highland village houses on the higher area would be extremely detrimental to the undisputed beauty of the area.

There would be room for about 2 houses on area (C) behind this very picturesque hillock and trees marked (B) there is a water course running through this area (C) which is drainage for the whole hillside.

The area we mark (D) is over the hill from our valley and our only comment is please do not ruin it either. There is only one view , once you take that away it is done forever.

We also want to retain our darkness without street light.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Lochinver H 2 Cnoc A Mhuillin

268 Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland Ullapool	<p>I am writing as a representative of the interest of the Free Presbyterian manse in Lochinver. I have been asked to contact you to make the following points.</p> <p>1 You do not stipulate the kind of housing development proposed. Our concern would be that it would detract from the privacy of the manse which would also lower its value.</p> <p>2 You do not indicate on your map the boundary of the Manse feu.</p> <p>3. It would be preferable if the building of houses proceeds, to have the entry from the Stoer road about 300 m from the main road junction. This would take the entrance to the site on a sensible gradient and would avoid congestion at the foot of the manse road and surrounding area.</p> <p>4. You also do not indicate the sites of the last two houses which have been built on the area concerned.</p>	As above
--	--	----------

2 Mr M.B. Rochester Lochinver	<p>A good area to develop but the road stinks of fishy smelling water draining from lorries climbing the hill and this would not be pleasant for residents. Also can the defunct transport business at the north east corner of H2 be purchased? It is full of derelict vehicles and a temporary/permanent mobile home. An eyesore and not a good neighbour to a new development.</p>	As above
----------------------------------	---	----------

326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>H.2 We welcome the requirement for a design statement but question the suitability of the site which consists of a knolly ridge on its southern side. The ridge provides a degree of visual containment to the church and cemetery and this narrow part of the sea loch. SNH strongly recommends that the ridge should remain intact and that housing should be located on the north side of the ridge with vehicle access from the north west only.</p>	As above
--	---	----------

Inset Maps Lochinver H 3 Glencanisp

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lochinver H 3 Glencanisp		
540 Bidwells For: Assynt Estate, Inverness	<p>We note the comments within the Deposit Draft concerning the development of land at Glen Canisp and stretching west towards the Church of Scotland Glebe lands. Our clients currently have a sporting lease over the Glebe lands and accordingly have an interest in this area. We are concerned that development of this general area will impose a significant impact upon the scenic quality and amenity of an area which provides an important backdrop to the village of Lochinver and is also the main access route into the Assynt hinterland.</p> <p>We are concerned that development would not be in keeping with the designation of this area as a National Scenic Area. Should development proceed, the provision of infrastructure, particularly access road improvements, pedestrian access and street lighting could have a significant detrimental impact and would have to very carefully managed.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT CHANGE HOUSING CAPACITY FROM 5-10 TO 15. REMOVE TEXT ABOUT LONG TERM CAPACITY</p> <p>The Assynt foundation had initial proposals for between 5 - 10 houses with a larger long term capacity of 30 to make feasible the road upgrade that is required by the Council to bring it up to adoptable standard. However it is now considered that it requires a capacity of 15 upfront to make it feasible. In effect this brings forward the amount of housing that can be provided within this plan period and it is considered that this is acceptable. The long term capacity of 30 will be omitted because it is considered that this is misleading now that glebe land is no longer in contention.</p> <p>There are developer requirements for this site seeking development to be sensitively sited within the cnocan landscape. When/if it comes forward as a planning application we are also seeking a design statement and safer routes to school plan. The Council feels in this context proposals could acceptably mitigate their impact on landscape but we acknowledge the sensitivity of development here. We also feel it is significant that SNH have not made any recommendations or objections to this allocation.</p>
62 Mr Nicholas Gorton Lochinver	The cost of building a new road and the effect on the environment should have this as a non starter.	As above
283 The Assynt Foundation Lochinver	<p>The Assynt Foundation are very much in favour of housing in this area. The private road will be upgraded as the development proceeds and this matter has already been discussed with H.C. Roads Dept.</p> <p>The A.F. foresees housing that will blend into the landscape using for example, turf/heather roofing and careful positioning to make best use of available light. These factors would mean that the houses would be practically unnoticeable, especially from the north. These and other ecological aims would of course, depend on planning consent.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Lochinver H 3 Glencanisp

A system of foot/cycle paths would hopefully be included. These would take people to and from the school and Culcag woods and offer alternative means of accessing the village and harbour.

This area offers opportunities for affordable and sustainable/ecological housing for local people who currently have poor or no housing. It also provides areas for the longer term aim of 30 houses.

499 Albyn Housing
Invergordon

Question whether the capacity shown is overly restrictive given the very considerable cost of developing this site. Given the weight attributed to numbers in the local plan, this site is one where additional flexibility on numbers would be useful to accommodate future infrastructure costs about which little is currently known.

As above

Capacity as per draft: 5-10

243 HSCHT
Dornoch

Glencanisp - the proposed housing capacity for phase 1 of any development in Glencanisp is suggested to be 5-10 in the plan. We would strongly recommend that this be increased as the initial development costs of phase 1 in this area are likely to be high and would most likely be unviable if first phase numbers were too low. We would suggest 5-15 would allow sufficient flexibility.

As above

Inset Maps Lochinver I 1 Culag Harbour

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency
Dingwall

Category 1

RETAIN ALLOCATION but add developer requirement, Site is at risk from flooding, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required. Built development will not generally be permitted on medium to high flood risk areas (SPP7)

The council cannot consider this objection because no reasons have been given. The objector was written to and advised that they needed to submit these if they wished us to consider their objection.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lochinver I 1 Culag Harbour		
88 Lindsay Jones Lochinver	Objecting	As above
Inset Maps Lochinver I 2 Land adjacent to the Assynt Leisure centre		
138 Assynt Leisure Centre Lochinver	Supporting allocation.	RETAIN ALLOCATION
Inset Maps Lochinver LT 1 West of the Coast Guards		
73 The Highland Council Lochinver	There should be no bar to developing this land prior to others. Quarrying and freshening of rock is permitted. Land is covered by Harbours Act 1964 for permitted development.	RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT BRING FORWARD AS A CURRENT ALLOCATION FOR BUSINESS. ADD TEXT INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT WILL ONLY BE CONSIDERED AFTER POSSIBILITIES AT I1 AND I2 HAVE BEEN EXHAUSTED.
<p>The 1964 Harbours Act, section 9 for the control of development was repealed but section 14 does allow Harbour Authorities to secure the improvement, maintenance or management of the harbour in an efficient and economical manner or of facilitating the efficient and economic transport of goods or passengers by sea. The provisions of the Local Plan will influence decision making over other proposed development. It is considered that the developer requirements are necessary mitigation in order to accommodate any development sensitively into the landform and a design brief will be required due to its prominent position.</p>		
<p>This site would represent an expansion of the existing developed area. It is considered that there are adequate opportunities for industrial development with two significant allocations within the existing developed area. It was considered that this site should be identified for business because of its potential for leisure and commercial development associated to the marina. We are however identifying that industrial development here could occur but only after the possibilities at allocations I1</p>		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Lochinver LT 1 West of the Coast Guards		
		and I2 have been exhausted.
2 Mr M.B. Rochester Lochinver	This area is in a remarkable location with an amazing outlook. It would be a pity if it was filled with junk or industrial/fishing sprawl. It deserves a more prestigious development e.g. hotel/water sports centre which could bolster marina development/utilisation but to reach it you have to run the gauntlet of a mish mash of styles and functions, lorries, fishing kit etc is there any future in using it for Renewable Energy?	As above
Inset Maps Lochinver G General Comment		
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Generally, we consider that the Plan allocated insufficient land in the Lochinver area which is so heavily constrained by topography and geology. Given this position, we believe that consideration would be given to enlarging the settlement boundary in the area of the Culag Wood where at least there is ready access into developable ground unlike the land behind the main street which has proved economically enviable to develop.	NO CHANGE There is a good point made about the need to update Local Plans regularly. The planning system is currently undergoing significant reform and the new Planning Act stipulates that Local Plans should be reviewed every five years. The Council are responding to this challenge and hope that through making changes, particularly through the amalgamation of Local plans so they cover much larger areas we can achieve this. There is land allocated for business/industrial use at the pier so these uses are encouraged. Anybody interested should pursue this through the Harbours department of the Council who own this land, and Highlands and Islands Enterprise who will provide advice and assistance perhaps including financial help.
210 Mrs Heather MacDonald Lochinver	Why is Baddidarroch not included in the settlement development area (policy 1) as it is a populated hamlet? The roads in Baddidarroch should be a priority for upgrading before Glencanisp development, and this should be incorporated into the local plan. The lack of inclusion of Baddidarroch prevents any croft related development and poses difficulty for crofters who want to even build shed or barn. There needs to be exclusions to the Local Plan which help crofters regenerate their land more easily. Will land e.g. in Glendarroch be available for local people to purchase at a reasonable price to allow fro self build; Glendarroch area needs	RETAIN BUT ENLARGE THE SDA TO OFFER SCOPE BEHIND MAIN ST AND AT CULAG WOODLANDS. AMEND TEXT TO GIVE SUPPORT FOR APPROPRIATE FOREST CROFT DEVELOPMENT IN CULAG WOODLANDS AND ANOTHER TO SUPPORT FOR CARE PROVISION IN LOCHINVER. An amendment is proposed in order to offer scope for forest croft development at Culag woodlands. Also behind Main st is a suitable site for development and therefore

Inset Maps Lochinver G General Comment

more elaboration and detail of possible development present draft does not satisfy.

the SDA has been amended more widely at this point to offer support for proposals to be compatible with adjacent uses, and the existing settlement pattern. Of course proposals would also be assessed against all the normal considerations. Without any certainty over proposals or the site area and knowing the constraints particularly with depth of peat which has hampered plans in the past it seems appropriate to identify the area within the SDA. The SDA offers policy support and there is also text to support the identification of a site for care provision in Lochinver.

Baddidarroch is not included within the Settlement Development Area (SDA) which is covered by policy 1 because there is no further capacity on the road network and no suggestion that the road improvement necessary to increase its capacity, will be viable or forthcoming. It would therefore be misleading to include it within the SDA. There are however some developments that do not require planning permission, or may be considered acceptable and gain planning consent because they are not considered to be traffic generating. We would therefore encourage anyone to discuss with the Council any proposals and get advice.

In the case of Glencanisp the Assynt foundation have initial proposals for 15 houses which should hopefully make feasible the road upgrade that will be required.

The Local Plan establishes the principle of development and it will be if/when planning applications are submitted that neighbours will be notified and the council will consider detailed proposals. At Glendarrach we have said that development can be accommodated but the loss of woodland should be limited. It will be up to any developer to decide what market they want to build houses for apart from our application of the Council's affordable housing policy which through this Local Plan the threshold is being revised from 10 to 4. This will hopefully allow the council to gain a contribution normally being a minimum of 25%

Inset Maps Lochinver G General Comment

for affordable housing if 4 or more houses are proposed on a site.

493 CKD Galbraith

For: Assynt Trading Company,
Inverness

During June/July 2004, Highland Council and its housing development partners invited views on potential housing sites in Lochinver. Site 1 which received considerable support during the consultation exercise was the land behind (to the east) of Main St, Lochinver. After further investigations, consultants concluded that the high cost of rock and peat removal, foul drainage works and access and relocation of existing non residential users rendered the development of a large area uneconomic. The land was subsequently withdrawn and is not included within the settlement boundary of the Deposit Draft Local Plan. The report went on to say that where opportunities for re-development arise as a result of voluntary relocation of uses from the lower area of time, the potential for housing could be considered.

As above

Whilst we are aware that part of the site would be difficult to develop it is our view that the entire site should not be discounted from the Deposit Draft Local Plan for Lochinver. Restructuring of local businesses has already resulted in some commercial properties becoming vacant within the area immediately behind Main Street thus providing opportunities for consideration being given to residential development. It is anticipated that this trend will continue in the future. As our clients are willing to consider developing parts of this land it is our view that the land to the east of Main Street be zoned for housing or, at least, be included within the settlement boundary. This can be achieved by moving the settlement boundary further to the east along the back of the Main Street so as to include this land therefore keeping the option open for future development. We would welcome the opportunity to meet.

573 Assynt Community Council

Lochinver

Thank you for your letter dated 8th May 2008. I would simply like to reiterate the desire of Assynt Community Council to have this site and the Craumer park site included in the local plan for mixed use development.

As above

The Social Work Service are considering cluster high dependency housing at the moment while there will also be a need for a Day Centre. The local community still hope for a Respite/Residential Centre

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Lochinver G General Comment

to provide the care supplied there as before, and still provide in less remote areas and taken for granted there. All of this or other plans could well fit into a mixed use development.

I will be glad for you to consider this and my last letter as a submission on your forthcoming consultation. I look forward to hearing from you.

573 Assynt Community Council
Lochinver

Housing/Care Home Site in Main Street, Lochinver

As above

I am writing on behalf of the Assynt Community Council who have asked me to question why the "Main Street" site for housing has been removed from the draft of the Local Plan. The survey conducted for the Community Council in December 2005 indicated that in the event of changes of use of the adjacent Brownfield site this site could become economic. As KSM garage has now relocated this may well be possible. Indeed, previous access difficulties may well have been solved.

This was very much in the local community's preferred site for housing, so it is regrettable it has been taken out of the draft. In addition to this, in view of the changes to the Assynt Centre and the proposals for a new residential care centre on the west coast, this would be an ideal site. It is very close to shops, the Medical Centre, Post Office and bus routes. This would be good for local residents and also for visitors from other communities. Assynt Community Council is fully in support of the Assynt Centre Action Group in this matter.

In short, Assynt Community Council would like the "Main Street" site to be reinstated in the Local Plan and also to be considered for the proposed new residential care centre.

243 HSCHT
Dornoch

Due to the severe lack of developable sites within the current envelope we would recommend widening the village envelope, and especially to include the Culag Community Woodlands site as a possibility for future housing development.

As above

Inset Maps Point of Stoer H 1 West of the school

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Point of Stoer H 1 West of the school		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	10.2 Point of Stoer H.1 SNH is satisfied that this location, within the Assynt Coigach NSA, is suitable for housing, subject to suitable siting and design. SNH recommends that there should be some flexibility in housing design to reflect the variety of types and styles already existing in the area but with a degree of similarity in order to give the development a distinct design or identity. A mix of traditional and modern materials should be used. Furthermore, it is our opinion that the area, due to its location and relative containment, could accommodate up to a maximum of 12 suitably designed units from small houses to larger 1.5 storey buildings. We agree that that the existing stone wall should be retained.	<p>RETAIN THIS ALLOCATION AND CHANGE HOUSING CAPACITY FROM 6 TO 12 AND AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS to remove text stating housing should be dispersed in similar density to surrounding area and should be single storey and simple in design. This is to reflect SNH's advice. INCLUDE DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT TO STATE a mix of types and styles which would reflect the area however a degree of similarity would be required to give the development a distinct design or identity. ALSO AN ENVIRONMENTALLY ACCEPTABLE PRIVATE SEWERAGE SYSTEM IS REQUIRED.</p> <p>There is an ownership dispute between the Free Church and the Free Church Continuing. This is relatively straight forward for the Local Plan since it is essentially a legal matter. If the owner does not want to develop the site then it will not happen so its inclusion in the Local Plan is not a problem for them. With regards to the quietness of the area, this is not a planning reason for limiting the capacity of the site. However the construction phase can be controlled through conditions on the planning consent.</p> <p>For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment however the policy has been amended (see GP9),</p>
173 Mr Andrew Fraser	<p>Although we have not been able to find a title to the glebe despite searches of the Register in Edinburgh, it figures in a 1998 list of agricultural holdings which I got details of from the Crofters' Commission office in Lairg. The glebe is not croft land and is on the above list as no. 828/0144, 0.9 hectares/2.2 acres, Stoer Free church Trustees per Miss D. Kerr. Miss Kerr was the school teacher in Stoer primary at the time and must have had use of the glebe. I re-registered the glebe with the Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Department in June 2005.</p> <p>Mr. John Morrison belongs to the Free Church Continuing which was set up in 2000 and which took the Free Church to court claiming that it was the real Free Church and entitled to its name and assets as the</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Point of Stoer H 1 West of the school	Free Church had deviated from its constitution in following internal church disciplinary processes. Therefore, the local Free Church Continuing congregation has no right to any of the assets of the Free Church and has no locus in this matter of the Stoer Free Church Glebe.	
37 Mr & Mrs Dennis Lochinver	Support allocation.	As above
140 Assynt Crofters Trust Lochinver	<p>I am writing to clarify the position with regard to site H1 on the plan for Point of Stoer. This site, known as "The Glebe", lying at the junction of the roads to Clashmore and Balchladich, was gifted to the then Stoer Free Church by the Duke of Sutherland many years ago. There is no actual title to the ground, however, and there is currently a dispute between two branches of the church. Title will not be resolved until the ongoing legal debate is concluded, but it has been accepted by the Board of Assynt Crofters' Trust that the ground does indeed belong to the church.</p> <p>I have received numerous comments from local residents expressing concern on this matter, and you may already have receive some representations.</p> <p>In view of the above, it would seem inappropriate for the site to be included in the Local Plan.</p> <p>I understand that Durrant Macleod, the Director of ACT who is looking at the area of affordable housing, has already informed you of the ownership issue.</p>	As above
10 Assynt Crofters Trust Housing Initiative Lochinver	The Clashnessie plot H2 can progress and can be looked at in more detail working with Ronnie MacRae of the HSCHT to help meet local needs. The west of school H1 land may be in ownership dispute between Church factions which may of course take a while to sort out. The Glebe site H1 should be removed from the Local Plan.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Point of Stoer H 1 West of the school		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 3	As above
293 Free Church of Scotland Assynt Congregation Assynt	<p>I refer to my visit to your office in November and to my meeting then with Mr David Cowie when we discussed the inclusion in the draft plan as a potential site for housing of the plot of land locally referred to as 'the manse glebe'. This is annotated as H1 in inset 10.2 of the plan. Mr Cowie was unable to advise what the sequence of events was that resulted in this parcel of land being so designated. I advised Mr Cowie that my interest in this land arises from the fact that I am the longest serving trustee of the Assynt Free Church congregation as well as being a member of the Board of Assynt Crofters Trust, I also intimated to Mr Cowie that at meetings of the Board of the Crofter's Trust held earlier in the year I had been able to show from the records of the congregation dated February 1923 that the land in question was held by the congregational trustees of Stoer and Drumbeg Free church. The Board of Assynt Crofters' Trust has accepted this as being the factual position.</p> <p>This matter was again taken up at a meeting of the Trust's Board held yesterday evening when it was noted that an email message to this effect was being sent to your office by the Secretary to the Board on 14 December. There was apparently no response to that message. I therefore now write as one of the two congregational trustees having a legitimate interest in the land in question with the request that it be removed from the Draft Local Plan as a potential site for multiple housing. I will be grateful for confirmation of receipt of this letter and that the appropriate action has been taken.</p>	As above
144 Mr Ian MacLeod Stoer	I chose the site for my retirement house for two reasons. 1 I was born here and I hoped to enjoy the quietness of the area the thought of another 6 houses next door to me would destroy my dreams. I would have no objections to a couple of private bungalows next door, more than that my home would be on the market.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Point of Stoer H 1 West of the school		
243 HSCHT Dornoch	This is a well located site within the area and we would suggest that it is capable of an increased capacity of approximately 15 units.	As above
Inset Maps Point of Stoer H 2 South of the radio mas		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	H.2 SNH objects to the extent of the area currently identified. However, we consider that there is scope for housing within the area shown on the map and would withdraw this objection if the area is reduced in size to approximately one third of that shown, excluding all the higher ground to the north of the existing house. Withdrawing the objection would also be conditional upon the requirement for a design statement to be produced and for THC to agree the detail of this with SNH.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT AMEND SITE TO REMOVE SOME OF THE HIGHER GROUND TO LESSEN THE LANDSCAPE IMPACT. ADD DEVELOPER REQUIRMENT for a design statement to be produced and for agreement to be reached between the council and SNH on its detail. CHANGE LAND USE FROM HOUSING TO MIXED USE AND HOUSING CPACITY FROM 12 TO 15 UNITS. ALSO AN ENVIRONMENTALLY ACCEPTALE PRIVATE SEWERAGE SYSTEM IS REQUIRED.</p> <p>There was a need to refine this allocation in order to better identify the suitable and effective areas for development. Also given its sensitivity it is felt that SNH's recommendations regarding the submission of a design statement are necessary mitigation. The suggestion to identify this site for mixed uses is sensible given there are no business or community allocations in Point of Stoer and there is adequate capacity on the site to retain the current indicative housing capacity. It is felt however that 20 houses here would be inappropriate over the plan period and further potential can be considered in the next review of the Local Plan.</p>
243 HSCHT Dornoch	H2 - this is a large, fairly easily, developed site, which would be suitable fro mixed use but would be capable of increased capacity, possibly up to 20 units.	As above
342 Mr Dennis Campbell Lochinver	A project of this size is huge for this area. We simply do not have the infrastructure to support this size of development of this nature. Lack of proper employment and local services could turn this into a 'sink' estate or a holiday village.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Point of Stoer H 2 South of the radio mas		
181 Chris Dulfer Lochinver	Too many units Would get storm damage. We have enough problems and get some shelter from the hill.	As above

Inset Maps Scourie G General Comment

290 Dr Jean Balfour Fife	<p>Housing at Scourie I have received a map etc of the housing proposals in Scourie.</p> <p>These are based on an area in Scouriemore looking southwest and around Achlochan. I am glad other locations have been shelved as these impinged on croft land.</p> <p>The number of houses proposed in the 10 year period is excessive at 20. Any house building should include affordable housing, for example, for fish farm employees.</p> <p>Generally speaking the total proposed should be reduced as not justified and will probably end up as holiday houses.</p>	<p>DO NOT RETAIN H1 REDUCING CAPACITY OF ALLOCATED LAND IN SCOURIE TO 8.</p> <p>Scourie now only has 8 houses on an allocated site however we have anticipated as you suggested that there is a need for around 20 houses over the period to 2018. The role however of single house development both within the SDA where there is ample scope and outwith as windfall means that the allocation of 8 houses should be sufficient. This is based on our strategy with land allocated for 1,304 additional houses across Sutherland in order to keep a stable working age population.</p> <p>Built into this figure is an assumption of similar proportion of future second/holiday home ownership and a 25% flexibility allowance for a choice of landowners, locations and markets. The Council cannot decide on planning applications on the basis of whether they are to meet local need or not but tries to ensure we are realistic and offer sufficient opportunity for both.</p> <p>With regards to affordable housing provision the allocation of 8 houses falls within our policy and therefore 25% will have to be affordable housing. However the market may determine that more houses built in Scourie are 'affordable'.</p>
-----------------------------	---	--

Inset Maps Scourie H 1 East of the football pitch

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Scourie H 1 East of the football pitch		
290 Dr Jean Balfour Fife	Furthermore, the proposed density of houses around Achlochachan requires reduction. This part of the village has an open landscape and should not be urbanised.	<p>DO NOT RETAIN ALLOCATION REDUCING CAPACITY OF ALLOCATED LAND IN SCOURIE TO 8.</p> <p>The reason it was allocated for 4 in the Deposit Draft of the Sutherland Local Plan was because the site area suggested that an allocation of 4 could be made in line with standard rural density levels and this would allow an affordable housing contribution to be sought as per the affordable housing policy. However I appreciate why the level proposed has been challenged and feel that looking at the form of the site and the current spacing of the surrounding properties that it would be better just to include this within the SDA. We would not seek to allocate land for less than 4 houses so removing the allocation and leaving within the SDA is the appropriate response.</p> <p>The effect on the value of a persons home is not considered a material planning consideration. The effect on privacy and amenity of adjacent properties will be considered fully at the point of a detailed planning application coming forward. You would be neighbour notified at this point and be able to make representation on the detail proposed.</p>
310 Scourie Community Council Scourie	<p>Response by Scourie Community Council.</p> <p>The community council considered the housing proposals in the draft local Plan, and it was generally felt that, with the plan now covering a timescale of only a few years, the provision made for housing is more than a small village like Scourie would require.</p> <p>We would suggest that the Achochan area should be reduced to 2 house sites leaving a larger number at the Scouriemore area.</p>	As above
348 Mr John M Williams Scourie	The position of the proposed houses in site H1 would be right outside my house, Cnoclochachan and directly in line of sight of my main living room window. That they would damage the amenity and reduce the value of Cnoclochachan.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Scourie H 1 East of the football pitch		
527 Mr Ian A S Hay Scourie	Lack of public sewerage, also doubt about water supplies. Rather an odd site for 4 houses.	As above
Inset Maps Scourie H 2 West of the school		
200 Mrs C Matheson Scourie	I don't see any need for more houses in Scouriemore. It is a very windy and open space on (H2) site, also there is no work here for incomers.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT REDUCE TO OMIT INBYE CROFT LAND</p> <p>It was only meant to cover land within the common grazings so the allocation should be amended to reflect the croft boundary.</p> <p>It is a relatively exposed site but many other areas were identified at Sutherland Futures stage and have been omitted due to crofting interest, ground conditions and landscape concerns. This site came through as the preferred location for development beyond single house proposals.</p> <p>Even without people moving into Scourie from outwith there would be a need for housing land due to changes in household composition along with dereliction of some of the existing stock. However one of the visions of the Sutherland Local Plan is to help achieve a stable working age population and our allocations are based on allocating sufficient land to try to help achieve this.</p>
87 Mrs Lynn Kerr Scourie	Supporting allocation.	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Site boundary should be redrawn. Capacity as per draft: 8 Suggested capacity: 8	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Scourie H 2 West of the school

72 Mr James Thomson Scourie	The area I have outlined and hatched in green is part of my croft which I am currently in the process of purchasing in accordance with Scottish Law and relative Crofting Acts. This matter could be easily overcome by moving the area H2 marginally south - south/west onto open space common grazing to which I would raise no objection. Indeed if this were done it would be more suitable for electricity, water and services and would also permit easy access to the beach as it is at present.	As above
--------------------------------	---	----------

Inset Maps Scourie MB Inset 11.1 Scourie

326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>11.1 Scourie SNH recommends the SDA boundary is redrawn to exclude the thin strip of Scourie Coast SSSI which may have been accidentally included. See detailed comments relating to Maps at annex 3. Given the proximity of the SDA to the SSSI in the north west of the SDA further development in this area should be carefully planned to respect the interest of this designated site.</p>	<p>RETAIN SDA BUT REDUCE TO EXCLUDE LAND WITHIN SSSI AND ENLARGE AT THE HOTEL.</p> <p>An acceptable extension to the settlement development area at the hotel was put forward. The details as to access, siting and design will need careful consideration at the planning application stage should it come forward. The topography of the land adjacent the hotel makes it a prominent site requiring sensitivity and if there is further loss of trees this could make proposals unacceptable in landscape terms. Also there is a flood risk issue covering a potential access into the house site/s here.</p> <p>Also an area of the SDA which overlaps with the SSSI should be removed.</p>
--	--	---

1 Mr Patrick John Price Scourie	<p>I seek changes to the Local Plan for the following reasons</p> <p>An area to north of the hotel is proposed for 1 or 2 houses. Services on hand and quote for undergrounding overhead cables and connection have been sought.</p> <p>To the west of the hotel on land which housed a 6 bed annexe in the past I seek to build an annexe in the future to cope with extra requirement over the peak months.</p>	As above
------------------------------------	---	----------

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Scourie MB Inset 11.1 Scourie		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	P35 Scourie. A thin strip of the Scourie Coast SSSI is not shown where it overlaps with the Settlement Development Area to the southwest of the road between c NC 147442 and NC 146447 .	As above
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 1 North of Innes Place		
97 Kinlochbervie Post Office Kinlochbervie	Supporting allocation.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT MAKE IT A LONG TERM ALLOCATION AND ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT. This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application”</p> <p>Local Plans need to be reviewed every five years under the new Planning Act. The owner of this croft does not want to see this land developed within the next ten years therefore this site should be made a long term allocation and should not be developed within the time period of this Local Plan.</p> <p>Access through the Health centre was not considered suitable by our TECs colleagues who give us advice on road issues. There is a developer requirement to cover the relocation of the playpark and potentially provision of compensatory parking and this is something that needs to be considered in more detail and proposals drafted. This should be used to support its inclusion as an allocation when the plan is under review again in the future.</p> <p>The affect of proposed development on the value of someone's home is not a material planning consideration however the amenity and privacy they enjoy would be considered when/if detailed proposals for its development were submitted to the council. However detailed proposals would not be encouraged within this Local Plan period.</p> <p>Whilst this land is croft land it was considered on the basis of feedback from our site options consultation 'Sutherland Futures' that other land being considered at Manse road was of a higher value as it is of arable</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 1 North of Innes Place		
		quality. The viable and suitable options in Kinlochbervie are limited so it is considered this is a suitable site albeit this will now be beyond this plan period to respect the wishes of the landowner.
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	As above
259 Miss Sandra Gunn Kinlochbervie	I confirm that I own the complete site H1 at present I am not willing to release the site for development. I am however considering releasing part of the site in the long term (ie 10 years)	As above
166 Mrs Margaret Munro Kinlochbervie	I strongly object to the proposed site for houses. It will have an adverse effect on my house so far as value is concerned, never mind the construction, and excess traffic which will cause more congestion. Anyway I am not aware of such a demand for houses in the Kinlochbervie area. For one thing there is no work here to attract anybody.	As above
223 Jack K E M Morrison Kinlochbervie	The area's to which you refer for your proposed building, are both crofts. There are hundreds of acres outwith the village between Kinlochbervie & Oldshoremore, which could be developed for building. H.R.C. are blindly trying to cram all buildings into the village against the wishes of the residents, an example being the High School. The residents of Manse Road, now have on view of Loch Innes, only a large block of concrete, and it is only a matter of time before someone is hit by a vehicle speeding down Manse Road either when the school goes in or comes out. I object most strongly to your proposed development.	As above
321 Crofters Commission Inverness	Objection is made to the inclusion of this significant portion of croft land. This forms part of croft 138 Kinlochbervie and the proposal could effectively remove most of the croft. Part of the croft was previously removed to provide land for the Health Centre. Consequently, the zoning as recommended would effectively entail that this croft would cease to exist.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 1 North of Innes Place		
	<p>It is understood from the current tenant of the land that up until fifteen years ago this croft supported crops of potatoes, oats and hay on a rotational basis. It is clearly an important piece of croft land in the Kinlochbervie context. There is increasing interest in local food production, and areas of land which have supported crops in relatively recent times are valuable assets for communities. Local crofting interest is not supportive of this proposal and has indicated its support for sustaining an objection. This proposal does not appear to accord with Draft Plan statements 3.41 (D) or 4.43 (N+O).</p>	
98 Filling Station Lairg	Supporting allocation.	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	<p>Site could accommodate high level of development as a consequence</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 10 Suggested capacity: 15</p>	As above
194 Heather MacNeill Kinlochbervie	<p>Parking and access in Innes Place is already a problem. Using the street for access to a new housing area especially building lorries would be a huge problem for residents. Damage to cars? Playpark is used constantly by local children. Where would it be relocated to? Where would the compensatory parking be? Why not use the Health centre road for access?</p>	As above
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 2 South of Mackenzie Square		
74 Mr Thomas Roberts Kinlochbervie	<p>I'm objecting purely for the reasons that I took tenancy of 5 MacKenzie Square because of the view onto Loch Inchard. However it appears your Planning Development may change all that! and if housing is built it will block my view I might as well be living in the city.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the support of David Clarke and John Morrison for this housing allocation.</p> <p>The Local Plan seeks to establish the principle of housing development here and if this happens the developer can proceed with a planning application at which stage there will be further neighbour notification.</p> <p>Based on our strategy land is required for 1,304 additional houses across Sutherland in order to try to</p>

Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 2 South of Mackenzie Square

keep a stable working age population. As a proportion this Kinlochbervie area requires around about 40 additional houses. The role of single house development both within the SDA where there is ample scope and outwith within the wider countryside means that not all of the housing need needs to be met within allocations. Built into this figure is an assumption of similar proportion of future second/holiday home ownership and a 25% flexibility allowance for a choice of landowners, locations and markets.

The link between housing and economic development is made in national policy through SPP 1 which states that The planning system supports economic prosperity by identifying land of a suitable quantity and quality in the right locations to meet the need for economic development and new housing.

The Local Plan identifies the most appropriate land for development and then sets out the necessary requirements. The principle of development will be established on allocated sites but detailed proposals will be assessed by the Council as part of any planning application that comes forward and neighbours will have the opportunity to comment on this. At the application stage the need for tree planting and the landscaping details will be considered although its exposed position may make the former difficult.

There are a range of factors taken into consideration before land gets identified within the Local Plan and the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of options certainly informs that. The options in Kinlochbervie are actually limited considerably by the topography, the ground conditions, availability and the need to protect locally important croft land. In addition to its crofting value servicing difficulties also made the land to the north of Manse road and further development extending Bervie road unfeasible.

Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 2 South of Mackenzie Square

These factors limited the available options and we also had to carefully consider where the landscape had the ability to accommodate development. H2 was identified as it appears to be a suitable and feasible site to develop. There is some doubt over the ground conditions so investigation of this will be necessary. One of the developer requirements for this allocation acknowledges that traffic calming may be required on H2 and therefore when any planning applications come forward this will need to be addressed.

In planning terms the views of private residents are not a material planning consideration. We have however tried to encourage mitigation through the following requirement, Consideration should also be given to existing residents' amenity and how development might be accommodated whilst mitigating the impact. Through careful use of the sites topography along with careful design the impact on existing residents could be reduced and we would encourage this approach. However we cannot place any obligation on them to avoid interrupting existing residents' views. Private views are not a material planning consideration as it would be too restrictive on future development if you could not obstruct the views of existing houses.

520 Donal & Maureen O'Driscoll
Kinlochbervie

What is the need here for more housing? Currently there are 6 properties for sale in the locality, where will new people come from? why? The site H2 is on a steep slope which has been levelled with infill, would this be stable? Where would the access to H2 be? Current access to this field is not owned by the same landowner. The road into Inchar Place already serves 3 different housing schemes and 2 holiday chalets. H3 would be more suitable site, breaking up developments making a better balance, there is only one house there. We are not against more housing per se, why are under class AH? Houses on market currently are probably not in price markets for people who live in the community, or to families that might come looking for work and settle here.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 2 South of Mackenzie Square		
57 Mr David Clarke Kinlochbervie	Supporting allocation.	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Concerns over nature of ground conditions and negative effect on potential for development. Capacity as per draft: 8 Suggested capacity: ?	As above
80 J K Morrison Kinlochbervie	Supporting allocation.	As above
96 M Chapman Kinlochbervie	Supporting of H3 only. I consider there is no need to crowd existing housing at site H1 and H2. It would be preferable to site new housing at H3 which would allow for the development of the necessary housing in a more spacious, less crowded location. This would now look forward to any future housing developments giving another location for consideration in such a remote rural area why? Crowd all housing together.	As above
31 Mr & Mrs Kemp Kinlochbervie	If this area of land is to be developed for housing, then the following would need to be implemented * traffic calming - the road is overly dangerous with children playing and cars going too fast * to offset the increased housing tree planting and landscaping of the area would be needed especially on the east side of Inchar Place	As above
36 Mr David Anderson Kinlochbervie	The proposal is unsuitable on several counts. Firstly access - Inchar Place - this road was originally designed to service the houses in this street since then McKenzie Square and McBeath Court have been added increasing the volume of traffic on this residential street dramatically to add a further 8 houses would exacerbate the problem and increase the already considerable danger to children and the elderly. Secondly this land is reclaimed by using rubble from other building projects and seems unsuitable for building on due to settlement issues. Thirdly the amenity of Inchar Place would be compromised especially the view of the residents at the bottom of the street - this land should be developed as a play area for the children to take them off the	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 2 South of Mackenzie Square	street.	
58 Mr John MacDonald Kinlochbervie	Its too close to peoples home, there is plenty of ground to build houses here, it also will take the value off people that have bought their home. I hope you consider all things when you build houses. Yours faithful, J Macdonald and family.	As above
63 Mrs Marion Campbell Kinlochbervie	I consider the site below MacKenzie Square and Inchard Place to be inappropriate because of a) disruption of environment - wildlife habitat and view from MacKenzie Square to Loch Inchard b) destruction of peace and security of the tenants of MacKenzie square which is amenity housing aimed at those over 60 years of age. The security of back gardens would be compromised. C) the land appears to be unsuitable for development, being a croft but being composed largely of rock and marsh. I am not knowledgeable about the local land but there would seem to be suitable sites at either end of Manse Road or at the entrance to Loch Innes on the fringe of Kinlochbervie on the Olshore Road, as well as those on your map.	As above
168 Ahila Kish Kinlochbervie	Why are the council building more houses? They don't, according to the above code, even come into the A4 category. What is there to bring, potentially, 8 new families to the area? Surely these people need jobs? What are they going to do? Are there people currently on a waiting list? There has just been new houses built in Scourie; most kids who have finished school are moving away, so why more houses? There are currently at least 6 properties for sale in and around KLB. Why don't the council buy these properties, some of which are quite useable, and allow larger families to tenant them. There are too many council houses that are inefficiently tenanted, e.g., one person living in a 2 or 3 bed roomed house; then isn't a need for more housing, only more efficient tenanting of the current stock. Any why not upgrade and improve existing housing - we've been promised a new kitchen for 5 years! Improve heating system (not install electric system!) & upgrade toilet systems for new dual flush.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 2 South of Mackenzie Square		
159 Trust Housing Association For: on behalf of tenants at Mackenzie Sq, Lochinver, Lochinver	<p>I refer to the Local Development Plan for Kinlochbervie and to the associations residents at Mackenzie Square, Lochinver.</p> <p>The association has been approached by several of the tenants therein, and has been asked to pass on their concerns at these proposals, with regards to the implications and impact such a development would have on the area and surrounding community.</p> <p>I would be very grateful if you could provide this office any plans or further supporting information with regards to these proposals, also a program of the proposed development intended for this area. Whilst I appreciate the need for further dwellings in the area it is hoped that further discussion with the residents and their concerns with regards to their issues will be considered regarding future proposals.</p>	As above
288 Edna Barraclough Kinlochbervie	As a resident of MacKenzie Square, Kinlochbervie, I feel I must object to the proposed building of new housing to the rear of my home. My reason being the housing development of MacKenzie Square was built for the purpose of providing accommodation for elderly residents, and as I fall into that category I need peace and quiet, I don not want the noise of construction directly below my window, nor do I want the noise and congestion that some residents of the proposed housing will bring.	As above
518 Kenneth & Monica Ross Kinlochbervie	We have houses in front of our home. We don't not want more looking out the back. We would like to keep the little privacy we have.	As above
Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 3 Land at Cnoc Ruadh		
558 Miss Kirsty Holland Kinlochbervie	<p>It concerns me that my property is not marked on the draft plan. Apart from my property the area is open croft land. Sites H1 and H2 are at least in keeping with existing residential housing. There are already 'affordable' properties - ex council houses, plots of land and private houses which have been up for sale for a considerable length of time. I question the need for further housing.</p> <p>Given the tentative nature of this draft proposal its difficult to comment further.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION AND ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT. This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application”</p> <p>The Council use the ordnance survey map base which is only periodically updated and this is why your property is not shown. However for the purposes of the Local Plan this is not a concern.</p> <p>If/when a detailed planning application comes forward</p>

Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 3 Land at Cnoc Ruadh

there will be opportunity to make representation on the detail but the Local Plan seeks to establish the principle of development of a site.

Based on our strategy land is required for 1,304 additional houses across Sutherland in order to try to keep a stable working age population. As a proportion this Kinlochbervie area requires around about 40 additional houses. The role of single house development both within the SDA where there is ample scope and outwith within the wider countryside means that not all of the housing need needs to be met within allocations. Built into this figure is an assumption of similar proportion of future second/holiday home ownership and a 25% flexibility allowance for a choice of landowners, locations and markets.

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Category 2

As above

Dingwall

Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 4 Land Southeast of Kinlochbervie Hotel

336 Mr Ian Munro
Kinlochbervie

Objecting.

RETAIN ALLOCATION

This site is well positioned within Kinlochbervie despite being slightly further away from some of the services within the village than the other housing sites. It relates well to the settlement pattern and landform and SNH have not made any recommendation or objection to its allocation.

The Council wrote to Ian Munro to see whether he wished to state his grounds of objection to this allocation. No further representation has been received.

Whilst this land is croft land it was considered on the basis of feedback from our site options consultation 'Sutherland Futures' that other land being considered at

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------

Inset Maps Kinlochbervie H 4 Land Southeast of Kinlochbervie Hotel

Manse road was of a higher value as it is of arable quality. The viable and suitable options in Kinlochbervie are extremely limited so it is considered this is a suitable site.

223 Jack K E M Morrison Kinlochbervie	The area's to which you refer for your proposed building, are both crofts. There are hundreds of acres outwith the village between Kinlochbervie & Oldshoremore, which could be developed for building. H.R.C. are blindly trying to cram all buildings into the village against the wishes of the residents, an example being the High School. The residents of Manse Road, now have on view of Loch Innes, only a large block of concrete, and it is only a matter of time before someone is hit by a vehicle speeding down Manse Road either when the school goes in or comes out. I object most strongly to your proposed development.	As above
--	--	----------

143 Mr Michael Otter Kinlochbervie	To build five houses on site H4 would further exacerbate the difficulties arising from the existing widely scattered estates while the other sites H1, H2, and H3 all strengthen the central focus around the health centre, post office and 'garage' and Taigh Ceilidh, H4 is a long way off, and it is even further away from the schools. The site has high visual amenity, and this would be lost. (the view from the Oldshoremore road is open and attractive.) If this site is approved it should be on the basis that the others should be fully used first.	As above
---------------------------------------	---	----------

Inset Maps Kinlochbervie I 1 Reclaimed land at Loch Bervie Harbour

311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 2	RETAIN ALLOCATION AND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT. This site may be at risk from flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any planning application”
---	------------	---

Inset Maps Durness H 1 School Road

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Durness H 1 School Road		
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Agree that this is a maximum Capacity as per draft: 5 Suggested capacity: 5	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION</p> <p>The Fire Station in Durness and the Fire and Rescue Service, District Legislation and Community Safety Officers based in Dornoch have been advised of this allocation and the suggestion that this road could be stopped off to through traffic and made a one way system with egress at Heatherlea. We have not received any representation in response to this matter and so we assume that they have no objection to this. However there will be a subsequent opportunity when this plan goes out on Deposit if they wish to raise concerns.</p> <p>Our TECs colleagues who give us their professional advise on road matters are concerned about pedestrian safety so we will follow their advice on this matter. It may be a relatively quiet road but further development will increase the hazard and particularly with kids using it to walk to and from school it seems advisable to take this approach.</p> <p>SNH's support of our developer requirement for careful siting and design and Albyns support of the indicative capacity of 5 houses is noted.</p>
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	13.1 Durness H.1 SNH welcomes the recognition of the need for careful siting and design in this prominent location.	As above
142 Mr Graham Bruce Durness	No objection to the housing but stopping off School Road is a ridiculous suggestion. The fire station is on this road and to block access to it is unthinkable! The pedestrian safety issue is overplayed - this is a very quiet road.	As above

Inset Maps Durness MU 1 Adjacent to the war memorial

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Durness MU 1 Adjacent to the war memorial		
252 Mr Nicholas Powell Durness	<p>My reasons for objecting to this proposed development are:- this is as essential useful and well used open space at the centre of Durness. It is used by both visitors and local people. Visitors can park here to use to nearby public toilets and public telephone box.</p> <p>It is used as a local focal point for the following services - RBS travelling bank, mobile library, mobile cinema, mobile sales outlets, festival events.</p> <p>The site is the most convenient place for the various recycling bins used by the community. The green with its war memorial and benches is popular with visitors and local people alike, particularly in fine weather, families, mothers and children enjoy the 'park' facilities across the road, also taking overspill from the shop nearby.</p> <p>Housing built on this site would not enjoy either outlook or open space (gardens), access being directly onto a road junction.</p> <p>Building on this site would radically alter the nature of what is an essentially rural community by creating an urban environment at its centre.</p> <p>When there is land available fro development at school row and adjacent to the village hall (otherwise useless land) which particularly could provide an opportunity to enhance the environment at Drumlhair, the relevance of this proposal is dubious.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT INCLUDE AS WIDER ALLOCATION ALONG WITH MU2 AND AMEND BOUNDARY TO PROTECT THE SETTING OF THE WAR MEMORIAL. THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN LIMITED POTENTIAL HERE DUE TO THE IMPACT OF LOSS OF PUBLIC CAR PARKING HOWEVER IF COMPENSATORY PARKING CAN BE PROVIDED WITHIN THE EXTENDED MU1 THEN THIS MAY BE ACCEPTABLE. ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO ENSURE COMPENSATORY PUBLIC PARKING ALONG WITH ENHANCEMENT TO THIS AREA AS A FOCAL POINT FOR THE VILLAGE.</p> <p>The changes proposed are to respect the setting of the war memorial and to try and improve the amenity of the surrounding area as more could be made to enhance it as an attractive focal point within the community. Without compensatory parking provided elsewhere within the now wider allocation then the development potential of the original MU1 would be very limited.</p>
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	<p>Good site particularly for elderly/amenity. The allocation should included existing the carpark area.</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 6 Suggested capacity: 6</p>	As above
115 Mr & Mrs Mackay Durness	<p>It's fascinating that the small area making up the village square should be identified for as suitable for up to 6 houses.</p> <p>There is no doubt that this important area requires investment and development. However there is very strong community support that any development should be community related certainly not 'affordable' housing or private housing/holiday housing.</p> <p>This area is very visually and historically significant. Personal opinion - any building erected should be fantastic highland with a community use - library/link to UHI/leisure facilities etc.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Durness MU 2 Adjacent to the village shop		
243 HSCHT Dornoch	To allow for suitable access we would suggest MU2 is extended to the boundary of the caravan and campsite.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT ENLARGE SITE AREA AND INCLUDE MU1. ALSO ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT FOR SHEEP FANKS TO BE RELOCATED AT THE DEVELOPERS EXPENSE. ALSO THE CAPACITY SHOULD BE INCREASED TO FROM 10 TO 17.</p> <p>There is land within this allocation that has suspected ground condition issues that a full feasibility study would need to determine the extent of. However it is considered that at least part of this allocation will prove effective but ground conditions will possibly make part of the site more expensive to develop and therefore potentially not economic. Perhaps these areas might prove suitable for compensatory public parking. The scope of the allocation has been increased in recognition that not all of this land is likely to be feasible and to allow for a better access point for visibility splays.</p> <p>It is recognised that this area is used as a holding ground for sheep before they go to market. Therefore the developer requirement for relocation at the developers expense is necessary in order to protect crofting interests which would involve the creation of a layby.</p> <p>The land adjacent to the caravan and camping site may end up being proposed for non residential because the site is identified for a mix of uses including community and business. Indeed this land benefits from road frontage and passing traffic. However it is not considered inappropriate to have houses adjacent a caravan and camping site so it remains allocated as suitable for a mix of uses.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Durness MU 2 Adjacent to the village shop		
115 Mr & Mrs Mackay Durness	There are several issues with designating the above identified area for building. Drainage is a problem. The location for additional housing is negative, the particular area already has a small mass of 'affordable' housing further development congests the small centre of the village. These fields are important holding grounds for crofter stock. The location next to an extremely busy campsite makes it less than ideal for housing.	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Consideration should be given to extending this site to the boundary of the caravan site. Capacity as per draft: 10 Suggested capacity:10/15	As above
252 Mr Nicholas Powell Durness	My objections to this proposal are as follows:- Firstly I should point out that the detail provided on this plan is incorrect - the filling station is opposite the post office/shop, on the south side of the road, not the north side as is shown. I would lose the open outlook/view enjoyed from the rear of this house together with its associated privacy. The land as shown here is built on earth placed on top of this wetland, making a concrete float necessary for foundations; this is just four inches below the floor inside which has no insulation provided, making for a poor quality, damp and cold atmosphere within the house. Also the front and rear gardens flood due to excessive rainfall (of which we have an abundance). The land has been tested on its east side and found to have no suitable bedrock for building without the use of concrete floats with all their disadvantages. As a cul-de-sac Holmes place is a quiet road where local children can play safely with little interference from traffic. The introduction of a loop road would destroy the peaceful outlook. A junction at the marked place together with parking at the shop, and with traffic using the filling station opposite would make what is already the busiest spot in the village for traffic movement more confusing and congested, particularly for business traffic which may not be familiar with the local layout. When there is land available elsewhere more suitable for development offering more potential benefits - I fail to see the relevance or common	As above

Inset Maps Durness MU 2 Adjacent to the village shop

sense of this proposal.

Inset Maps Durness MU 3 East of the village hall

30 Mr Thomas Ritchie
Durness

I have no objections to MU3 but I would like you to remove the concrete foundations on the left hand side of the approach road to Alt Smoo and replace with top soil.

RETAIN ALLOCATION

The proposals for the development of MU3 would become available if/when detailed planning permission is sought. At this stage the siting, design and landscaping of the development would be considered and there will be opportunity for representations. The Local Plan seeks to establish the principle of development here.

The suggested improvement to remove the concrete foundations would not be directly related to or necessary for the development of MU3 and may also not be enforceable (within the applicants control). Referring to the Scottish Executive circular on the use of conditions it would fail the tests as to whether the a condition should be imposed and therefore it cannot be included as a development requirement in the Local Plan. Therefore no change is proposed.

Private views are not a material planning consideration as it would be too restrictive on future development if you could not obstruct the views of existing houses. If there are affordable houses built here then the Housing Association will determine the letting or allocation of these.

Historic Scotland has not made any representation with regards to the allocation of this land and potential impact on the setting of the C (s) listed Smoo lodge. It is considered that development can be accommodated within this allocation without negatively impacting on Smoo Lodge. However its setting will be a consideration when dealing with the detailed proposals if and when they come forward.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Durness MU 3 East of the village hall		
155 Mr Colin Coventry Durness	I live in "Druim Bhlar" I already look out my front window into the front window of the council house opposite. I don't want the same view ie someone's back door from my back garden and I don't want the extra problems of living in close proximity that more council houses would bring ie more cars, noise, dogs, motor bikes. The walls are paper thin its already a noisy place to live.	As above
56 Mr Donald Morrison Durness	Druim Bhlar is such a complete eye sore, so any development around that area could only be an improvement. Some landscaping around the site in an attempt to improve the look of the area, would be a good idea.	As above
225 Ian & Marion Anderson Port Glasgow	Smoo Lodge dates from 1793 and is a listed building. Has Historic Scotland got a view? The proposed development would have an overview of its garden area and as such would result in a clear loss of amenity.	As above
Inset Maps Durness MB Inset 13.1 Durness		
325 HIE Caithness & Sutherland Thurso	Durness - I note that the Balnakeil area (and in particular the existing craft village) is not identified on the inset map for Durness and would ask for confirmation that this area is identified for business and industrial development.	NO CHANGE With regards to the craft village and its businesses it is considered that there is support within the Sutherland Local Plan for appropriate redevelopment if pursued.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	SNH objects to the inclusion of an area of the Durness SAC within the SDA. Whilst the existence of the SAC does not preclude development, clearly there are likely to be constraints on development which do not exist outwith the SAC. It is therefore misleading to include the designated site within the SDA which presumes in favour of development.	RETAIN SDA BUT REDUCE TO EXCLUDE LAND WITHN THE SAC.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	P39 Durness. The Durness SSSI/SAC is not marked at c NC 400679. The SSSI/SAC is not marked where it overlaps with the Settlement Development Area. Earlier comments regarding the removal of the SAC from the SDA would resolve this point.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Durness MB Inset 13.1 Durness		
529 Mrs Mary MacKay Durness	I feel that the envelope for building in Durine is too narrow thereby restricting any new building. There are extremely attractive potential house sites on some of the crofts but they are well outside the envelope. Durness is a scattered village anyway and I feel the draft plan is too restrictive.	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>The recommendation is to defend the current SDA for Durness. The wider countryside policy provides opportunity for development whilst assessing against the natural and cultural heritage features, considering settlement pattern, loss of locally important croft land, and any infrastructure constraints. The SDA has been defined considering these matters so we would generally resist development immediately outwith the boundary. However there will be appropriate sites for development outwith the settlement where proposals will be assessed against the wider countryside policy.</p> <p>It is considered that the Local Plan cannot seek to identify all the specific sites that are suitable in the wider countryside as this would be a very time consuming and difficult exercise which would be unlikely to be comprehensive enough. The site by site approach against the wider countryside policy is the most suitable especially when you consider the traditionally low build rate.</p> <p>However although not relevant in this instance this does not apply for the hinterland of Tain where there is greater development pressure in the wider countryside.</p>
128 Mr James Keith Durness	<p>Having viewed the plan in the Post Office, I was a little disappointed to see that none of my property has been deemed suitable for housing.</p> <p>I have 5 children and what happens if any of them wish to live and work in the village? If this were the case I would have to buy a plot for them to build on as none of my land is included. By this time plots will probably be selling for 50 K plus! A bit of the 2 fields I am concerned about, 1 of them (plan a(02)) already has 2 houses on it, 1 of them my own. The other (plan b) has a new house in the next field but one .</p> <p>As far as I can see all this draft has done is increased the value of some peoples property by up to 10 times the value and made mine</p>	As above

Inset Maps Durness MB Inset 13.1 Durness

virtually worthless. I believe that every planning application should be judged on its own merits but I can see what's going to happen. In the future the planning office will look at the location and say " it's not deemed suitable on the local plan so the answer is no". A bit frightening when we are going to be stuck with this plan for years to come!

I am writing to see if these 2 fields can be included as suitable for building before it becomes "law". In this way my children can, if they wish, build a house for themselves in the village of their birth, without having to lay out a fortune for a plot of land.

Inset Maps Tongue G General Comment

243 HSCHT
Dornoch

Thank you for forwarding the above letter which you had received. I would appreciate it if you could keep this response from HSCHT on record with the letter from Mr Guttridge. With regards to the comments in the above letter the HSCHT would respond as follows.

The HSCHT carried out a Housing needs survey in 2003 and whilst the findings of that survey are possibly out of date as suggested by Mr Guttridge, the trend however in virtually all of the smaller more rural villages in the highlands is that demand for affordable housing has increased since that time. This trend has been backed up in Tongue by recent work carried out by HSCHT, which involved meetings with the Community Council, attendance at local plan consultation meetings and a housing surgery along with various discussions with local residents some of whom reside in Varrich place.

As you are aware (having made note of this in the Local Plan) there is indeed a strong link between affordable housing and employment as suggested by Mr Guttridge. The HSCHT works across the Highlands and in general all the communities it works in (including Tongue) appreciate the need for affordable housing in order to attract possible future business opportunities to the area which is essential for the community's future well being. The lack of suitable affordable housing in smaller villages can very often require those young local entrepreneurs wishing to start up a new venture to move away to get suitable housing which then allows them to start a business.

Inset Maps Tongue G General Comment

Quite apart from employment although again it is strongly linked the lack of suitable affordable housing can affect a number of essential local facilities such as Schools, Post offices, medical provision, shops etc and equally importantly the demographics can change alarmingly quickly leaving a very aged population with no facilities or suitable carers.

With regards to working outside the area you live in! This is something that the HSCHT or any community body would not want to influence as that would be interfering in personal choice in a lot of cases. As you know if you do have a strong work connection to an area outwith the one you live in this can give you extra points towards affordable housing available in that area. In the case of Tongue I would suggest the general feeling amongst the community is that they are happy for workers to commute rather than move away as this at least means they have a family base locally and are supporting local services.

The offer of land to the North of Varrich place is indeed a very generous one from Sutherland Estates and following discussion with the CC the HSCHT fully supports the inclusion of this land in the Local Plan. However given the relatively small allocation of viable sites for affordable housing in Tongue the HSCHT would strongly recommend that the current allocation H1 remains in the Local Plan. This would help to keep the limited viable options for affordable housing open for the foreseeable future.

To summarise the HSCHT are currently carrying out valid work in the Tongue area. This work is consistent with work carried out successfully across the highlands on affordable housing demand, with that work to date suggesting there is some demand for such housing in Tongue. The most suitable siting of such housing from an economically viable and social inclusion point of view would be in the Varrich place area, most likely (although this has not been clearly established as yet) to the North and not on H1 which we would still recommend stays in the Local plan.
I

Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place

Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place

40 Mr Scott Coghill
Tongue

I am very disappointed to see you have not listened to the residents of Varich Place who quite clearly told you that the building of houses on site H1 was unacceptable and rather ignorant. Luckily for us Lord Strathnaver came to meet with the residents to discuss and see the problem we have with site H1. He totally understood our objections when he looked at our view, though he stated that legally he had made the offer to the council of site H1 and he now realised that the site was inappropriate. He proposed the top of the field next to Varich Place (north) was a more suitable site and he has offered this site to the council (the farmer also agrees with this). We really appreciated that he took the time to meet us and most of all that he listened !! And sensible person would.

Let us now deal with the reasons you give not to use this site!!

(1) Taking the view away from passing drivers!! Using this reason not to build on this site is infuriating to us local residents (you would not want to spoil the view for passers by but damn the people that live here permanently they do not need a view !!!)

Do not use this as a reason or you will have a lot of very angry people on your hands.

(2) Arable ground both fields are used exactly the same one isn't better than the other and the farmer has agreed to use the top of the field next to Varich Place for houses. They all agree with our view and see the reason for it. So using this reason won't hold water.

I can assure you that this group of residents will use every means possible to fight the building of houses on site H1. Lord Strathnaver has offered you the best site next to Varich Place please use it and stop all the bad feeling now.

We have spoken to a builder and they say the site next to Varich Place is far more cost effective site to build on.

Your talk of a tree belt is good but certainly not in front of us, but in front of us, but continuing along the main road between the row of new single storey houses and the road (shown on a diagram).H1 site (Varich Place) more suitable as road access is already in place.

Sewer at Loyal Terrace is inadequate and causes problems at present without adding to it.

H1 site is flatter drier ground which would be easier and less expensive to develop.

H1 site is closer to main sewer system.

RETAIN ALLOCATION AND ENLARGE TO INCLUDE AREA TO WEST OF VARICH PLACE AND ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGN BRIEF TO COVER EXTENDED AREA.THE ALLOCATION

The original H1 site was identified in the Landscape Capacity Study (LCS) to reinforce the existing cluster of houses at Varich Place. The LCS identifies the most suitable sites in terms of impact on the landscape, fitting with the settlement pattern, and protecting important public views. H1 is a site identified as suitable for development on this basis and the council supports these findings. The allocations for Tongue aim to protect and consolidate the settlement form of the village.

Although H1 occupies agricultural land the crofters commission have not objected to its inclusion it appears not to be in crofting tenure and to the best of our knowledge the land concerned would not be considered locally significant.

Sutherland Estates have not asked for H1 to be excluded from the Local Plan. They are however offering adjacent land to affordable housing providers. They consider that H1 will not be economic to develop for affordable purposes.

After considering the new site carefully particularly in terms of its landscape impact and affect on public views, the council have decided to support its inclusion. It is important that suitable and effective land is identified for the provision of affordable housing in Tongue. The original H1 is a suitable site but it is not viable for affordable housing development. We will therefore support this extension but require a design brief to make sure development is brought forward appropriately on this sensitive site.

With regards to the mention of a tree belt on the original H1 this might be a possible mitigation measure should

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place	Tourist season already causes traffic congestion without the extras traffic volume that the new housing would bring.	odour nuisance be raised as an issue here. However Scottish Water have received no complaints so have not investigated this matter. If you feel this is a significant problem then it needs to be followed up by contacting Scottish Water.
248 Mr & Mrs DA & FM Mills Tongue	<p>We have examined both documents and while generally in support of the environmental plan we are concerned about how some of the objectives may negatively impact on the community of Tongue.</p> <p>We are deeply concerned about the proposal under the local plan deposit H1 as it can be linked from a planning perspective to the environmental plan objectives to secure approvals, but can at the same time undermine objectives that make Tongue such a wonderful community in which to live.</p> <p>We have tried to draw out our objections in this letter in the hope that they can be seen as a positive contribution to modifying these initial proposals. Our comments fall into two categories; Those affecting our family directly and those which we believe will have a negative affect on Tongue as a community.</p> <p>Individual level concerns. Clearly the HI proposals will seriously detract from the view enjoyed by ourselves and those living in Varich Place. There are few places on earth that offer such beauty and tranquillity. It is this that enhances our personal wellbeing, and blighting this with the proposal to build at the bottom of our garden will have an adverse psychological impact on us and we suspect our neighbours.</p> <p>It will no doubt disrupt community cohesion and cause much stress where currently none exists. While this concern may sound a little like a "not in my backyard" response one cannot help but note the statistic on page 5 of the environmental report which indicates a population density in Sutherland of 2.2 persons per square kilometre. One cannot help but ask whether alternative and less intrusive options are available.</p> <p>Community issues There is much reference in the plan for the need to maintain and</p>	As above

Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place

support "quality living environments" with a strong focus on "place making". The natural beauty which surrounds and engages the lives of communities should not be sacrificed for unsympathetic developments such as those proposed in H1.

We have not actually seen any demographic figures to suggest that there is a local need for such developments in Tongue. We are yet to find anyone in the community that believes there is a demand or local need for such housing. We would further make the point that the proposed location is on an incline all the way to the local amenities. This would limit from a practical perspective access to this housing for the elderly, and with the demographic profile which sees a 21.9% of over 65 population one cannot help but think that accessibility to amenities should be seen as a key requirement.

P7 of the plan acknowledges the reality of car dependency but we should be responsible in our approach to this. We can bury our heads in the sand and say our environment demands the extensive use of cars, or we can build communities in areas where support and infrastructure is already in place. This is acknowledged in part within the plan (page 8K) yet the proposal will create a greater demand on car dependency as people will need to travel from Tongue to larger communities where jobs are more likely to be present.

An area that causes me great concern is the affect on the natural environment.

Although the proposed HI plot may appear relatively small it is a haven for wild life .It is used by both resident and migrating geese, badgers and certainly in recent years we have been delighted to see hedgehogs visiting our garden from the HI designated land. The land is rich in fauna with many species of orchid making an appearance when the weather is kind, together with associated butterflies and moths. Red deer grazing in the early mornings are maybe easily described as "nice, but they'll move onto other available sites when we start working".

Is that what those of us that cherish the availability of nature on our doorsteps really want?

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place	<p>We note the documents talk about working with communities. This being a consultation phase the Tongue community, as far as we can judge, appreciates the opportunity to comment. Those that we speak to are less sure that the community voice will be heard and these HI proposals will offer a sharp test.</p> <p>We are also assuming that when you say that "other agencies" are being consulted this will include the likes of the RSPB (royal society for the protection of birds) the Red Deer Commission and other wildlife trusts and organisations. This will be important as while we can reflect on the communities love of this daily delight of nature, at its best we are less able to give a view on its importance in terms of biodiversity. We hope you take our comments positively and they can be used to develop alternative options for the HI proposal.</p>	
243 HSCHT Dornoch	<p>This site is unlikely to be suitable for affordable housing, but would allow private development to continue. It has been agreed with the local landowner that the field north of H1 should be included in the local plan, to allow for economical provision of affordable housing.</p>	As above
192 June Taylor Tongue	<p>Having seen the proposal H1 - to this I would strongly object. We have one main tourist attraction in Tongue - both historical and beautiful. To put extra housing on this site would be so detrimental, that I cannot comprehend any justifiable reason why this site should be considered as suitable. If more housing than the proposal 8 (H2) is required in our village (which I very much doubt, as many of the villages have to go and live away from home to be able to find work) can I suggest that either MU1 or MU2 would be much more acceptable.</p>	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>14.1 Tongue H.1 SNH is content with the identification of area H.1, which falls within the Kyle of Tongue NSA, for housing. It is our opinion that this area could be developed without compromising the views to Ben Loyal on the approach to Tongue from the causeway from the north and west.</p> <p>It is our understanding that, since this Deposit Draft Plan was drawn up, a possible extension of H.1, to the north has been identified. This would see a natural extension to the settlement although it is also likely to affect the approach to the settlement from the north and west. Should</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place	<p>this additional area be allocated for housing the layout and design should be of a high standard and tree planting should be incorporated. SNH recommends that a design brief is drawn up to ensure the inclusion of these requirements.</p>	
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	<p>Site difficult to develop towards south of site. Consideration should be given to extension of site north creating road frontage onto village road. Suggest extending site along road frontage as far as fence line opposite middle of MU1 across the road.</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 6 Suggested capacity: 15</p>	As above
163 Mr Simon Gutteridge Tongue	<p>1. The Actual Need for Affordable Housing in Tongue The data on the need for affordable housing in Tongue is now out-of date, and is in any case of doubted validity. When people are contacted and asked whether they want additional housing to be available within Tongue, there are several understandable reasons why they would say 'Yes', but the reality is often very different.</p> <p>The main reason why housing surveys can be unreliable is that they usually do not include parallel questions on employment. If there is no suitable local employment, either for adults or young people already in the community, then although they may correctly say that they want to live in affordable housing in Tongue the reality is that they either have to move away for work or become dependent on benefit. If someone is working in Reay/Thurso/Wick or down on the east coast or towards Lairg and Invades, then it would be more helpful for them to have access to affordable housing nearer to where they are working.</p> <p>So it needs to be strongly emphasised to the Housing Trust which will be carrying out the needs survey, that the survey will not be valid unless it includes specific questions asking:</p> <p>Are you already living in the immediate area around Tongue?</p> <p>Are you already employed within the area round Tongue?</p> <p>Do you have access to transport to get to and from that employment within a reasonable time each day?</p>	As above

Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place

The previous surveys completed by the Housing Trust need to be looked at in detail, but my impression so far is that they have not included employment considerations, so their surveys of housing need are substantially incomplete and invalid as a basis for decisions on housing. The Housing Trust Survey should include these questions concerning employment

2. The use of Land West of Varich place for Affordable Housing in Tongue After the last meeting at Tongue Village hall and the consequential findings posted on the council web site, ignoring all the points put forward by the residents of Varich to be of no relevance or consequence, said residents contacted Tongue community council and Lady Sutherland to ONCE AGAIN voice their feelings on the proposed building of houses on area H1 of your plan (west of Varich place).

Very soon after receiving this letter and petition signed by the residents of Varich place, Lord Strathnaver came to see the residents to discuss our fears. Due to the strong feelings held against using this site for housing he informed us that he has very kindly offered 2 acres of the field to the north of Varich place (marked on map enclosed), to the council as a viable alternative to the site H1 mentioned above. For this we are all very grateful and hope that as the Sutherland family have read our letter, found the time to visit and generously offer; an alternative site, that the council will also take the time to re-evaluate the local plan and consider seriously the alternative so generously offered. We would also like to believe that the Council will seriously take into consideration the feelings of the community that they are committed to serve.

On our reckoning any houses built (4 to 5 have been mentioned) in the plot North of Varich Place which has been so generously and selflessly donated, would not block any important buildings or views and would strengthen the villages compact form much more effectively. Furthermore, taking into consideration Mul's possible development, we feel that using the recently donated area of land North of Varich Place would have a significantly lower environmental impact on the area as a whole. How anyone can honestly think that putting more houses of any design below the present building line of Tongue does just amaze us all.

Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place

3. The Alternative Uses for the Land below Varich Place In earlier discussions, one possibility that was mentioned is to use the small flat area below the houses (area H1) as an area designated for visitor seating and parking for castle Varich and the village. At present, those living in Tongue village and also the visitors to the area do not have anywhere where they can sit and look over the Kyle. As a result, most visitors drive down to the field gate at the start of Varich Place, find that there is nowhere to park/sit, turn around and go on down to the parking areas on the causeway, away from the shops and the tourist facilities in the village. Visitors staying in local accommodation are also unable to walk to a seating area overlooking the Kyle, during the summer months a constant flow of people stopping the night in Tongue wander along the water board road below Varich place in the evenings enjoying the views. The land below Varich Place would have the capacity to form an excellent seating and small parking area, with views over the Kyle but within easy walking distance of the village. It would become an asset for the whole community.

As concerned residents of Varich Place, it would be reasonable to:

- a) ask for this alternative use of the top section of field as a small car park and seating area for the village to be fully considered and
- b) to request the designation of the park seating area as a memorial to be chosen locally.

Sincerely and including and on the behalf of the residents of Varich Place

243 HSCHT
Dornoch

As above

242 Tongue Community Council
Talmine

Ronnie MacRae of HSCHT has forwarded a letter from Simon Guttridge on behalf of the residents of Varrich Place, Tongue.

As above

Firstly, some of the residents have distanced themselves from part 1 of the letter but there objection to the siting of housing to the west of Varrich Place remains. While we fully accept this objection, we very much support the siting of low cost/rental housing in the Tongue area

Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place

and would support any housing built on the area to the north of Varrich Place. We feel it is extremely important that initiatives of this kind should be supported as vigorously as the future of the area is linked with bringing new people, children to our Schools and business will hopefully follow. We are grateful to the HSCHT and Sutherland Estates support on this matter and look forward to yours.

94 Mr & Mrs Nicholson
Tongue

After the last meeting at Tongue Village hall and consequential the findings posted on the council web site ignoring all points put forward by residence as of no relevance, the residence of Varich place contacted Tongue community council and Lady Sutherland to ONCE AGAIN voice their feelings on the building of houses on area H1 of your plan (west of Varich place). Very soon after receiving this letter and petition signed by the residence of Varich place, Lord Strathnaver came to see and discuss our fears, and due to this strong feeling against using this site for housing has informed us that he has very kindly offered 2 acres of the field to the north of Varich place (marked on map enclosed) as a viable alternative to the site mentioned above, to the council. For this we are all very grateful and hope that as the Sutherland family have read our letter, found time to visit and generously offered an alternative site to try and quell our fears that the council will take the time to also re-evaluate the local plan and consider seriously the alternative generously offered, and taking into consideration the feelings of the community that they are supposed to serve. On our reckoning any houses built (4 to 5 have been mentioned) would not block any important buildings or peoples views and would strengthen the villages compact form much better, taking into consideration MU1s possible development, how anyone can honestly think that putting more houses of any design below the present building line of Tongue does, just amazes us.

Also after a telephone conversation with Katie Briggs I would like to re-state that the planned field H1 is as much prime farming land as the alternative site and is used for grazing of sheep, cattle and the making of hay every year, and further more should 100m of road side view for passing motorists which can still be seen that much further on, really hold more importance to the council than the people who actually keep the village going!

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue H 1 West of Varrich Place		
38 Ms Suzanne Fox Tongue	I support the provision of more housing in Tongue especially if it were affordable housing. I would also support more development in the area in terms of tourism the village has a lot to offer, and not enough is made of it.	As above

25 S Plass Tongue	I object to building on site H1 as long as there is viable ground to develop inside a community there shouldn't be an exploitation of farmland or any other nature areas outside the housing perimeter. Tourism and environmental issues are of importance so why not ??? Close buildings, cars and harmonise the existing village structures? There is no need to spoil the castle area and path by building at site H1.	As above

129 Mr Ian Keith Tongue	Objecting	As above

Inset Maps Tongue H 2 South of Loyal Terrace		
111 Mr Peter Cattermole Tongue	<p>I won't object to development on the NW leg of this site if the houses were built to a height or at a proximity to 11 - 16 Loyal Terrace so as to obscure the view presently enjoyed by these properties of the valley and ridge directly opposite and southwards towards Ben Loyal.</p> <p>Houses built close to the main road might not obscure these views and would not be objectionable to me. My overall response, therefore, depends entirely on how buildings are located within the site and to what height they are built.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there has been some support for this sites inclusion.</p> <p>It may well be that H1 is less expensive to service and develop than H2. However it is still considered that H2 offers some effective land and flexibility/choice within Tongue. There has been support from the crofting owners for its inclusion, and the crofters commission have not made an objection. Whilst there is other common grazings land that has been identified it is considered that this site offers choice, is otherwise suitable, and does not appear to represent locally important croft land.</p> <p>Although we are aware of access issues we are sure that the western area is effective whilst the eastern area is challenging and there is doubt over whether the whole site is effective. Whilst aware of this we see no harm in allocating the whole site in the hope that this issue is</p>

Inset Maps Tongue H 2 South of Loyal Terrace

overcome and in the knowledge that the western area is not constrained.

The Local Plan establishes the principle of development on allocated sites however the detail of what is proposed will only become available if and when someone moves forward with a planning application.

Connection to the main sewer will be sought in accordance with our 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 will have impact on the density of proposals. If proposals do need to connect to the main sewer then Scottish Water will advise if there is a network problem here that the applicant needs to address.

Private views are not considered a material planning consideration however in considering the amenity of nearby properties the applicant may well be able to minimise the impact given the topography through careful siting.

203 Mr Gary MacLeod
Tongue

Supporting allocation.

As above

192 June Taylor
Tongue

Supporting this allocation.

As above

499 Albyn Housing
Invergordon

Difficult site to develop and believed to be crofting issues which may limit release of land.

As above

Capacity as per draft: 8 Suggested Capacity: 8

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue H 2 South of Loyal Terrace		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	H.2 SNH welcomes the inclusion of site H.2, also within the NSA, which represents a logical extension to the village.	As above
243 HSCHT Dornoch	H2 - Due to access and servicing, and also the topography, this would be a difficult site to develop, and current crofting issues mean that this site is unlikely to come forward within the life of this plan.	As above
282 DC MacLean Tongue	Supporting allocation.	As above
262 Mr & Mrs Frances & Andrew Gunn Tongue	<p>We object to this area being included for 2 reasons. Firstly the area is a local croft and as a crofter myself and a member of the grazings committee feel that by including this croft (or indeed any croft) gives it an inflated value to the buyer who may suppose that it is an opportunity for development. We are trying to preserve crofts for young people with an interest in working the croft and a will to maintain crofts for future generations. There is other common grazings land available for housing.</p> <p>Also the access to this site and the area to the north would be dangerous and difficult. Poor drainage and flooding have affected the houses on the west side of the road (my own included) and springs continue to pour water into poor drainage systems.</p> <p>I would object strongly to houses built where I mentioned but would welcome houses built in the area to the east of (marked area) and support in particular low cost developments.</p>	As above
41 Mr George Mackay Tongue	<p>H1 site (Varich Place) more suitable as road access is already in place.</p> <p>Sewer at Loyal terrace is inadequate and causes problems at present without adding to it.</p> <p>H1 site is flatter, drier ground which would be easier and less expensive to develop.</p> <p>H1 site is closer to main sewer system.</p>	As above

Inset Maps Tongue H 2 South of Loyal Terrace

Tourist season currently causes traffic congestion without the extra traffic volume that the new housing would bring

Inset Maps Tongue MU 1 West of the Manse

311 Scottish Environment
Protection Agency

Category 3

Dingwall

RETAIN ALLOCATION

It is considered that the integrity of these buildings and their settings can be protected whilst allowing development here. These issues can be dealt with when developing proposals and a design statement will be required with any planning application.

For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment however the policy has been amended (see GP9).

309 Mr John Barlow
Lairg

No development in this area so as to protect the integrity of the older buildings Manse, Church, Hotel which are essential to the history of the village. Their setting should be enhanced not threatened. This area was always designated an open space area and this should not change. Landscaping and hedging are all possible here. The steadings of the Old Manse are listed (B) and in any development, have to be conserved as in sites & subject to any listed building regulation. This should preclude any development as being prohibitive.

As above

Inset Maps Tongue MU 2 North of St Andrews Church

495 Historic Scotland
Edinburgh

Tongue MU2: The Tongue House Designed Landscape sits to the north of this land allocation. There is potential for the design of the development to have an adverse effect on the setting of this nationally important site, and this should have been identified in the assessment. Mitigation in the form of text in the Development Factors has already been provided; however, in Historic Scotland's response to the plan, suggestions have been made for the inclusion of text in the Developer Requirements as well to strengthen this.

RETAIN ALLOCATION AND ADD DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO SAFEGUARD THE SETTING OF THE CHURCH AND ADDRESS ANY IMPACT ON THE SETTING OF TONGUE HOUSE DESIGNED LANDSCAPE. A DESIGN STATEMENT SHOULD ACCOMPANY AN APPLICATION HERE.

John Barlow's support of this allocation is noted and the trustees support the development of this site.

Inset Maps Tongue MU 2 North of St Andrews Church

The Local Plan seeks to establish the principle of development here however the detailed proposals would become available with a planning application at which point there is an opportunity for representations if someone wishes to make comments on the proposals. The drainage issues will be considered as part of a planning application. All development must meet the guidance set out in The SUDS Manual and in Sewers For Scotland, including the making of agreements for the on-going maintenance of surface water drainage systems.

For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment however the policy has been amended (see GP9).

495 Historic Scotland
Edinburgh

There is a Category A listed building (St Andrew's Church; HB No 18456) to the south of this land allocation. The Tongue House Designated Landscape sits to the north of this land allocation.

As above

Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation. We note the requirement to protect the setting of Tongue House and its Designed Landscape in the Development Factors. We consider that the proximity of the designed landscape should be taken into consideration in the design and scale of proposed housing/mixed use development on the site. We therefore recommend that text is also included in the Developer Requirements and suggest: "The design should address and potential impact on the setting of Tongue House Designated landscape"

We welcome the inclusion of the setting of the church in the Developer Requirements but have concerns that a development could be visible in principal views of the church from the public road. We therefore recommend that some of the requirements for MU1 also be applied to MU2, and that the Developer Requirements be amended to read: "Safeguard the setting of the Church. A design statement should accompany an application here."

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue MU 2 North of St Andrews Church		
109 Mr & Mrs Skene Tongue	<p>Previously forwarded comments (including site visits by the existing planning (Brora) and Local Councillor were relevant to a proposed relocation of a fire brigade depot? The approx area is already fenced and we have received a copy plan (subject to further advice.) However we take this opportunity to reemphasise our two major concerns for your consideration.</p> <p>A. If the access to the new site is onto the unlimited speed section of road adjacent to our properties (shown by cross-hatched areas at road frontage) major drainage/road water drainage already identified but unattended to (as yet) must be acknowledged and included in works to secure safe access/exit.</p> <p>B. The configuration of any building would we assume, take into account the motorist sight-lines as the junction from our premises is subject to use by cars and heavy goods. Referring to the developer requirements - very good we've tried for 18 years due to junction and passing traffic speeds! Footpath/pavement? See comments re. road drainage and driving safety.</p> <p>Comments in support apply to MU2 proposals and plans for lesser area already in our files. Trust this is in order and acceptable. PS New cemetery extension access not shown!</p>	As above
500 Historic Scotland Edinburgh	<p>There is a Category A listed building (St Andrew's Church; HB No 18456) to the south of this land allocation. The Tongue House Designated Landscape sits to the north of this land allocation.</p> <p>Historic Scotland does not object to the principle of development within this allocation. We note the requirement to protect the setting of Tongue House and its Designated Landscape in the Development Factors. We consider that the proximity of the designed landscape should be taken into consideration in the design and scale of proposed housing/mixed use development on the site. We therefore recommend that text is also included in the Developer Requirements and suggest: "The design should address and potential impact on the setting of Tongue House Designated landscape"</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue MU 2 North of St Andrews Church		
	<p>We welcome the inclusion of the setting of the church in the Developer Requirements but have concerns that a development could be visible in principal views of the church from the public road. We therefore recommend that some of the requirements for MU1 also be applied to MU2, and that the Developer Requirements be amended to read: "Safeguard the setting of the Church. A design statement should accompany an application here."</p>	
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>MU.2 A design statement should also accompany any applications here. This is already stated in relation to MU.1, and both sites are within the NSA.</p>	As above
324 The Curch of Scotland General Trustees Edinburgh	<p>I would confirm that the trustees support the principle of development on the two sites which you have identified at Tongue under the reference LT1 and MU2 as well as that at Edderton (ref MU1). They would certainly be willing to consider releasing them for development within the timescales set out in your letter subject to their reaching agreement with their respective tenants.</p>	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	<p>Category 3</p>	As above
309 Mr John Barlow Lairg	<p>As you say any development has to be sympathetic to the setting of the church and its attached burial ground. Any development, including the proposed fires station, should have planning exterior controls rigidly enforced to comply with this. Your map of the area though is not entirely accurate.</p>	As above
Inset Maps Tongue LT 1 South of Hysbackie access		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue LT 1 South of Hysbackie access		
339 SR & DM Wood Kent	We object on the grounds that our property could be devalued and property built might directly overlook ours if built opposite on higher ground this would restrict our privacy. However it depends upon capacity and design we feel we need more information.	<p>DO NOT RETAIN AS AN ALLOCATION BUT RETAIN REDUCED AREA WITHIN THE SDA</p> <p>The owners support of this allocation is noted. It should be noted that the effect on the value of someone's property is not a material planning consideration so we cannot consider this.</p> <p>In the Sutherland Local Plan we are establishing the principle of development along with the likely capacity of development and factors affecting its development. This site was allocated with an indicative capacity is 10 to reflect both the edge of settlement location and to mitigate the effect on the water environment. The details about the siting and design of the development will be required with a detailed planning application and there is a chance to make a representation at this stage on the detail. Although no longer an allocation the developer requirements will remain for low density development suitable for its edge of settlement location.</p> <p>The site area has been reduced reflecting advice from SNH regarding the higher ground previously allocated so that it fits comfortably with the landform.</p> <p>For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment however the policy has been amended (see GP9),</p>
243 HSCHT Dornoch	LT1 - this site could prove difficult to develop due to the topography and lack of services. Consideration should be given to other possible sites as per Tongue Community Council's proposals.	As above
324 The Curch of Scotland General Trustees Edinburgh	I would confirm that the trustees support the principle of development on the two sites which you have identified at Tongue under the reference LT1 and MU2 as well as that at Edderton (ref MU1). They would certainly be willing to consider releasing them for development within the timescales set out in your letter subject to their reaching agreement with their respective tenants.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Tongue LT 1 South of Hysbackie access		
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 3	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Steep site with limited potential. Sewer not available at this point. Capacity as per draft: 10 Suggested capacity: 10	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	LT.1 SNH is concerned about the allocation of site LT.1. Whilst there may be some scope for limited development here, following the pattern of dispersed housing in the NSA around Tongue, SNH does not consider the site suitable for allocation or inclusion within a SDA. SNH strongly recommends that this allocation be removed.	As above
Inset Maps Melness G General Comment		
528 Melness Crofters Estate Inverness	<p>1. The Board is concerned that Melness may be disadvantaged when seeking investment because it has only been categorised as a "Small Village", rather than a "Key Settlement", like Tongue. In particular, Melness Estate is owned by the local d n g community, who are progressing major regeneration projects in Melness (e.g. community owned wind energy project). The Board therefore considers that Melness should be formally regarded as a "Key Settlement".</p> <p>The Board is concerned that the boundary that has been drawn around the centre of the community in Melness will disadvantage the small townships that have been excluded to the north and west of this centre. These townships are important, integral elements of the whole crofting community in Melness.</p> <p>It appears that many of the proposals that were suggested by local people during the earlier consultation exercise have now been excluded from the plan. The Board is therefore concerned that there is now insufficient provision in the plan, particularly for ' Mixed Use" (sheltered housing, playpark, community facilities, etc.) around the former school house/ community centre, as well as for a variety of uses to the west of</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>The small village categorisation has been developed within a hierarchy to encourage appropriate retail, office and leisure development. In this context Melness currently fits within small village category, with Tongue as the sub area centre. Outwith the centres (which Melness is considered as) it is appropriate that proposals are judged against the criteria mentioned within Policy 17. It is not felt that this disadvantages Melness but it does provides an appropriate test of a proposals suitability.</p> <p>The wider countryside policy provides opportunity for development whilst assessing against the natural and cultural heritage features, considering settlement pattern, loss of locally important croft land, and any infrastructure constraints. The SDA and allocations in Melness serve to identify where the larger developments should occur but for single house proposals or other small scale developments there will be scope subject to the wider</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Melness G General Comment	<p>Midtown and Skinnet.</p> <p>The Board would be grateful for your consideration of these comments.</p>	<p>countryside policy considerations and the natural and cultural heritage features.</p> <p>The act of defining SDA's for all the crofting townships requires significant resources not just from the council but also from the statutory consultees. For these areas it is considered that the most appropriate way forward given the historic low build rate, is by site by site assessment as proposals come forward.</p> <p>The extension of the SDA as far south as was suggested by the community was considered inappropriate whilst adequate opportunities exist for infill. Therefore only a small extension was supported. Proposals submitted for midtown did not represent a good fit with the settlement pattern, and landscape capacity at this point and were therefore also resisted. Potential around the former school house and community centre can be considered favourably if appropriate proposals come forward as the area is within the SDA.</p>
243 HSCHT Dornoch	<p>In line with our general comments submission the local community feel strongly that greater flexibility in the planning system is required in Melness in order to assist younger families to build homes and settle in this fragile area.</p>	As above
Inset Maps Melness H 1 West of Joseph Mackay Court, Melness	<p>Site has potential for additional units but would careful planning to acknowledge concerns that impact may have.</p> <p>Capacity as per draft: 8 Suggested capacity: 12/15</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT AMEND SITE TO EXCLUDE EASTERN AREA WHERE IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT AND INAPPROPRIATE TO DEVELOP DUE TO LANDFORM</p> <p>It is considered that 8 is a suitable indicative capacity for this site. Potential for more might be accommodated but issues such as design and layout would be critical and would require the detailed application to prove the site can accommodate more.</p>

Inset Maps Melness H 1 West of Joseph Mackay Court, Melness

I note Margaret Mackay's, and Danny Mackays support for this site. The representations of neighbours matter and are carefully considered where they refer to material planning reasons. This may result in the exclusion of a site or inclusion of a developer requirement to address an issue. Feedback from members of the public at the consultative issues and options stage 'Sutherland Futures' resulted in many changes for the Deposit Draft.

It is highly probably that Melness will be included in Scottish Water's new water supply scheme served from Loch Calder and will benefit from the additional capacity in 2009. However even if this scheme does not happen the Local Plan should continue to allocate land and planning consents should be issued for housing in order to illustrate the demand for increased capacity in the water supply.

With regards to the point about employment in the area national planning guidance expects planning authorities to provide an adequate supply of effective housing land. It also acknowledges planning's role in advancing the vision for rural Scotland is to enable and create opportunities for development in sustainable locations wherever appropriate e.g. where infrastructure capacity and good access exist, or can be provided at reasonable cost, or to meet justifiable social and economic objectives.

The link between housing and economic development is made in national policy through SPP 1 which states that 'The planning system supports economic prosperity by identifying land of a suitable quantity and quality in the right locations to meet the need for economic development and new housing.'

67 Mr Danny MacKay
Talmine

Supporting allocation.

As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Melness H 1 West of Joseph Mackay Court, Melness		
68 M J Waud Melness	I do not feel that the area can sustain more housing on the grounds that the Water Board is already taking too much from the local lochs and this is damaging the eco - system. I would like to know if 8 houses are built what jobs these households would be doing? Already in J M C there is only two of us that pay by working the rest are on benefits! There is a lot of private builds in the area too.	As above
104 Margaret Mackay Talmine	I have no objection at all with new housing the more the better. Would my opinion and that of my neighbours matter, I don't think so, but I am all for it no matter what.	As above
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	14.1 Melness H.1 SNH recommends that the extent of this site is reduced and that development is restricted to a linear pattern of housing following the road line rather than the formation of a cluster around Joseph Mackay Court.	As above
Inset Maps Melness MU 1 Adjacent to the existing Caladh Sona		
162 C R Mackay Talmine	I suggest that a different area of ground is used for the Caladh Sona unit as present area is too small. Ground is available from the estate. I support the idea of replacing the Cala Sona unit but it needs more ground should offer sufficient scope for	<p>REMOVE ALLOCATION BUT RETAIN WITHIN SDA AND ADD TEXT TO DEVELOPMENT FACTORS TO SUPPORT THE REBUILD OF THE CALADH SONA</p> <p>The Social Work service has given a commitment to the replacement of the existing Caladh Sona. They gave us an indication earlier in the Local Plan review that they were considering the MU1 site. However it has recently become evident that they will be considering different proposals within a wider area here. There is a lack of certainty at this moment and this does not lend itself to allocating a specific site. We have therefore consulted them on our SDA boundary which will offer support in principle for development here. This will provide sufficient and suitable scope for care provision here once plans have been further developed. Also the development factor outlined above offers support to the rebuild in Melness.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Melness MU 1 Adjacent to the existing Caladh Sona		Without planning reasons for objecting to sites we cannot consider objections. We wrote to advise Steven Bostock who submitted this representation giving him the opportunity to follow this up. However no reasons have subsequently been submitted.
312 Ngair & Stuart Mingham Tongue	I raise the following objection to site MU1 on the Melness Plan. This area is allocated for a rebuild of Caladh Sona Care Home is far too small, and would totally take away the parking space for the adjacent Community Hall. I understand the Melness Crofters are willing to donate as much as is required for a rebuild of Caladh Sona, and have identified three possible sites.	As above
367 Mr James P MacKay Melness	Is H.R.C paying Melness Crofters for the land?? (If so, I support) (If not, I object)	As above
528 Melness Crofters Estate Inverness	<p>This site appears to be in error because it is currently the community centre's car park. This 'mixed use' one should be redefined in consultation with appropriate parties, including Melness Estate.</p> <p>Melness Estate strongly supports the replacement of Caladh Sona, and has offered a site for this purpose, but does not agree that it should be the car park. Please clarify why this particular site has been identified.</p> <p>Regarding the zone 'MU1", this appears to be the current car park for the community centre. This appears to be an error. Land for a replacement Caladh Sona sheltered housing facility has been offered by Melness Estate, and would be more appropriately situated within the suggested wider "Mixed Use" zone around the former school house/community centre.</p> <p>Melness Crofters Estate occupies the former Nurse's house as an estate office. This site is currently used as the car park for the community centre. It is also convenient for parking when using the estate office, rather than on the street.</p> <p>Although Melness estate strongly supports the replacement of Caladh</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Melness MU 1 Adjacent to the existing Caladh Sona		
	Sona, it is not clear why this site has been zoned for this purpose. Melness Estate has already offered the choice of site in the immediate surrounding area. Please clarify.	
506 Mr Steven Bostock Talmine	Objecting.	As above
552 Mr David MacLennan Melness	Supporting allocation	Noted
Inset Maps Melness MU 2 West of Craggan Hotel		
367 Mr James P MacKay Melness	<p>I am writing in response to your letter dated 15th November 2007 regarding the plans for development of a site next to The Craggan Hotel.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As my right as a crofter some two years ago I have already applied to acquire this land for development. 2. Your proposed development would encroach on the privacy of me and my guests. 3. The excess traffic on my access road, which is also my goods delivery road, would undermine and disturb my dry stone walls and disturb my guest at all times as I would have no control over the extent people will be using it. 4. As the land in question is much higher than the hotel the residents of the houses would be looking directly into my bedrooms, lounge and bar. 5. It would interfere with any future development of the hotel 6. Any additional traffic would delay and interfere with my deliveries. 7. Vehicles could be damaged in my car park below if you have children in these houses. 8. Also I certainly would not be responsible for children been around my 	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION</p> <p>Any developer would require to take ground conditions of the site into consideration. The foundations for any houses or other buildings should be designed to suit the loadings on the site. Where problems may be flagged up as to ground bearing etc any developer would have to design foundations specific to the site and this may require certification from a structural engineer.</p> <p>The site is sufficiently close to the sewerage network to connect and we have been advised that there is sufficient capacity in the waste water treatment works.</p> <p>With regards to comments about settlement pattern the council recognises that any proposal here will need to exhibit careful siting and design because this is a sensitive site within a National Scenic Area (NSA). We have added this as a developer requirement to make developers aware this a key factor for consideration of any planning application that may come forward. However there is no strict linear pattern here at the moment to disrupt which therefore offers scope. If sensitively approached development here can be accommodated here without having a negative impact on the NSA. Neighbours will be notified if/when a planning application</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Melness MU 2 West of Craggan Hotel	<p>hotel where alcohol is involved, cars speeding out of the bar car park, Lorries turning and reversing.</p> <p>9. Any disturbance of the water table above could flood The Craggan Hotel and surrounding area out completely, as at the moment we have considerable amount of excess water.</p> <p>I could raise many more points regarding this issue, but have just stated a few. My lawyer will be contacting all concerned shortly regarding this matter.</p>	<p>comes forward. This will give an opportunity to make representation on the detail of what is proposed.</p> <p>The owner of Craggan Hotel has been written to in order to advise of the opportunity that is afforded by this lands allocation in the Sutherland Local Plan. It seems very unlikely that this objection will be sustained since it is in their interest for it to remain allocated if they wish to develop here.</p> <p>For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment however the policy has been amended (see GP9).</p>
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 3	As above
528 Melness Crofters Estate Inverness	Melness estate supports the development of this site, but would like to see other sites zoned as per the local consultation suggestions for the south of 'MU2'.	As above
162 C R Mackay Talmine	Area of houses east of burn are built on a clay knoll. All the houses have the foundation, being built straight onto the ground. Any development involving drainage, would need to be careful not to upset the status quo and create subsidence or slip due to a change in the water table.	As above
552 Mr David MacLennan Melness	<p>The settlement patter is linear all along the Melness road. The proposal does not accord with the existing pattern which should be maintained in the Kyle of Tongue designated 'scenic area'. Any development should be infill not a carbuncle on the road. Only infill fits with the strong existing settlement pattern.</p> <p>The proposed area is of some archaeological significance having foundations dating to either pre or just past clearance ie about 1800 or before. There have neither been recorded or excavated. There is also a 19th century artefact in the area.</p>	As above

Inset Maps Melness MU 2 West of Craggan Hotel

In that NONE of the adjacent or contiguous properties support this change of designated use it should be rejected. Any main housing development should be west of Joseph Mackay Court as is also proposed. Although it is stated that the road would require to be brought up to standard it must be noted that access is also by the Kyle of Tongue bridge which according to council reports needs substantial refurbishment likely to involve closing as a result of corrosion

316 Mr J MacKay
Dingwall

I wish to object to the above entry within the Deposit Draft for the following reasons: As background, I am and have been for the past 32 years the owner of the neighbouring property 26 Skinnet, Talmine, Melness and as such have an extensive knowledge of the area its surrounding and its physical characteristics.

As above

1. The entire township and beyond lies within a National Scenic Area and as such any development would have a detrimental effect on the landscape. The site sits prominently on the skyline and will be visible from a considerable distance.
2. The predominant ground conditions are rock and as such it would make development extremely difficult.
3. There are extensive drainage problems with the site and subsequently the rear of my property resulting from numerous springs and the like occurring over the total site area.
4. Access to the site will be difficult to achieve
5. Any connection to the foul drainage network would result in a requirement to track a considerable distance to secure a suitable connection point and also I am led to believe that there are capacity issues within the existing network.
6. Any connections to existing utilities would require significant upgrading works which could have a detrimental effect on the landscape. I feel that any new development within the township should be sensitively sited to protect our current beautiful surroundings, a fact recognised by it being a National Scenic Area, and as stated above the

Inset Maps Melness MU 2 West of Craggan Hotel

site to the West of the Craggan Hotel would not fall into this category.

Inset Maps Bettyhill G General Comment

328 Bettyhill Community Council
Bettyhill

On behalf of the Bettyhill, Strathnaver & Altnaharra Community Council I wish to submit the following as a response to the Sutherland Draft Plan.

In support of The Draft Plan, we believe that it is an in depth and well researched document and is supported by relevant maps and plans which enable the reader to cross reference the paperwork. However, there are some issues which we need to address and support members of our community.

Footpaths in Bettyhill. There is a need for further footpath provision i.e. pavements in certain areas of Bettyhill and should be included in the Draft Plan. We endorse Jayne Gordon's concerns about the pavement situation. The back road used by the buses which pass Seacrest is also used by an increased number of young children as a direct route to school - this number will no doubt increase in the future.

The back road is very narrow and the grass verges, where they exist are very poor substitutes for a proper pavement. The grass is uncut and 80% of the time, being grass it is soaking wet and therefore lethal for young children sliding on, which could result in them falling into the path of a vehicle. There is also a blind spot on the road where drivers are unable to see pedestrians.

Building work is planned to take place on forestry ground and will increase the amount of traffic using this road and others without pavements. Therefore, there is definitely a need for the construction of pavements for the safety of everyone.

NO CHANGE

The Education Service are aware that the footpath provision issue will not be resolved through developer contributions. We can only seek these when the impact is directly related to the proposed development and none of the allocations encourage additional development which would use these. However this is only to say that this issue cannot be dealt with through the Local Plan not that the Council will not address it through other means such as the safer routes to school.

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 1 West of the school

305 Mr Ian Jappy
Thurso

Supporting allocation.

The owners support of this allocation is noted.

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 1 West of the school

126 Mr Andrew N Carr BA FRICS
Bettyhill

Objection to development on site H1:

1. Tourism is an important contributor to the prosperity of Bettyhill (and the area generally) and one of the biggest attractions of the area is the beautiful scenery. Any development which might detract from the visual amenity of the area is therefore undesirable. PAN 72 states that: "It is therefore crucial that the proposed location and siting of new housing considers the impact on the landscape, in terms of both immediate and wider surroundings". NPPG13 states that: "The coast is a key attraction for tourists and policies should therefore be in place which protect and enhance the quality of the coast. If development is allowed in inappropriate locations on the coast or is of a poor standard it can reduce the quality of the visitor experience which, in turn, can have a detrimental effect on local economies".

2. The view from the Bettyhill Hotel is one of the "sights" of the tourist trail; many of our guests are drawn by the view and coach parties stop at the hotel simply to enjoy the vista. Loss of the view would certainly have a detrimental effect on the turnover of the hotel. Possibly even to the extent of making its continuation as a business no longer viable. It is worth noting that on the "Undiscovered Scotland" (the most comprehensive on-line guide to Scotland) the entry for Bettyhill commences with a taken across the field in question and goes on to comment: "Bettyhill Hotel started life in 1819, though it has grown steadily since. Its location is superb, giving magnificent views to the north-west over Torrisdale Bay" which have featured on local postcards since these were first introduced.

3. Since the first stage of the development started, many visitors to the area have expressed surprise and dismay that the vista from the Bettyhill Hotel is being despoiled: the typical reaction is that "this would never be allowed in my country/county".

4. As consent has already been given on this site it would be futile to object to development taking place, but it is obviously important that this is done in such a way as to minimize impact on the local environment, including the visual amenity which attracts tourists. I would suggest that any detailed consents be carefully controlled with particular consideration to the following points:
A. Low rise development only.

RETAIN ALLOCATION

With the principle of housing development here already established the Council wrote to Y Daniels and J Grant to advise of the opportunity to find out the details and possibly make a representation on the detailed application for two houses on H1. That application has now been approved with conditions relating to drainage and access.

It is considered that the allocations H1 and H2 represent a logical extension to the village and fit comfortably within the landscape. It is not considered that the development of H1 and H2 will entirely block the views either from the hotel or the public road. There is a level difference here which means the foreground of views will be affected but views from the hotel across Torrisdale Bay will not be blocked by their development. All of H1 and H2 now have outline planning consents thus establishing the principle of development here. If/when detailed applications are submitted there will be the opportunity for representations on the detail proposed.

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 1 West of the school

- B. Development in materials reflecting the local building heritage.
- C. Proper co-ordination of design specifications for the development as a whole.
- D. Control to prevent a profusion of untidy outbuildings and extensions by removal of permitted development rights.
- E. Steps to minimize light pollution, particularly from street lamps.

5. We are far from the only tourist based business in the locality; while we might be the one most obviously affected there would be a "knock-on" effect on others, including shops, licensed premises and guest houses. It is the view that brings tourists to a halt in Bettyhill and there is a very delicate balance in deciding whether to stop or to continue to the next village or town. While it might be argued that new houses may bring extra trade, this is unlikely to be substantial if, as is likely, most are only occupied on an occasional basis.

6. PAN 72 advises that: "Small-scale infill in existing small communities can bring economic and social benefits by supporting existing services such as schools and shops. Planning authorities should generally seek to reinforce the building pattern of the existing settlement and ensure that new buildings respect and contribute to the area's architectural and cultural heritage". PAN 72 also advises that: "New groups of houses related to existing groupings will usually be preferable to new isolated developments. The groupings should not be suburban. They should be small in size, and sympathetic in terms of orientation, topography, scale, proportion and materials to other buildings in the locality. They should take account of sustainable development criteria in location and infrastructure needs". Any development should therefore make use of local materials and not follow the regimented construction and layout formulae of so many modern housing estates.

7. NPPG13 states that: "Over 3400 km of Scotland's mainland coastline, which is 88% of the total length, can be regarded as undeveloped in the context of this NPPG. Along its length can, however, be found smaller towns and villages, including dispersed settlements which are characteristic of many parts of the Highlands and Islands. It is important that the development requirements of these communities, including for example the provision of affordable housing, community facilities and

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bettyhill H 1 West of the school		
	<p>workshop space locally, are fully addressed. In addition, development opportunities, for example related to tourism, leisure and recreation, can make an important contribution to the economy of rural areas. Many of these developments which can assist in sustaining the long-term viability of coastal communities are likely to be on a modest scale. Ill considered development. However. Can have a detrimental effect on ecology and scenery as well as on cultural heritage interests; a key objective for the planning system is to provide a framework for investment in development while protecting the undeveloped coast from unjustified and inappropriate development."</p>	
358 Miss Y Daniels Thurso	<p>This area has already got planning permission. I don't support it, but there is little point in objecting now . Although I do object to the planning application in the N.T. on 19th January 2008, for the erection of two 1.5 storey house on Plot 2. This does not make sense to me.</p>	As above
360 Mrs J Grant Thurso	<p>This area has already got planning permission, I would hope that as H2 site is seeking planning permission that the road into both these sites be from the main road directly and not through Munro Place. Munro Place is already extremely busy with the school and swimming pool traffic and the road is not suitable for lorries taking building materials and equipment into the field. Lorries would be a hazard to residents. As I live at number 5 the lorries would be coming round that sharp corner right beside my house, which I feel would be very stressful, and quite dangerous, for older residents. A planning application went into the Northern Times newspaper on 18th January 2008 for the erection of two 1.5 storey houses (plots 4 and 5) at house plot 2. I will have to object to this as it doesn't make any sense to me. (this is on site H1)</p>	As above
Inset Maps Bettyhill H 2 West of Munro Place		
243 HSCHT Dornoch	<p>Current discussions with the owner of this site and the local planning team would suggest that the more appropriate site capacity for this development is 16.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT CHANGE HOUSING CAPACITY FROM 15 TO 16.</p> <p>It is considered that the allocations H1and H2 represent a logical extension to the village and fit comfortably within the landscape. It is not considered that the development of H1 and H2 will entirely block the views either from the</p>

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 2 West of Munro Place

hotel or the public road. There is a level difference here which means the foreground of views will be affected but views from the hotel across Torrisdale Bay will not be blocked by their development. All of H1 and H2 now have outline planning consents thus establishing the principle of development here. If/when detailed applications are submitted there will be the opportunity for representations on the detail proposed.

Whilst it is appreciated that there is an element of disruption for local residents through a construction phase this can be controlled to some extent through conditions on the operating hours. With regards to access arrangements we have been advised from our roads colleagues that either an access through Munro Place or from the main road is acceptable.

126 Mr Andrew N Carr BA FRICS
Bettyhill

Objection to development on site H2:

As above

1. Tourism is an important contributor to the prosperity of Bettyhill (and the area generally) and one of the biggest attractions of the area is the beautiful scenery. Any development which might detract & from the visual amenity of the area is therefore undesirable. PAN 72 states that: "It is therefore crucial that the proposed location and siting of new housing considers the impact on the landscape, in terms of both immediate and wider surroundings". NPPG13 states that: "The coast is a key attraction for tourists and policies should therefore be in place which protect and enhance the quality of the coast. If development is allowed in inappropriate locations on the coast or is of a poor standard it can reduce the quality of the visitor experience which, in turn, can have a detrimental effect on local economies".

2. The view from the Bettyhill Hotel is one of the "sights" of the tourist trail; many of our guests are drawn by the view and coach parties stop at the hotel simply to enjoy the vista. Loss of the view would certainly have a detrimental effect on the turnover of the hotel, possibly even to the extent of making its continuation as a business no longer viable. It is worth noting that on the "Undiscovered Scotland (the most comprehensive on-line guide to

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 2 West of Munro Place

Scotland) the entry for Bettyhill commences with a photograph taken across the field in question and goes on to comment: "Bettyhill Hotel started life in 1819, though it has grown steadily since. Its location is superb, giving magnificent views to the north-west over Torrisdale Bay" which have featured on local postcards since these were first introduced.

3. Since the first stage of the development started on site H1, many visitors to the area have expressed surprise and dismay that the vista from the Bettyhill Hotel is being despoiled: the typical reaction is that "this would never be allowed in my country/county".

4. As you will be aware, none of the houses permitted on site H1 have been completed and the site is currently an eyesore (as it has been for over a year now). I understand that most of the plots have now been sold, but it would seem that it will be some time before the houses are finished, especially as the development is apparently being undertaken on a piecemeal basis. We have had several visitors to the hotel inspecting the plots for potential purchase as holiday homes and you will be aware that the Evaluation of NPPG15 noted a growing concern on the impact of second home ownership since its publication.

5. Obviously we have a vested interest in the business, but it should be borne in mind that we are also an important local employer and anything which is harmful to the hotel would have wider implications for the community. I understand that planning policy allows such matters to be taken into account. We are far from the only tourist based business in the locality; while we might be the one most obviously affected by development on this site, there would be a "knock-on" effect on others, including shops, licensed premises and guest houses. It is the view that brings tourists to a halt in Bettyhill and there is a very delicate balance in deciding whether to stop or to continue to the next village or town. While it might be argued that new houses may bring extra trade, this is unlikely to be substantial if, as is likely, most are only occupied on an occasional basis.

6. In an area with, I believe, a declining population it is hard to understand why additional speculative housing should be necessary, especially on a "greenfield" site such as this. Perhaps you could provide

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 2 West of Munro Place

the statistics as to current population change in Bettyhill, as I have been unable to locate any up to date figures.

7. I understand that the site is currently categorized as suitable for infill development, but this seems an unsuitable designation for land outside the village envelope. Having regard to the rigorous planning policies enacted to prevent the sprawl of development beyond established limits seen in less attractive environments elsewhere in Britain, it is hard to see how one could justify this occurring in such a scenic and sensitive location.

8. The proposed designation for this site is for housing, not affordable housing. I would make the point that there is little point in providing housing if employment is not available for those that might need it, unless it is intended for holiday home occupation. With an increasing reliance on tourism to bring prosperity to the area coupled with the loss of other employment providers (such as Dounreay), it is unfortunate that development is being allowed which detracts from the attraction of the locality. There is a fallacious argument that young people are leaving the area because of lack of affordable housing; in reality lack of employment is a much more relevant factor.

9. PAN 72 advises that: "Small-scale infill in existing small communities can bring economic and social benefits by supporting existing services such as schools and shops. Planning authorities should generally seek to reinforce the building pattern of the existing settlement and ensure that new buildings respect and contribute to the area's architectural and cultural heritage". I would argue that, by endangering existing businesses, the proposed designation is contrary to this advice and that development of this site would not reinforce the building pattern of the existing settlement nor would it respect and contribute to the area's architectural and cultural heritage.

10. If consent were to be granted for development on this site, it would obviously be important that it be done in such a way as to minimize impact on the local environment, including the visual amenity which attracts tourists. I would suggest that any detailed consents be carefully controlled with particular consideration to the following points:

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 2 West of Munro Place

- A. Low rise development only.
- B. Plots to be restricted to the less prominent positions on the site.
- C. Development in materials reflecting the local building heritage.
- D. Control to prevent a profusion of untidy outbuildings and extensions by removal of permitted development rights.
- E. Steps to minimize light pollution, particularly from street lamps.
- F. Proper co-ordination of design specifications for the development as a whole.

11. PAN 72 also advises that: "New groups of houses related to existing groupings will usually be preferable to new isolated developments. The groupings should not be suburban. They should be small in size, and sympathetic in terms of orientation, topography, scale, proportion and materials to other buildings in the locality. They should take account of sustainable development criteria in location and infrastructure needs". I would argue that development of this site would create a suburban environment at this end of Bettyhill and would not be sympathetic to other buildings in the locality, especially in terms of orientation and topography.

12. Government policy as set out in NPPG13 is to generally restrict new house building in the open countryside and to focus new development in areas where it can best be accommodated in terms of: access, infrastructure, landscape, and habitat conservation. I would suggest that this designation would be contrary to all the above.

13. Continued designation of H2 for housing purposes opens the way for future development to the west of the site, between this area and the River Naver; while the land to the west of H2 might not be designated for housing, it is difficult to see why it would be any less suitable than H1 and H2.

14. NPPG13 states that: "Over 3400 km of Scotland's mainland coastline, which is 88% of the total length, can be regarded as undeveloped in the context of this NPPG. Along its length can, however, be found smaller towns and villages, including dispersed settlements which are characteristic of many parts of the Highlands and Islands. It is important that the development requirements of these communities, including for

Inset Maps Bettyhill H 2 West of Munro Place

example the provision of affordable housing, community facilities and workshop space locally, are fully addressed. In addition, development opportunities, for example related to tourism, leisure and recreation, can make an important contribution to the economy of rural areas. Many of these developments which can assist in sustaining the long-term viability of coastal communities are likely to be on a modest scale. Ill considered development. However, can have a detrimental effect on ecology and scenery as well as on cultural heritage interests; a key objective for the planning system is to provide a framework for investment in development while protecting the undeveloped coast from unjustified and inappropriate development."

15. NPPG13 also states that: "As relatively few types of development require a coastal location, the undeveloped coast should generally be considered for development only where:

- a. the proposal can be expected to yield social and economic benefits sufficient to outweigh any potentially detrimental impact on the coastal environment
- b. there are no feasible alternative sites within existing settlements or on other previously developed land. In other cases robust reasoned justification will be required in support of development." I would argue that this designation would result in negative economic benefits (except to the land owner concerned) and that there is more suitable land in Bettyhill if a need can be proven for development.

16. I would make the point that just because land is currently designated for housing, there is no reason why it should not be redesigned for some other purpose in future.

499 Albyn Housing
Invergordon

Current application for 13 including area of affordable housing. Suggest increasing the overall capacity to 16 to reflect the landbanking of a site for future affordable housing.

As above

Suggested capacity: 16

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bettyhill H 2 West of Munro Place		
360 Mrs J Grant Thurso	I have already objected to this development. As I stated in my previous objection Mr I. Jappy has got permission for site H1. I think houses should be built there before plans be made for H2. I am an elderly resident as are a number of others and am very worried at the prospect of lorries negotiating the sharp bend leading into Jappy's field, passing my house day in day out for weeks and weeks taking building supplies and equipment to the house sites. I do not believe the road is suitable for this or for the extra traffic more housing will bring. Also the beautiful view which the residents enjoy so much will be lost for them. These houses should be built somewhere where views are not compromised. I'm sure some other land is available in the area, where houses can be built and not interfere with the views of housing already in place.	As above
358 Miss Y Daniels Thurso	I have already objected to this development as I stated in my previous objection. Mr I Jappy has got permission for H1. I should think house be built there before plans be made for H2. Only then can the volume of traffic and congestion in Munro Place be assessed. I am 60 this year and a lot more are older. With Lorries up and down the road its going to be hell. I do not believe the road is suitable for this extra traffic and more housing. Beautiful views holiday makers come to see, and for them to enjoy, with 26 house there if they go up it won't be such a nice view. Its not so good for the shop and Hotel if most of the Holiday tread stop coming.	As above
305 Mr Ian Jappy Thurso	Supporting allocation.	As above
Inset Maps Bettyhill H 3 North of Gordon Terrace		
328 Bettyhill Community Council Bettyhill	<p>Apparently, houses are planned to be built on the land near to the school and north of Gordon Terrace, this is already a congested area which lends itself as a car parking area for the school, swimming pool, residents, nurses and other medical staff.</p> <p>There is definitely a need for the construction of adequate parking facilities in this area and believe that this should be a priority.</p>	<p>RETAIN ALLCOATION BUT REDUCE AREA TO ALLOW PARKING AND TURNING AREA TO BE PROVIDED FOR THE SCHOOL</p> <p>The Education Service are aware that the footpath provision issue will not be resolved through developer contributions. We can only seek these when the impact is directly related to the proposed development and none of the allocations encourage additional development which would use these. However this is only to say that this</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bettyhill H 3 North of Gordon Terrace		<p>issue cannot be dealt with through the Local Plan not that the Council will not address it through other means such as the safer routes to school.</p> <p>With regards to the footpath to the store if the land is entirely within the landowners control then this is something which can be pursued at the point of submission of a planning application</p>
35 H D E A Mackay Thurso	Will the footpath from Gordon Terrace to the store be repaired?	As above
99 Susan Mackay Bettyhill	Supporting allocation.	As above
170 Bettyhill Common Grazings Inverurie	Supporting this site is an issue for all shareholders. The land identified as H3 is part of Bettyhill Common grazings on the Skelpick Estate belonging to the Skelpick Partnership. Development would require the normal De-crofting procedure with all shareholders in the Bettyhill Common Grazings being notified. I have good reason to believe that consent would be given.	As above
499 Albyn Housing Invergordon	Difficult site to develop hence increase to density of H2 Capacity as per draft: 6 Suggested capacity: 6	As above
243 HSCHT Dornoch	H3 - We would question the effectiveness of this site due to access, servicing and topography problems.	As above
263 Rosemary Mackay Thurso	While I realise houses are urgently needed and support this, I am very concerned about the parking aspect, or rather the lack of this. Cars are regularly parked outside my entrance, there is little parking for the school traffic and unless there are parking places produced with new house chaos will prevail.	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bettyhill H 3 North of Gordon Terrace		
81 Mr Gordon M Gray Thurso	<p>But the problem here is the school parking and the buses blocking the roads twice a day. There is no paths, lack of street lighting to the northwest side.</p> <p>Blocked drains which the Council have been informed of three years ago.</p> <p>Parking, paths, Lighting, passing places need to be dealt with first. A kids play park would also benefit the area. This is a good site for housing but the above would need to be addressed first.</p> <p>All the above the Council have been informed of both by public and the community council, and nothing has been done.</p> <p>The road to the North is breaking up due to daily buses!</p>	As above

560 Mr Jim Johnston Bettyhill	<p>I wish to object to the designation of the entire area north of Gordon Terrace in Bettyhill. The western part of the area in question has already been identified as a site for carpark/safe drop off area for Farr High School and its associated Primary and council officials are, at this moment, working on the project with the aim of acquiring land and building the car park within the next few months. If the designation proposed in the plan is rigidly adhered to it will preclude this very necessary and long awaited development.</p> <p>The Authority was required by HMle, in a report on the school, to sort out the parking/drop-off problem but has been exceedingly dilatory in this regard and I am very anxious that the work should proceed as soon as possible. The ideal location for a car park/drop off point, opposite Munro Place, has already been usurped by a planning designation for affordable housing, housing which shows very little sign of materialising, and I cannot stand aside while the inferior option at Gordon Terrace is also snatched from our grasp.</p> <p>I therefore request that the designation at Gordon Terrace be partially rescinded so that a common sense solution can be pursued to satisfy the real and immediate need of Farr High School.</p>	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bettyhill H 3 North of Gordon Terrace		
515 J MacKay Bettyhill	I don't object to housing site (H3 Gordon terrace) but I do object to 4 houses in Munro Place Bettyhill (AH1) it is a tiny site on what we local people call the village green, this site is not suitable in size as there is no parking for the site at the moment also the OS site in your map is the local playing field and is not public open space.	As above
<hr/>		
Inset Maps Bettyhill AH 1 East of Munro Place		
358 Miss Y Daniels Thurso	I do not consider this a suitable area to build on, as it is the village green and very popular spectating spot for such as gala events, football matches and sports day. Also most school days, all spaces where cars can be parked are used by parents, teachers, swimming pool customers, extra housing would bring more cars with each house having 1-2 vehicles if not more, this site would be better saved to provide a ring road for the safe dropping off and picking up of school children, and for swimming pool customers with a number of extra car parking spaces, the coalman, dustman and ambulance can not get down the end of road for all the cars down there at times. They have 4's and stop there and walk to get bins or carry coal down to who needs it. With all the housing going up 26 of them if it gets the go ahead and 10 in Munro Place already its 36 in toll. Its too much for a small road. It is not fair on us that live here someone is going to get hurt. They should go in from the main road down the hill its only 30 mph that's not fast, there is a gate down there or make a way through the wall. They knocked some of the wall down to put up housing here in Munro Place. Its not right if they are 1 1/2 in height with us in Munro Place stuck in the middle, after all anyone else I don't think they would like it. Its not them who's got to live here.	<p>RETAIN ALLOCATION</p> <p>Albyn Housing Society have been granted planning permission for 4 houses on this land to complete the development at Munro Place. Whilst it is locally considered a relatively attractive space there is ample open space nearby and the land was previously serviced for development. It therefore represents an effective and suitable site for development. With regards to its use for school traffic the Council is progressing plans for the turning area and parking to be provided at Gordon Terrace.</p> <p>The conversion or reuse of traditional buildings does have policy support so a proposal for a residential conversion of the former Police station could potentially contribute towards the housing need. However whilst opportunities for infill development/conversions will come forward they need to be supplemented by allocations in order to meet the level of housing required for Bettyhill over the plan period.</p>
<hr/>		
360 Mrs J Grant Thurso	I do not consider this to be a suitable area to build on. As it is an area where locals and those further afield come to enjoy school and village events. It is a central point of the village. During the week it is heavily congested with vehicles - never enough car parking spaces, cars are often parked all the way up the road. People naturally park as near as they can to where they want to go. The carpark at the toilets is almost empty whereas in Munro Place you can barely move with cars parked in any available spot sometimes even on the grass. Therefore would it not make more sense to have a safe dropping off and picking up point	As above

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Bettyhill AH 1 East of Munro Place		
	<p>for school children with a road continuing round to make a loop and a one way system where traffic including buses could come in drop off drive away then pick up again later and also incorporate many more parking spaces into the layout. This would be a more suitable area than Dordon Terrace for carparking, a loop road would also make it safer for the coal lorries, the refuse lorry and the ambulance to name but a few vehicles which often have to reverse in or out as it is too congested to turn in the turning area.</p>	
<p>515 J MacKay Bettyhill</p>	<p>I don't object to housing site (H3 Gordon terrace) but I do object to 4 houses in Munro Place Bettyhill (AH1) it is a tiny site on what we local people call the village green, this site is not suitable in size as there is no parking for the site at the moment also the OS site in your map is the local playing field and is not public open space.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>35 H D E A Mackay Thurso</p>	<p>Surely this green area isn't going to be built up!</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>43 Mr George Mackay Bettyhill</p>	<p>I do not want houses directly in front of my house or behind. If Bettyhill Hotel had kept the land in the first instance Mr Jappy would not have been able to consider this. Possible alternative sites for your consideration would include the old Police Station/Information office in Bettyhill.</p>	<p>As above</p>
Inset Maps Bettyhill MB Inset 15.1 Bettyhill		
<p>328 Bettyhill Community Council Bettyhill</p>	<p>Bettyhill is first and foremost a settlement but this is not reflected by the boundary line in the Draft Plan. The boundary line is restricted to a small area. As a settlement, we believe that this should encompass areas in the Parish of Farr, including Kirtomy to the east, Newland, Skelpick and Strathnaver to the south, and Airdneiskich to the west.</p> <p>Newlands Junction. This has been an ongoing issue, probably over twenty five years. It has involved much discussion but lacked any action. Consideration must be given to the fact that more families now live in the Newlands Area, therefore creating more traffic at the junction.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>The intention is to defend current SDA boundary as there is no presumption against outwith. The wider countryside policy provides opportunity for development whilst assessing against the natural and cultural heritage features, considering settlement pattern, loss of locally important croft land, and any infrastructure constraints. The SDA and allocations in Bettyhill serve to identify where the larger developments should occur but for single house proposals or other small scale developments it is not necessary for them to be within the</p>

Inset Maps Bettyhill MB Inset 15.1 Bettyhill

There can be no further development to the south of this junction due to the standard of the road and extremely poor visibility where it joins the A836. This issue must be resolved, as sooner or later, a terrible accident is inevitable.

SDA. The act of defining SDA's for all the crofting townships outwith the villages requires significant resources not just from the council but also from the statutory consultees. For these townships it is considered that the most appropriate way forward given the low build rate, is by offering site by site assessment approach as proposals come forward.

The Local Plan states, 'Currently the Newland's area to the south does not have spare capacity for further development due to the standard of the road and visibility at its junction with the A836. However if the road network issues can be resolved the area is otherwise suitable for a small amount of housing which reinforces the existing dispersed pattern of development.' This offers potential and is as far as the Local Plan can go before the necessary improvements are committed to. This supports appropriate development here if the access issue is overcome and the wider countryside policy will employ a site by site approach to assessing suitability.

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

570 Mr & Mrs B & J Wilson
Armadale

DRAFT SUTHERLAND LOCAL PLAN.

We were unable to respond by 1 Feb. Our letter of 10 Jan to you however made our objection points Strathy North Windfarm, at this stage, should not be included in an Area Local Plan.

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: We explain why you will not have received many objections about Strathy North Windfarm in your Plan:- Today, when people here were asked if they had seen the Draft Plan, some had not even heard of it, others had not read it, and the only person who had read any had only read bits of it and had not noticed the inclusion of Strathy North Windfarm, because the Draft Plan is so lengthy. Comments have been that Planning Committees in Highland Council now have to cover far too large an area, so that opinions of the people of affected area can be over-ridden.

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

OBJECTION SUMMARY.

Our objection is:- Strathy North Windfarm should not be deemed to be part of the Plan. Most people here regard Strathy Windfarms as totally unacceptable. But their opinions have not been expressed regarding the Local Plan because they have not read the Draft Plan, as explained above. Proof of their opinions is in next page.

The Draft Plan has good words like "to address the need for quality living environments", "the purpose --- is to provide for a high level of protection of the environment", "to contribute to the creation, enhancement or regeneration of communities", "enhance landscape". Large windfarm destroy these aims; there are better ways of producing electricity. (Wind power is very unreliable.) Other major points against Strathy Windfarm as explained in the attached include:- Use of the grid-line to south would be far better used by Pentland Firth Tidal-electricity especially with the developments that are taking place. The scenic aspects of the area, and tourist trade. The land on which the turbines are planned is peat, with chance of collapse of some turbines, which could lead to prosecution by EU of those who granted consent. Peat is best Carbon store in the world, and that windfarm would seriously destroy that over considerable area. All land around the site is national & international classified protection areas. Planning Guidelines, and Highland Structure Plan, etc contain many statements that are contrary to having a windfarm at Strathy North. The multiple huge rotating blades of a windfarm, all rotating in different ways at the same time have a serious affect on people. The foregoing paragraph's points are in more detail in additional documents submitted to the Council that can be viewed on request. In addition, your Draft Local Plan includes an area in Strathy West that you have ear-marked for new houses, on a side road running nearly West & from the main body of Strathy West, so that if the relevant

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

houses had their windows facing in the normal way relative to the road, viz nearly South North, which is also the way to get the best sunlight, to warm the houses interiors and so reduce their heating costs, these windows would be looking straight to the disturbing huge rotating blades of the turbines, and if their windows were at right-angle to that then their openness of view would be blanked-out owing to the steep hill to west and likewise hill to east as the housing site is in a narrow valley.

Also, many existing houses outlook would be destroyed by these blades. (Map submitted and can be viewed on request).

It would be very wrong nationally to allow Strathy Windfarm on the best carbon sink in the world, destroying its CO₂ and Methane absorption, and causing it to release these gases instead, especially with Pentland Firth Tidal prospects for electricity generation. And there is the adverse effect on humans living within sight of huge rotating blades, or others coming to seek uplift by the special scenery, hence adverse effect on Scotland's largest industry, tourism.

So there is no way that Strathy North Windfarm should be included in Sutherland Local Plan.

Further information has been submitted with this representation. It covers specific objections relating to Strathy North Windfarm site, and has general comments relative to Caithness and north Sutherland wind farm plans including consideration of alternative energy sources. This in addition to the aforementioned map can be viewed on request. Please enquire with a member of the Sutherland Local Plan team if interested.

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

t

Comments resume on page 490

;

;

;

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Comments resume on page 490

Inset Maps Strathy G General Comment

Inset Maps Strathy H 1 Strathy West

539 Dr Sally Ward
Brora

I support the decision to place the area for new housing, H1, south of Strathy West at Strathy end not next to Steven terrace. This avoids using crofting ground for housing and places the houses at a safe distance from a busy/noisy road, providing a safer environment for children to play and revitalising a part of the community that had little new housing recently.

RETAIN ALLOCATION BUT AMEND TEXT FOR
POSSIBILITY OF ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

The junction and road serving Strathy West is considered to be acceptable by our TECs colleagues for a small amount of development, beyond that stopping further development or further access improvements will need to be considered. The connection to the existing pavement network will be dealt with through any planning application. However wider aspirations in relation to

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Strathy H 1 Strathy West		
		<p>footpath provision should be considered through the Councils work on Core Paths Plan for Sutherland. This route/path does not appear to be currently identified.</p> <p>The Council does not control who the houses go to and cannot determine planning applications on the basis of who might buy or rent houses. We are currently assessing the effectiveness and suitability of the land for housing development. If a Housing Association acquires the site they will use their allocations and lettings policies to decide who should get the houses and otherwise the owner/s will sell to whoever they want to.</p>
219 Mrs J Breaton Thurso	With proviso that houses are allocated to young families in employment rather than those living on benefits.	As above
244 Grazings Committee Golspie	As the Grazings Committee suggested this area as suitable for housing some years ago it has already given support to the project. It would be preferred that the houses should be allocated to young families (at present the youngest person in Strathy West & East is in her 40's) alternatively the houses could be made available to retiring crofters who are giving up their holdings to younger persons. NB Employment in the area may be required before building is considered.	As above
92 Mr David Khalil Thurso	The Plan looks ok. A crash guard should be installed above the house at Strathy West with the high speed road the risk of crash is not worth taking. A better road access to Strath West needs be designed for this poor visibility bend. I find the proposed "Strathy West Housing" is good but would like to see a public footpath from there to the village along the river as part of the plan to offer safe Strathy pedestrian areas.	As above

Inset Maps Portskerra H 1 Northeast of Bayview Terrace

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Portskerra H 1 Northeast of Bayview Terrace		
164 Dr Morag MacDonald Melvich	I most strongly object, part of this ground ear marked belongs to my croft of 132 Portskerra. Although this park is currently holding stock or under cultivation. I intend to use it for such in the near future once I have stock proofed the fence. I am a tenant crofter ie I currently do not own the land but rent it, but I can at any time exercise my right to buy for a fixed price under crofting law. The other half of this land is owned by a crofter and sub let for sheep grazing, in between the 2 crofts is a strip of land designated as common grazings and is used as a right of way to move stock round. There is also a great deal of water run off. The grazings committee several years ago did have the traditional field drains cleared but drainage is still a problem and if this site was built upon not only would it have extensive drainage, but also all the way to the low road to flooding the best of the croft. Sewage would also be a problem, I myself am on a septic tank. I would also point out you already have part of the 132 croft, to build Bayview avenue originally, as though not owning the land my grandfather's planning permission was still required. I would resist most strongly any attempt to build house on my croft, especially that part as it has been the most cultivated and most fertile.	REMOVE AS ALLOCATION BUT RETAIN WITHIN THE SDA After consulting on "Sutherland Futures I was under the impression that this area was part of the common grazings. However the allocation makes up part of two crofts and the obvious access into the site is from the access which serves Orkney view. As the crofter here wants to continue its crofting use and it is unavailable this allocation should be removed. If the owner of the adjoining croft wants to develop part of their croft and access can be achieved then subject to the usual considerations there is opportunity for them to do so. There is ample scope for single house/infill development in Portskerra and Melvich within the SDA and opportunity for a developer to do something in the adjacent settlement Melvich on site H1. Therefore the removal of this site does not create a problem in terms of provision of an adequate housing land supply.
287 Melvich & Portskerra Grazings Committee Thurso	The deposit draft was discussed at a recent meeting of the Melvich and Portskerra Grazings committee and we wish to state that the areas identified for housing will be subject to crofting restraints as they form parts of registered crofts.	As above
539 Dr Sally Ward Brora	I object to the housing, H1, proposed near Bayview Terrace in Portskerra as this would occupy good crofting ground and does not have the agreement of the crofter. A place like that at Strathy west on the edge of the community should be found instead perhaps near the playpark that is NW of the school?	As above

Inset Maps Portskerra MB Inset 17.1 Portskerra

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Portskerra MB Inset 17.1 Portskerra		
172 Mr Tim Huddleson Abingdon	Earlier this year I decided to work for UKEA Fusion at Culham, I am no longer a member of the community council. I passed the email on to Morag Mackay as she is the new chairperson. I forwarded the email to her. One comment I have about the plan is that the northern boundary of the Portskerra Settlement Development Area cuts across my garden, see the orange shaded area in the attached sketch, and may preclude building, extensions etc. It would be good if this were extended.	RETAIN THE SDA AND ENLARGE THE BOUNDARY TO INCLUDE THE GARDEN GROUND Whilst on one hand its exclusion from the SDA would not presume against the extension of the house its inclusion is not considered inappropriate and therefore the SDA should be amended to reflect this.
Inset Maps Melvich H 1 West of Pentland Terrace		
372 Mr Frederick Robertson Tongue	Supporting allocation.	RETAIN ALLOCATION The Council notes the support of this housing allocation. For category 3 sites we will not add a developer requirement asking for a flood risk assessment however the policy has been amended (see GP9),
337 Mr Iain Rankin Melvich	25 new houses in the area are desperately needed in the Melvich area to provide appropriate affordable housing for a rural community, to help preserve and support growth.	As above
311 Scottish Environment Protection Agency Dingwall	Category 3	As above
28 J Mackay Thurso	Supporting allocation	As above
377 B Campbell Melvich	Supporting allocation.	Support noted.
Inset Maps Melvich B 1 West of Melvich Terrace		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Inset Maps Melvich B 1 West of Melvich Terrace		
338 Carolann Galloway Melvich	Supporting allocation.	RETAIN ALLOCATION
Note the comments in support of this allocation. The concerns regarding the construction period can be dealt with if and when a planning application comes forward with conditions on consent to cover their working hours.		
28 J Mackay Thurso	Supporting allocation.	As above
209 Mega Caff Melvich	Mega Caff meets 3 nights a week 6.30pm - 9.30pm - if this could be taken into consideration the safety of the children when planning the roads layout.	As above
21 Mr Livingstone Thurso	Supports allocation	As above
377 B Campbell Melvich	Supporting allocation.	As above
Background Maps MB Consultation Areas & Physical Constraints		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	Suggested additional inclusions Various Physical Constraint Maps are missing and should be included (e.g. 400m from active quarry; 1000m from large wind turbines; and EU Shellfish and Bathing Water Directive areas).	Further background maps will be added where they are available, in a format suitable and contain robust information. However, information relating to large wind turbines may be made available separately, in association with new SPG being prepared for wind energy.
Background Maps MB Natural, Built & Cultural Heritage Features		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	Note the discrepancy between the legend on p51 and the policy text with regard to woodland areas, this emphasises the need to look again at these titles as set out above.	Amend mapping legend in line with changes to supporting text for Policy 4.
Background Maps MB Area of Great Landscape Value		

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Background Maps MB Area of Great Landscape Value		
<p>307 Laid Grazings Committee Loch Eriboll</p>	<p>Loch Eriboll and Sutherland As indicated in our letter of 16th February 2006, we feel that Loch Eriboll should have one of the special designation statuses. All the households in Laid argue as to who has the most spectacular view over the loch to Ben Hope and down the loch to Strathbeg - these views are quite outstanding and deserve the special status of National Scenic Area or Area of Great Landscape Value. On this subject we are surprised that the west side of Loch Eriboll which enjoys these views is not listed as being of "Local/Regional importance" on the large Proposals Map whereas the east side enjoys that description. 'The same remark applies the Area of Great Landscape Value map on page 64 of the Map Booklet - the hole of Loch Eriboll should he included in that category we would suggest. We do not think Loch Eriboll can be split into parts .- it is a whole. The views and the landscape are superb from different points and in different ways but it cannot be split up.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Early discussions between the council and SNH are underway with a view to reviewing our areas of great landscape value. This would consider our methodology, the citations for these areas, and the boundaries of them. This will be taken forward and widely consulted on a Highland wide basis through our work on the Highland Wide Local Plan.</p>
Background Maps MB Inventoried Designed Landscapes		
<p>240 Peter Polson & Angela Ogilvie Golspie</p>	<p>In the Background Mapping there needs to be more clarity about the nature and extent of the Area of National Importance which appears to lie between Golspie, Backies and Dunrobin. This may be the Dunrobin Castle Designed Landscape and appears to merge into the Backies crofting area. As such, we are concerned that as this designation need not necessarily restrict development, particularly in locations outside the "essential setting", of the main protected feature, it will not presume against further housing in Backies.</p>	<p>The Proposals Map contains the full boundary of the Dunrobin Castle Designed Landscape and is a consideration when considering applications within it's boundary but does not offer a presumption against development nor is it intended to. The consideration of proposals for development in the wider countryside will be assessed against the suite of general policies and in particular GP 3 Wider Countryside.</p>
Background Maps MB National Nature Reserve		
<p>326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie</p>	<p>Areas that need to be added to the maps as they are currently not marked at all The Flows NNR is not shown on p57 of the Map Booklet, this area is also not shown as nationally important on the 1:130 k map (the area of the NNR is greater than the area of the SSSIs/SPA/SAC in this vicinity). SNH will arrange for this information to be passed to THC in digital format.</p>	<p>Check and amend the mapping to show the Flows NNR.</p>

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Background Maps MB Ramsar		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	Suggestion to improve clarity of the Map Booklet It is not clear that the dotted line on p54 delimits the Dornoch and Loch Fleet Ramsar site. Maybe the line can be drawn in a circle as has been done around Assynt Lochs on p52 of the Map Booklet?	The map will be amended as suggested for clarity.
Background Maps MB Sewage Treatment Works		
214 Scottish Water Glasgow	With regards to the West Highlands and Islands Local Plan Written Statement, we are pleased to note that there are a number of policies which relate to both the provision and protection of water infrastructure.	[Applies to WHILP- support noted.]
Background Maps MB Special Area of Conservation		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	Inconsistencies between maps in the Map Booklet P53 of the Map Booklet has Inverpolly, Beinn Dearg & Rhidorroch Woods SAC's stop at the county boundary but on p58 these sites go over the county boundary to show the whole of the site, the latter being the preferred approach.	Amend the mapping to show SACs in their entirety where they extend beyond the Plan boundary.
Background Maps MB Trunk Water Mains Buffer and Water Catchment Areas		
214 Scottish Water Glasgow	In relation to the background maps located to the rear of the map booklet, we welcome the inclusion of the 'Water catchment areas' figure on page 74. This figure is slightly out-of-date. Many of our sources have been abandoned in recent years and although we still own intake structures the catchment/sources are no longer used. In relation to Sewerage treatment works plan on page 76, this appears to be accurate.	Noted. We will check and amend the water catchment areas map for accuracy.
Background Maps PM Proposals Map		
300 Mr & Mrs J Lockie Dornoch	I have looked at your CD giving the details of the proposed Local Plan and I am writing to object to certain parts which appear to affect my own proposed house on my fathers croft which has already been turned down under the previous local plan.	AMEND HINTERLAND BOUNDARY TO EXCLUDE LAND WHERE DEVELOPMENT PRESSURE IS CONSTRAINED BY INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICE ISSUES.
	The area of hinterland proposed for the Dornoch area affects my site which lies just inside the marked boundary shown on the maps on the disk but which is also shown as being an area of low regional	The area indicated lies within area of hinterland that is poorly serviced in regard to roads infrastructure and the potential for development of any significant level of

Background Maps PM Proposals Map

importance.

The site as can be seen from the attached plan lies well away from the public road and is hardly visible from any of the surrounding area as it is well screened by trees to all sides and the proposed house was to be designed in accordance with the council's recommendations for housing in the countryside.

The present croft house is old and still occupied by my parents and while I live relatively nearby the working of the croft and especially my bee hives are adversely affected and by living on the croft it would allow me to be right at hand for both my parents and the animals.

The local plan shows a large area of land beside the Achu road as being out with the envelope and as this almost abuts the croft land I would ask if it could be extended or the line to the rear moved as it appears to be an arbitrary one as it follows no fixed fence or natural feature that I can see.

My proposed house site on my father's croft was refused because of it lying just on the border between the hinterland around Tain and the wider countryside and does not meet with the need to encourage young people into the crofting community.

The easing of this boundary which appears to have been adjusted East of the Achu road for some reason would allow me to build my house and continue the use of the family croft as the current house occupied by my elderly parents fails to meet modern standards and is too small.

In the written statement [strategic objectives] it mentions the need to put people first and develop thriving settlements which I also assume to mean crofting communities and this is the last thing the proposals will address as it basically restricts any development away from the main villages.

While I understand the need for guidance over how an area is developed I have found that the local planning officials are not prepared to relax even slightly the local plan and my only hope is to have my site taken out of the hinterland.

housing development is unlikely. The maintenance of crofting activities and related housing is supported within the Housing in the Countryside Development Plan Policy Guideline. The location of the area proposed is such that a further proposals are unlikely due to servicing and access difficulties and that the area should be excluded from the identified area under pressure from housing development within the hinterland.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Background Maps PM Proposals Map		
240 Peter Polson & Angela Ogilvie Golspie	The Background Mapping at page 68 indicates a Settlement Setting area, but this is not reflected on the Proposals Map.	The Settlement Setting is reflected as a feature of Local/Regional Importance on the Proposals Map
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Open Space</p> <p>Mapping of open space is inconsistent within the Local Plan. For example, the map for Golspie shows only two areas of open space. Several large areas of open space in the east of Golspie are not mapped and will therefore not be afforded policy protection. Another example is Kinlochbervie where the open space around a school in the east of the village is mapped but the annotated football field is not. SNH strongly recommends that the open space mapping, including the identification and inclusion of playing fields, is carefully reviewed for all communities. A clear and consistent and inclusive approach to mapping of open space and its policy protection is required to ensure that this important resource is protected in the long term for the benefit of the local populations. It would also ensure that the distribution and type of open space is equitable and adequate and that large housing developments, such as that proposed at Dornoch, complement and/or augment the present open space system.</p> <p>Earlier comments relating to SPP11 apply here.</p>	We have reviewed the mapping and indicated some changes in relation to specific settlements to achieve greater consistency as to which types of open space are identified in the Plan. This will be advanced further in association with the Council's preparation of supplementary planning guidance on open space, which will be referred to in the Plan, and the preparation of the forthcoming Highland Local Development Plan. A masterplanning approach to development on large sites can assist in delivering new open space provision.
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>National Scenic Areas that are not marked fully</p> <p>Boundary lines to National Scenic Areas shown on the inset maps between pages 5 and 48 of the Map Booklet are incorrectly drawn and should be replaced with those supplied by SNH.</p> <p>Areas that need to be added to the maps as they are currently not marked at all</p> <p>The Flows NNR is not shown on p57 of the Map Booklet, this area is also not shown as nationally important on the 1:130 k map (the area of the NNR is greater than the area of the SSSIs/SPA/SAC in this vicinity). SNH will arrange for this information to be passed to THC in digital format.</p>	Check and amend NSA boundaries if found to be incorrect.

Subject / Individual / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Recommendation
Background Maps PM Proposals Map		
326 Scottish Natural Heritage Golspie	<p>Areas that need to be added to the 1:130k map as they are not marked at all on that (but they are marked on the maps in the Map Booklet) The Dornoch Firth and Loch Fleet SPA and Ramsar site are not shown on the 1:130k map (but they are on p52 and p54 of the Map Booklet).</p> <p>Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC + Moray Firth SAC + Loch Laxford SAC are not marked on the 1:130k map (but are on p53 of the Map Booklet).</p> <p>Areas that should be marked more clearly on the 1:130k map Some of the smaller SSSIs e.g. the ones between Helmsdale and Brora are hardly visible on the 1:130 k map. It seems that the resolution of the printing is not great enough for the detail being shown. The much smaller maps in the Map Booklet are printed more crisply and are much clearer than the large 1:130k map.</p> <p>The river SACs (Rivers Evelix, Borgie, Naver, Okyel & Abhainn Clais an Eas and Allt a'Mhuilinn) are not visible on the 1:130 k map and even large areas such as Loch Naver and Loch Coire are not clearly marked as of international importance (but these are on p53 of the Map Booklet).</p> <p>Assynt Loch SPA is not shown clearly on the 1:130 k map - even though Loch Assynt is large - but it is on p52 of Map Booklet. Same comment for Inverpolly, Loch Urigill and Nearby Lochs SPA, and for Lairg and Strath Brora Lochs SPA.</p> <p>Lochs that are SSSIs such as Loch Ailsh, Loch Urigill and Cam Loch are not shown on the 1:130 k map as being SSSIs (but they are shown on p58 of the Map Booklet).</p>	<p>The mapping will be checked for consistency. We will add marine heritage designations to Plan mapping subject to the legibility issue. There is in any case a statement covering the fact that not all designations will be shown. There is potential longer term for these issues to be overcome within an e-version of the Local Plan mapping.</p>