

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ARDGAY - General Comment</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Development plan Reference:</b>	General Comment Text MB 20 – Map 7.1 MB 21	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr I. & Mrs G. Glennie(581)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Extension to Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Request for inclusion of land to the south of the Kyle of Sutherland Hatchery be included in an extension of the SDA. Seek to move the current boundary line from the edge of the Hatchery land further along the road to the Kincardine Burn.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEK EXTENSION TO SDA SOUTH OF THE KYLE HATCHERY		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (277)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
This <u>area is</u> 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.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ARDGAY - B1 Ardgay Railway Station Yard North</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	B1 Ardgay railway station yard north Text MB 20 – Map 7.1 MB 21	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr D. J. Laver MRICS FCIQB(368) Mr & Mrs E. K. Dunbar(533) Ardgay & District Community Council(546) Miss H. Buchanan(561)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Business allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Mr D. J. Laver MRICS FCIQB(368)</u> B1: If access is to be via the existing station yard, this will cause a major traffic hazard when joining the existing highway. If the sole access is through the privately owned station yard development would be impaired. Suggest 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> <p><u>Mr &amp; Mrs E. K. Dunbar(533)</u> 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, the aesthetic beauty of the location would also not be enhanced.</p> <p><u>Ardgay &amp; District Community Council(546), Miss H. Buchanan(561)</u> 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. B1, no heavy industry should be allowed on the A836 main road into the village.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>Mr D. J. Laver MRICS FCIQB(368)</u> RELOCATION OF ACCESS</p> <p><u>Mr &amp; Mrs E. K. Dunbar(533)</u> DELETION OF SITE(assumed)</p> <p><u>Ardgay &amp; District Community Council(546), Miss H. Buchanan(561)</u> RE-ALLOCATION OF SITE TO MIXED USE</p>		

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**Response and Reasons

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.

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.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ARDGAY - B2 Ardgay Railway Station Yard South</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	B2 Ardgay railway station yard south Text MB 20 – Map 7.1 MB 21	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr D. J. Laver MRICS FCIOB(368) Ardgay & District Community Council(546) Miss H. Buchanan(561)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Business allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Mr D. J. Laver MRICS FCIOB(368)</u> Two access points indicated, assumed that this will be one way in and out.		
<u>Ardgay &amp; District Community Council(546), Miss H. Buchanan(561)</u> B1 is zoned for business. Community see mixed use of housing and light business as more beneficial, allowing small business's to be created and for people to be able to live above or beside their business. This would enable enterprise and hopefully improve the economic status of the community. It also would give land owners more flexibility with the use of the land regarding obtaining planning consents. B1, no heavy industry should be allowed on the A836 main road into the village.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>Mr D. J. Laver MRICS FCIOB(368)</u> CLARIFICATION OF ACCESS POINTS		
<u>Ardgay &amp; District Community Council(546), Miss H. Buchanan(561)</u> RE-ALLOCATION OF SITE TO MIXED USE		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (281)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>  This allocation is a continuance of exiting use and the site will remain as a business use, other allocations in the settlement can more appropriately accommodate residential uses. this use is more likely to sit comfortably beside business use as housing. It is not intended to expand the area from what is currently there. Both access points remain acceptable.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ARDGAY - General Comment – Settlement Development Area</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	General Comment – Settlement Development Area Text MB 20 – Map 7.1 MB 20	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr D. J. Allan MRICS(274)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Kincardine, Ardgay is clearly a developing settlement and we 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.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
INCLUSION OF NEW SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA AT KINCARDINE		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (275)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
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. Reject suggested SDA at Kincardine		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ARDGAY - H1 North Of Manse Road</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 North of Manse Road Text MB 20 – Map 7.1 MB 21	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
S. Maclean(590), Mr A.E. & Mrs P Nash(621) Mr & Mrs H. Jack(643) Scottish Natural Heritage(326) Mr W. MacLaren(334) Ardgay & District Community Council(546) Mrs A. McDonnell(548) Miss H. Buchanan(561)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u> H1 (previously LT1) 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.</p> <p><u>S. Maclean(590), Mr A.E. &amp; Mrs P. Nash(621), Miss H. Buchanan(561), Mrs. A. McDonnell(548), Mr &amp; Mrs H. Jack(643)</u></p> <p>Poor road access to new site, restrictions on improvement and lack of jobs in area so no need to build new homes or business. Location of allocation would be to the detriment of the village setting. Development would require the residents to pass through an already established quiet area of the village to reach any amenities. Not enough employment for the present population of the area. Other larger settlements are better placed to accommodate development. Water supply is inadequate for more housing development, closing the railway bridge to traffic would add to road journeys. Better access in place on other sites along Church Rd.</p> <p><u>Mr W. MacLaren(334)</u> Objection to the land north of Manse road being used for housing as it is regularly cultivated and is the only access to land rented 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). Below and South of manse would be more suitable rather than proposed site as it would be closer to water, sewer, and road.</p> <p><u>Ardgay &amp; District Community Council(546)</u> Objecting to zone LT1 (now H1). 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.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u> Preparation of an Appropriate Assessment and consideration of impacts and mitigation to natural heritage designations.</p> <p><u>S. Maclean(590), Mr A.E. &amp; Mrs P Nash(621), Miss H. Buchanan(561), Mrs A. McDonnell(548), Mr &amp; Mrs H. Jack(643), Mr W. MacLaren(334), Ardgay &amp; District Community Council(546)</u></p>		

Deletion of site (assumed)
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (282)</b>
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p><u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u> An Appropriate Assessment has been prepared in liaison with Scottish Natural Heritage, the consideration of impacts of development did not identify impacts that have not been addressed by amendments to general policies. No adverse effects on site integrity as a result of this decision.</p> <p><u>S. Maclean(590), Mr A.E. &amp; Mrs P. Nash(621), Miss H. Buchanan(561), Mrs A. McDonnell(548), Mr &amp; Mrs H. Jack(643), Mr W. MacLaren(334), Ardgay &amp; District Community Council(546)</u></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, this could also facilitate the movement of livestock.</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>
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ARDGAY - H2 Adjacent To Primary School</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H2 Adjacent to primary school Text MB 20 – Map 7.1 MB 21	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
CKD Galbraith(275) D. & C. Easton(279)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>CKD Galbraith(275) for Gledfield Trust</u> H2 is owned by the Gledfield Trust who is supportive of plans to develop this land. The main constraint 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.</p> <p>Wish to see all land originally zoned as H2, including land to East of farm lane retained. Therefore no reductions in area originally allocated in October 2007.</p> <p><u>D. &amp; C. Easton(279)</u> Site is affected by flooding, something that happens all too often in our area. Entrance at blind corner, traffic safety, speeding. Standard of buildings, will the houses be built using the highest standards of materials, planned in according with the area, at appropriate densities and consistent with existing. Loss of privacy at our back garden?</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>CKD Galbraith(275) for Gledfield Trust</u> SEEKS INCLUSION OF FULL EXTENT OF LAND ALLOCATED IN EARLIER DRAFT</p> <p><u>D. &amp; C. Easton(279)</u> SEEKS ADDITION OF FURTHER REQUIREMENTS TO THE PLAN</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>The size of the allocation has been reduced on its eastern side to remove a farm lane and the SDA revised accordingly to remove the farm lane from 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> <p>Impact from light pollution can be minimised by planting and via the Council's policy to install low, downward emission lighting.</p>		



<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BETTYHILL - H1 West of the School, H2 West of Munro Place</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 West of the school, H2 West of Munro Place Text MB 44 – Map 15.1 MB 45	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr A. N. Carr (on behalf of the Bettyhill Hotel) (126) Mrs J. Grant (360)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocations	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Mr A. N. Carr, BA, FRICS</p> <p>He feels this impacts an important view for tourism and visitor experience and therefore the local economy which increasingly relies on tourism and has suffered job losses from other employment providers such as Dounreay. Believes the argument that young people are leaving the area because of lack of affordable housing is over stressed and more important is the lack of employment.</p> <p>Refers to the guidance in NPPG13 for development on the undeveloped coast. '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> <p>He suggests that the view from the Bettyhill Hotel is an important view and its loss would be detrimental to the turnover of the hotel perhaps even making the business unviable. Notes that on the "Undiscovered Scotland" (the most comprehensive on-line guide to Scotland) the entry for Bettyhill commences with a photo taken across the field in question and comments: "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.</p> <p>In an area with a declining population questions why 'additional speculative housing' is necessary. Infill/allocation unsuitable designation for land outside the village envelope. Suggests 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. Finds it hard to justify this occurring in such a scenic and sensitive location.</p> <p>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. Just because land is currently designated for housing, there is no reason why it should not be redesigned for some other purpose in future.</p> <p>He refers to Pan72 on siting housing within landscape, reinforcing settlement pattern, and ensuring local appropriateness of development in layout, design and materials taking account of orientation, topography and scale. Also refers to the evaluation of NPPG15 which noted a growing concern on the impact of second home ownership since its publication. He is aware of interest from visitors on holiday. The proposed designation for this site is for housing, not affordable housing.</p>		

As consent has already been given it would be futile to object to development taking place, but it is important that this is done in such a way as to minimise impact. Suggest that any detailed consents be carefully controlled with particular consideration to the following points:

- A. Low rise development only.
- 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.

Mrs J. Grant

H1 and H2: Hope that as H2 site is seeking planning permission that the road into both these sites is from the main road directly and not through Munro Place. She raises concerns regarding the construction phase of development and the impact this has on herself and other residents in terms of parking places, noise etc. Does 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.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

ACCESS SHOULD BE FROM THE MAIN ROAD rather than Murno Place

J. Grant

DELETE ALLOCATION or more specific controls through ADDITIONAL DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS (assumed) - Mr A. N. Carr, BA, FRICS.

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**

Response and Reasons

It is considered that the allocations H1 and H2 represent a logical extension to the village and will 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 should not be blocked by their development. All of H1 and H2 now have outline planning consents thus establishing the principle of development here. H1 also has detailed consent for three houses. If/when further detailed applications are submitted there will be the opportunity for representations on the detail proposed. A design brief covers the H1 site and a developer requirement covers its extension for H2. 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.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BETTYHILL - H3 North of Gordon Terrace</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H3 North of Gordon Terrace Text MB 44 – Map 15.1 MB 45	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
R. Mackay (263) Albyn Housing Society (499)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>R. Mackay Realises houses are urgently needed and supports this but concern about parking or rather the lack of this. Cars are regularly parked outside her entrance, there is little parking for the school traffic, and unless there are parking places produced with new housing, chaos will prevail.</p> <p>Albyn Housing Society Site has obvious topographical challenges. The council might consider whether there should be some flexibility in the Plan around boundaries (particularly the western boundary) to assist some future developer to work around the rocky outcrops and level changes.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS (assumed) – R. Mackay		
EXTEND ALLOCATION TO WEST (assumed) - Albyn Housing Society		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>To reflect the need this allocation was reduced to reflect the Council's work to establish a parking and drop off area for the school. The land excluded was the only practical option available for this purpose. There are substantial housing allocations within Bettyhill already being progressed providing a healthy and effective housing land supply. Therefore it was felt that the long standing need for additional parking and a drop off area for the school should not be prejudiced.</p> <p>There will be parking required with new housing development and this aspect will be considered at planning application stage in consultation with our roads colleagues with regard given to the Council's roads guidelines at the time.</p> <p>As mentioned this is a more challenging site to develop for housing and its feasibility has never been established. The road network is such that our TEC'S colleagues suggest that only 6 houses can be accommodated before requiring improvement. It is considered that the remaining allocated land will probably be able to accommodate this level of development. Being within the Settlement Development Area does not exclude the potential for housing here if plans for parking and drop off area should change.</p>		

<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
None

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BETTYHILL – Settlement Development Area</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 44 – Map 15.1 MB 45	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Bettyhill Community Council (328)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
<p>Bettyhill Community Council 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. 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. It was considered that the Local Plan would give the opportunity for some action to be taken regarding the road network.</p> <p>There is a need for further footpath provision i.e. pavements in certain areas of Bettyhill and should be included in the Draft Plan. Endorses Jayne Gordon's concerns about the pavement situation. The back road used by the buses which pass Seacrest are 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.</p> <p>They feel it is disappointing that issues raised have not been considered for change in the Sutherland Local plan and that the footpath issue cannot be dealt with through the Local Plan. 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, they contend that there is definitely a need for the construction of pavements for the safety of everyone.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
UNCLEAR - They are dissatisfied with the Council's lack of action with regard to the Newlands junction, and the footpath issue, but no Local Plan alteration is proposed.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>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.</p> <p>The Education Service are aware that the footpath provision issue will not be resolved</p>		

through developer contributions. We can only seek these when the impact is directly related to the proposed development and none of the allocations could result in 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.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BONAR BRIDGE - General Comment</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	General Comment Text MB 22 – Map 7.1 MB 23	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Scottish Natural Heritage(326)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Bonar Bridge Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
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. SNH maintains the objection for MU1 site at Bonar Bridge until a satisfactory Appropriate Assessment has been produced.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
Preparation of an Appropriate Assessment and consideration of impacts and mitigation natural heritage designations.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (414)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u> An Appropriate Assessment has been prepared in liaison with Scottish Natural Heritage, the consideration of impacts of development did not identify impacts that have not been addressed by amendments to general policies. No adverse effects on site integrity as a result of this		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BONAR BRIDGE - LT1 South Of Cherry Grove</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	LT1 South of Cherry Grove Text MB 22 – Map 8.1 MB 23	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs M. Mackay(596) Ms M. Watt(33) Creich Parish Church(86) Mackenzie & Cormack(134)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>		
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Ms M. Watt(33)</u> Request that the designation be changed to a housing allocation (H1), as the other previously allocated housing land at Swordale Road has been deleted. LT1 is of little or no agricultural use and has the main services of water, power and sewage installed to supply the new development of Swordale Park. Access is readily achievable from Carnegie Court.</p> <p><u>Creich Parish Church(86)</u> An old septic tank is in the field (marked LT) and overflows from this 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.</p> <p><u>Mackenzie &amp; Cormack(134)</u> Surface Water Issue, 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.</p> <p>Privacy, concerns that privacy at Kyle House will be considerably compromised. Additional 30 houses will considerably compromise privacy given that development is to be on a slope with tiers of properties overlooking hers. Drainage - Need a site meeting plus plans of new drainage system.</p> <p><u>Mrs M. Mackay(596)</u> Increase in traffic on Carnegie Court.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>Ms M. Watt(33)</u> CHANGE FROM LT1 TO H1</p> <p><u>Creich Parish Church(86)</u> REQUIREMENT FOR DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS (UNCLEAR)</p> <p><u>Mackenzie &amp; Cormack(134)</u> CHANGE TO CAPACITY OF ALLOCATION AND REQUIREMENT FOR DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS (unclear)</p>		

Mrs M. Mackay(596)

CHANGE TO ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (286)**

Response and Reasons

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 developer requirements for MU1 Cherry Grove already state, "Access point to be reserved for future access onto allocation LT1 South of Cherry Grove". It is not intended to have traffic access through Carnegie Court. 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.

The indicative capacity of 30 units is only indicative and actual site capacity would be agreed at planning application stage.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BONAR BRIDGE - MU1 Cherry Grove</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU1 Cherry Grove Text MB 22 – Map 8.1 MB 23	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs M. Mackay(596)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>		
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Concern regarding ongoing problems with water supply in Bonar Bridge. Water tanks are carting water to the plant on a regular basis. Extra housing will suffer the same supply interruptions.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF ALLOCATION(assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
Scottish Water 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.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BONAR BRIDGE - Settlement Development Area</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 22– Map 7.1 MB 23	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr B. Coghill (253)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Extension to Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Seek reconsideration of the Eastern Village Boundary behind Tulloch Road Bonar-Bridge. Seek realignment of boundary with Robert Grant's Coal Yard and even if only between no. 1 to no.6 Tulloch Road to allow for development. No possible reason that land behind No 1 to No 12 Tulloch Road cannot be developed.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
INCLUSION OF LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (283)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<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>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BONAR BRIDGE – Development Factors</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Development Factors Text MB 22 – Map 7.1 MB 23	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mackenzie & Cormack(134)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Bonar Bridge SDA	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p>Sewerage/Foul Drainage 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, drainage system has ruptured twice in the last eighteen months. Concerns if further capacity was added to the existing poor drainage system.</p> <p>Water Capacity 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.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF ALLOCATIONS(assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (339)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>The Council 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.</p> <p>The granting of planning permission does not secure connection to the public water supply or public sewer, but applicants are advised by the Council that they must seek consent from Scottish Water for a water and waste 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.</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 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</p>		

and they will use this when programming their investment priorities. Scottish Water advises the Council on the current and programmed capability to accommodate development.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - Development Factors</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Development Factors Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
The Coal Authority (647)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Development Factors	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
The Coal Authority believes it is important that the Sutherland Local Plan identifies previous mining activity so that potential mining legacy issues can be made aware to developers.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEK REFERENCE, AS A DEVELOPMENT FACTOR, THE CONSIDERATION OF THE COAL MINING HISTORY OF BRORA.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (240)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
Although not highlighted as a development factor within the draft plan the presence of mining shafts is a constraint that is checked against through the Development Management process, it is acknowledged that this should be highlighted as a development factor.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
INSERT TEXT IN DEVELOPMENT FACTORS SECTION TO HIGHLIGHT CONSIDERATION OF DEVELOPMENT.		
ADD BULLET POINT to Development Factors, “Development proposals should pay regard to the potential presence of redundant mining works”.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - H 1 East Brora Muir</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	<b>H 1 East Brora Muir</b> Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
A. B. Rennie(284), Mr & Mrs V. and H. Hastings(16), Ms F. Holliday(26), R G. Sim(108), S. M. Clarke(267)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p>The density of the housing would dictate that the buildings would be of more than single storey construction, with a negative effect on the privacy of the dwellings in Ben Mailey Gardens, adverse effect on house values and outlook from these dwellings.</p> <p>Proposed development in the East Brora Muir area and that at Carrol House will add to the existing problem of access to the A9. Access to A9 (staggered jct and limited visibility.) Ben Mailey Gardens to be main access to proposed scheme (Dangerous bends) Seek clarification what is meant by "limited development served through Muirfield Gardens", seek information on how limited access will be enforced to avoid the route becoming used as a main access</p> <p>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>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
REDUCTION IN DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE OF ACCESS		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (211)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>The concerns regarding traffic safety are noted. Proposals for the site should seek to restrict traffic movements passing the Beachview Daycare Centre and Respite Centre, this may be achieved by having no through access to the Ben Mailey Gardens access. Development accessed from Muirfield Gardens would most appropriately be for sheltered or similar type housing. 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 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, general infrastructure and service provision, also the consideration of the general amenity of existing properties.</p>		



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.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - H 4 Rosslyn Street / MU4 Former MacKays Yard</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 4 Rosslyn Street / MU4 Forner MacKays Yard Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
<u>A. Clarke(106)</u> <u>M. Fielding(158)</u>		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed Use allocation, housing/business	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Objections to development relate to physical disruption and potential damage to property adjacent during any demolition. Also impact to roots and branches of trees and plants in adjacent property from excavations. Effected by dust, vibration and noise during demolition/construction. Suitability of access. Impact on adjacent listed building of design and type of new buildings ie houses or flats and effect on property values.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>A. Clarke(106)</u> DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed) <u>M. Fielding(158)</u> SEEK REQUIREMENT THAT FLATS ARE NOT APPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE SITE		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>  The former Mackays Garage site has lain disused since 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 subsequently building regulations which will require more detail on method of demolition, this 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.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - I1 Adjoining industrial estate</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	I1 Adjoining industrial estate Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr S. Price(246)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Industrial allocation, development requirements	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
No objection 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. Not assured by previous response in this regard.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEKS MODIFICATION TO DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO BOUNDARY TREATMENT.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
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. The requirements for the site indicate the need for landscaping on boundary adjacent housing.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - MU 1 Former radio station</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU 1 Former radio station Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr I. M. Sutherland(297), Sutherland Country Homes(569)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Mr I. M. Sutherland(297), Sutherland Country Homes(569)</u>  Support plan for housing at the former radio station. This is an area of Brora which is in need of upgrading and renovation. Only viable use for this area would in my view be housing given the amenity and attraction of the site.</p> <p>Objection relates to identified potential for site differing from the existing South East Sutherland Local Plan. The deposit draft plan does not consider housing use for the site. Given the pursuit of a planning application for housing and the investment in a flood risk assessment the draft plan should reflect the potential for housing on the site Wording from the adopted <a href="#">South East Sutherland Local Plan</a> indicates the potential for housing on the site, “Special Uses 11 - part or full development of the site for permanent dwellings may also be appropriate. (<a href="http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/243465DE-FAAD-4A2D-A43C-850CF604ECD0/0/sesuthwritstat.pdf">http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/243465DE-FAAD-4A2D-A43C-850CF604ECD0/0/sesuthwritstat.pdf</a>)</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
OBJECTION TO HOUSING NOT BEING INCLUDED AS IDENTIFIED USE.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (224)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>The Deposit Draft Local Plan seeks to identify the most appropriate uses to identified allocations. The former Radio Station offers a brownfield opportunity for redevelopment on the edge of the settlement. Given the location of the site, which is dislocated from the built extent of the settlement in a wider area of amenity, it is considered that the most appropriate uses relate to visitor/interpretation/recreational uses. However, given the pending planning application for housing development there is a need to allow potential for alternative redevelopment opportunities to be assessed on their individual merits.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
AMEND FIRST SENTENCE OF REQUIREMENTS TEXT TO INDICATE POTENTIAL FOR ALTERNATIVE USES. Replace first sentence with, “Brownfield site, preferred reuses relate to visitor/interpretation/recreational and outdoor uses, alternative uses will be assessed on merit and against general policies.”		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - MU2 Scotia House</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	<b>MU2 Scotia House</b> Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
<p>G. H. Johnston for Brora Investments (331)</p> <p>J. Shaw &amp; E. Davis (583), A. Norris (588), D. Gunn (595), A. Coghill (594), Mrs Y. Mackay(597), Mr G. MacKenzie(607), T. M. Burns(624), Mrs D. White(625)</p> <p>Transport Scotland (659 )(Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)</p>		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>		
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>G. H. Johnston for Brora Investments (331)</u> Concerns that the wording relating to housing potential is too restrictive. The modular housing project is currently on hold due to the economic recession. In the event that it does not proceed at this location in future the restrictions indicated in the highlighted section of the text – “related to modular house construction activities at the Scotia House. Provision of housing to be subject to legal agreement for longer term management.” – would not be appropriate. Accept the reduction to 10 units and an overall requirement that a minimum of 25% would be affordable. This objection would be withdrawn if the highlighted text was deleted.</p> <p><u>J. Shaw &amp; E. Davis (583), A. Norris (588), D. Gunn (595), A. Coghill (594), Mrs Y. Mackay(597), Mr G. MacKenzie(607), T. M. Burns(624), Mrs D. White(625)</u> Objections relating to the identification of Scotia House as having further potential for development of housing and/or retail/tourism uses. Understanding that no further development would be allowed closer to the existing housing, loss of views and privacy.</p> <p><u>Transport Scotland (659 )(Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)</u> Objection to the intensification of uses on the site with regard to the potential cumulative increase of traffic on a junction to the A9(T). Seek that provision of an assessment of impact to the junction is carried out prior to inclusion of the allocation.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>G. H. Johnston for Brora Investments (331)(Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)</u> OBJECT TO RESTRICTIVE POLICY WORDING</p> <p><u>J. Shaw &amp; E. Davis (583), A. Norris (588), D. Gunn (595), A. Coghill (594), Mrs Y. Mackay(597), Mr G. MacKenzie(607), T. M. Burns(624), Mrs D. White(625)(Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)</u> OBJECTIONS RELATING TO THE POTENTIAL FOR DEVELOPMENT AND PROXIMITY TO EXISTING HOUSING.</p> <p><u>Transport Scotland (659 )(Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)</u> OBJECTION TO THE ALLOCATION RELATES TO CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE EXISTING ACCESS.</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (230)</b>		

Response and ReasonsG. H. Johnston for Brora Investments (331)

It is noted that the current economic climate has impacted on the development programmes of many businesses, and it is accepted that the link to the delivery of “modular housing” is restrictive. The potential for the development of a limited number of houses between Dudgeon Drive and the bunding has been indicated within the draft plan. The relation to the development of modular housing does not require to be tied and the requirement for the provision of 25% affordable housing on a proposal of this is established within wider policy.

J. Shaw & E. Davis (583), A. Norris (588), D. Gunn (595), A. Coghill (594), Mrs Y. Mackay(597), Mr G. MacKenzie(607), T. M. Burns(624), Mrs D. White(625)

The allocation seeks to enable the existing development at Scotia House to further the overall economic development of the settlement. Development of housing on the site would be confined to the land to the rear of Dudgeon Drive with other potential uses maintaining a separation from the residential areas and continued presence of the bund offering protection from noise emanating from activities at Scotia House.

Transport Scotland (659) (Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)

The allocation at Scotia House lies within the defined settlement boundary. The site already has consent in regard to the provision of tourist and restaurant facilities, although these have not yet been implemented. The approved development and junction has been originally designed to accommodate the Hunters Woollen Mill with associated tourist/restaurant facilities and was approved in 1996. The mill was to have an intended workforce of approx 400 employees. The existing junction, which is within the 30mph limit and accommodates a dedicated right hand turning lane, was designed to accommodate the workforce, road deliveries and tourist related traffic as well as existing residential traffic. Currently the Mill building, Scotia House is utilised by small scale users and the junction operates well under the designed capacity. The Local Plan allocation seeks to facilitate the development of the existing site and building to provide further economic development opportunities for the area through the identification of a number of potential future uses. Any potential intensification of traffic use would require consideration of the need for further assessment of the traffic flows and junction. The existing policy can be augmented to indicate more clearly this requirement *“The cumulative impact of development on the access to the A9(T) will need to be considered and any further identified mitigation measures undertaken by the developer.”*

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**G. H. Johnston for Brora Investments (331)(Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)

AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TEXT, DELETE ~~“related to modular housing construction activities at Scotia House. Provision of housing to be subject to legal agreement for longer term management”~~ INSERT in third sentence, *“25% Affordable housing contribution will apply”*.

Transport Scotland (659) (Nov 2008 Deposit Draft)

AMEND TEXT, FINAL SENTENCE OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TO READ, *“The cumulative impact of development on the access to the A9(T) will need to be considered and any further identified mitigation measures undertaken by the developer.”*

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - MU3 Carrol House</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU3 Carrol House Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
A. Robertson (622), P. Shanks (635)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing or Tourist related development	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Object on basis that still may be flatted development and that capacity is not indicated, also regarding the lack of demand for housing in Brora there is no need for further housing.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (240)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>  The allocation seeks to address the potential for redevelopment of this site that has been the subject of development proposals. Given the site is contained within a largely residential area the proposed use is not inconsistent with existing and consideration of a detailed proposal will consider the appropriate level of development. The existing demand for tourist related development requires that the need to provide a contribution towards affordable housing is clearly identified.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - Prospects</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Prospects Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr A. Risk (230)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Prospects	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
The Braes Hotel building is unattractive to visitors and its unloved and degenerating appearance and condition is of concern. Can a compulsory purchase order not be sought and have it removed and replaced with a new property including commercial units and flats.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEKS INCLUSION OF POLICY REGARDING BRAES HOTEL (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (212)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
The prospects section of Inset 3.1 makes reference to the Council working with the community and businesses to improve the visual amenity of the area. The Council has programmed environmental improvements to the paved area in front of the Braes Hotel to facilitate an improvement to the area. The potential for compulsory purchase is limited and the Council continues to work to bring about improvements to the area.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA - H 2 Tordale and H3 West of the Masonic Hall, Settlement Development Area (H 5 South of Academy Street(deleted))</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 2 Tordale and H3 West of the Masonic Hall Settlement Development Area(H 5 South of Academy Street (deleted)) Text MB 13 – Map 2.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr J. S. Beattie(235)  Mr I.M. Sutherland(297)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocations	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Mr J. S. Beattie(235)</u> H 2 Tordale and H3 West of the Masonic Hall Objecting to allocations</p> <p>H 5 South of Academy Street (deleted) Initial objection to site allocated in previous draft of plan, maintained objection assumed to be on basis of continued inclusion of land within the SDA.</p> <p><u>Mr I. M. Sutherland(297)</u> Seeking inclusion of land adjacent to H3 West of the Masonic Hall within the aforementioned allocation in order to assist in redevelopment of the site</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>Mr J. S. Beattie(235)</u> H 2 Tordale and H3 West of the Masonic Hall DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed)</p> <p>H 5 South of Academy Street (2009 DD)(deleted) CHANGE TO SDA BOUNDARY(assumed)</p> <p><u>Mr I. M. Sutherland(297)</u> INCLUSION OF LAND WITHIN EXISTING ALLOCATION H3 WEST OF MASONIC HALL</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (225)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p><u>Mr J. S. Beattie(235)</u> H 2 Tordale and H3 West of the Masonic Hall The allocation of land at H2 Tordale and H3 West of the Masonic Hall offers an element of choice of available housing land. The allocations provide opportunity for housing development to the northern side of the settlement that already has the benefit of an existing access to the A9(T).</p> <p>H 5 South of Academy Street (deleted) The Council acknowledged the views of the landowner, who did not wish to release the site for housing development, the site was removed as an allocation but retained within the settlement boundary, through this retention there remains potential for limited infill.</p>		

Mr I. M. Sutherland(297)The potential for the redevelopment on this area of land can be pursued within the context of the general policies of the plan.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>BRORA SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 13 – Map 3.1 MB 15	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
A. Colvin for K. A. Forbes (664)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation (seeks inclusion of site)	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Object to the delineation of the settlement boundary to a temporary fence line; seek the expansion of the boundary to the south east to incorporate land in their ownership.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
EXPANSION OF SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (221)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>The land identified by the objector lies to the east of the A9(T) (Victoria Road), Brora, to the rear of the property "Ashcroft". The wider area is constrained for development of any scale through an existing policy restriction to the formation of new vehicular access to the A9(T), as identified in the adopted South East Sutherland Local Plan and maintained in the Deposit Draft Sutherland Local Plan. Any proposals that may emanate from this boundary change can adequately be addressed through the general policies of the Plan, and the inclusion of this area of land will not have any implications for the wider operation of the plan.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
<b>COMMEND CHANGE TO SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA BOUNDARY</b> Modify the Brora SDA to include the area of land as indicated within the attached recommendation.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - C1 Meadows Park</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	C1 Meadows Park Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
H. Maulley (644) M. Morris (642) M. Gillanders (630) J. Mackenzie(122)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Community use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
The development of a community centre in this area will reduce house values as a result of increased traffic and noise passing to access centre. The development of a community centre is unlikely to go ahead in the plan period because of the current economic situation. Seek clarification of where site to be accessed.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF SITE (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>  Proposals for the community centre will require to be the subject of a planning application which will involve further consultation on the detail of proposals. The control of use of the facility can be the subject of planning and licensing controls so as not to be detrimental to the general amenity of surrounding properties. The current access from Meadows Park Road is likely to be the most appropriate access although the consideration of a proposal for the site would assist in determining the most appropriate access point.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - General Comment</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	<b>General Comment</b> Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
G. I. Grant(215) M Davis (579) & Matheson Mackenzie Ross Architect (660)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	General Comment/Housing allocation/housing in the countryside	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>G. I. Grant(215)</u> Objecting to the local plan of the Dornoch area on the grounds that the land identified in objection has not been included.		
<u>M Davis (579) &amp; Matheson Mackenzie Ross Architect (660)</u> Seeking allocation of Ambassador House and grounds for residential development		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEKS ALLOCATION OF LAND IN HINTERLAND OF DORNOCH FOR HOUSING		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<u>G. I. Grant(215)</u> 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.		
The site is located around 1 mile outwith the settlement 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.		
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, outwith prescribed exceptions. 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 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.		

**M Davis (579) & Matheson Mackenzie Ross Architect (660)**

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 Ambassador House and grounds can be investigated within the existing policy context without its inclusion as an allocation.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - H1 Bishopsfield</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 Bishopsfield Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mrs J. Everitt(352), Mr & Mrs S M Wilson(544), Mrs C Charlish(537) Mrs L Lafferty(165) Albyn Housing(499)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Mrs J. Everitt(352), Mr &amp; Mrs S. M. Wilson(544), Mrs C. Charlish(537)</u> Housing already under construction before consultation. Representation against any road linking Elizabeth Crescent to new development. Elizabeth Crescent should remain a cul-de-sac and not a loop road for joy riding traffic to cruise round</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-Retention of amenity/green space.</p> <p>Do not wish to be closely surrounded by what is basically a "council scheme". Surplus of affordable housing will end up occupied by families from outside the area or EU workers. Insufficient employment in the area to support the occupants of all the proposed housing.</p> <p><u>Mrs L. Lafferty(165)</u> Existing development will be extremely close to any new build and are already very close to the existing path. The allocated land has been used for recreational purposes and is a nice feature in the middle of what is already an extensive development.</p> <p>The village that does not have the infrastructure to support more houses.</p> <p><u>Albyn Housing (499)</u> The plan should note the requirement of a masterplan for this area and it would be helpful if it could be noted that the Council (Housing and Property) is working with its partners to deliver such a masterplan.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>Mrs J. Everitt(352), Mr &amp; Mrs S. M. Wilson(544), Mrs C. Charlish(537), Mrs L. Lafferty(165)</u> MODIFICATIONS SOUGHT RELATE TO NEED FOR FURTHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN SETTLEMENT, RETENTION OF ROAD LAYOUT AS CUL DE SAC AND LOSS OF AMENITY AREA.</p> <p><u>Albyn Housing (499)</u> REQUIREMENT FOR PROVISION OF MASTERPLAN</p>		

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (109)**Response and Reasons

Mrs J Everitt(352), Mr & Mrs S M Wilson(544), Mrs C Charlish(537),

Mrs L Lafferty(165) 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.

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.

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 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 Council is aware of the ongoing work towards preparing a masterplan for the delivery of the overall development of the site. The delivery of a masterplan will assist in addressing the concerns of local residents as to the physical form and location of development on the site.

Albyn Housing (499) INSERT TEXT TO REFER TO PREPARATION OF A MASTERPLAN. Insert before first sentence, *“Preparation of a masterplan indicating form and location of development, traffic management and provision of amenity land and landscaping.”*

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

INSERT TEXT TO REFER TO PREPARATION OF A MASTERPLAN. Insert before first sentence, *“Preparation of a masterplan indicating form and location of development, traffic management and provision of amenity land and landscaping.”*



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - H 2 Earl's Cross</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 2 Earl's Cross Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr P. Higgins(23), Mr & Mrs S. M. Wilson(544) Mrs J. Everitt(352)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Mr P. Higgins(23), Mr & Mrs S. M. Wilson(544) 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.		
Mrs J. Everitt(352) Connection road accessing Elizabeth Crescent. 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.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEK REQUIREMENT FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO WIDER ROAD NETWORK(assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (6)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<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> <p>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.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - H 3 Sutherland Road</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 3 Sutherland Road Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr H. Turner(265) M J. Napper(84) S. Wild(304) A. M. A. Bagott(380)  SEPA(311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Mr H. Turner(265)</u> Consider a through road to Evelix road should have been included in the H3 plan as it appears this is not serious thought should be given to the Sutherland Road Castle Street junction as the night times are very bad. Suggest necessary road improvements, remove Church Hall wall, install traffic lights, install roundabout, realign the junction to Cromartie road.</p> <p><u>M. J. Napper(84)</u> 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. 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!</p> <p><u>S. Wild(304)</u> Due to high water table no extended permission beyond existing boundary. Site to be kept tidy during construction.</p> <p><u>A. M. A. Bagott(380)</u> 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, will now be ruined forever.</p> <p><u>SEPA(311)</u> SEPA would withdraw its objection to Dornoch H3 provided the wording "Flood Risk Assessments will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area" is inserted into the Developer Requirements.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEK INCLUSION OF FURTHER DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS (assumed)		

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (171)**Response and Reasons

Mr H. Turner(265), M. J. Napper(84), S. Wild(304), A. M. A. Bagott(380)

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.

In regard to archaeology, a programme of archaeological work including the preservation and recording of archaeological features has been submitted to the Council.

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 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.

Development requirements for the allocation set out the need for applications to consider the aforementioned issues, the wider general policy requirements also need to be considered.

SEPA(311)

There is a need to observe the potential flood risk on the site and it is appropriate for the inclusion of additional wording to the developer requirements.

Note:-The above objections relate to an allocation where the issues have already been the subject of detailed planning consideration and approval, site is currently under construction.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

INSERT TEXT

SEPA(311)

In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "Flood Risk Assessments will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area"

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - H 4 Meadows Park Road</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 4 Meadows Park Road Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
M.J. Napper(84), Mr H. Turner(265), S. Wild(304)  SEPA(311)  Scottish Natural Heritage(326)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>M.J. Napper(84), Mr H. Turner(265), S. Wild(304)</u>  Consider a through road to Evelix road should have been included in the H3 plan as it appears this is not serious thought should be given to the Sutherland Road Castle Street junction as the night times are very bad. Suggest necessary road improvements, remove Church Hall wall, install traffic lights, install roundabout, realign the junction to Cromartie road.</p> <p>Development is on a very low lying and inherently boggy bit of ground. Due to high water table no extended permission beyond existing boundary. 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.</p> <p><u>SEPA(311)</u>  SEPA would withdraw its objection to Dornoch H4 provided the wording "Flood Risk Assessments will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area" is inserted into the Developer Requirements.</p> <p><u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u>  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.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEK INCLUSION OF FURTHER DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (183)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p><u>M.J. Napper(84), Mr H. Turner(265), S. Wild(304)</u> 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 water have been concluded to the satisfaction of both the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Council.</p>		

The approved development makes adequate provision for open space.

Development requirements for the allocation set out the need for applications to address particular issues, the wider general policy requirements also need to be considered.

SEPA(311)

There is a need to observe the potential flood risk on the site and it is appropriate for the inclusion of additional wording to the developer requirements.

Note:-The above objections relate to an allocation where the issues have already been the subject of detailed planning consideration and approval, site is currently under construction.

Scottish Natural Heritage(326)

An Appropriate Assessment has been prepared in liaison with Scottish Natural Heritage, the consideration of impacts of development did not identify impacts that have not been addressed by amendments to general policies. No adverse effects on site integrity as a result of this decision.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

INSERT ADDITIONAL TEXT

SEPA(311)

In respect of identified potential flood risk issues insert text to end of developer requirements, "Flood Risk Assessments will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area"

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - LT Dornoch North Expansion</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	LT Dornoch North Expansion Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
R G Grant(174)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing expansion allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Question need for LT Dornoch North Expansion allocation, all these developments will change the character of Dornoch. Insufficient infrastructure to cope with all development. What compensation for loss of amenity etc, to occupiers of housing adjoining any proposed development?		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (176)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>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. The wider amenity of the existing settlement will be a consideration for the development of the site, with requirements seeking appropriate measures to reduce impact on the amenity of the area, not the subject of financial compensation to individuals.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - MU 1 Dornoch North</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU 1 Dornoch North Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
<p><u>Mr M. MacGregor(218)</u>  <u>K. Cadell (651) for J. MacKintosh(628)</u>  <u>J. MacKintosh(628)</u></p> <p><u>Mrs G. Moss(600), G. A. Marshall(255), S. &amp; A. Reid(633), Mrs V. Bhatti(634)</u></p> <p><u>Scottish Environment Protection Agency(311)</u></p>		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed Use allocation – housing and business, flood risk	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Mr M. MacGregor(218)</u>  Objections relate to access indicated in the draft plan through my ownership, not be possible to achieve the necessary road standard required. Concerns also to flood risk issue in the area and the potential implications of development exacerbating the position.</p> <p><u>K. Cadell (651) for and also by J. MacKintosh(628) (landowner)</u>  The developing masterplan has identified a preferred access from Station Square as crossing point across the Dornoch Burn into the builder's yard. and a preferred access from Embo Road has been identified to the north of that identified in the draft local plan and would like to see these reflected in the Local Plan. Proposals show that this would be a high density mixed use gateway building on this corner site on the south of the Dornoch Burn</p> <p>Seek inclusion of the Slater's Yard area within the allocation to form a gateway entrance to the development.</p> <p>Prefer to see the use of the term "<i>masterplan</i>" referred to in the plan instead of "<i>urban design framework</i>."</p> <p>Would like the term "<i>housing use with associated business and commercial uses</i>" replaced with home-work or home-office type space.</p> <p><u>Mrs G. Moss(600), G. A. Marshall(255), S. &amp; A. Reid(633), Mrs V. Bhatti(634)</u> – objections relate to wide range of issues relating to impact on capacity of services and infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Scottish Environment Protection Agency(311)</u>  SEPA seek the removal of last sentence from developer requirements, is deemed unnecessary given other references to flood risk.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>Mr M MacGregor(218)</u> SEEK CHANGE TO INDICATIVE ACCESS</p> <p><u>K Cadell (651) (agent as at DD Nov 2008 onwards) for J MacKintosh (DD October 2007 &amp; Nov 2008)</u>  SEEK ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING INDICATED POINTS OF ACCESS AND INCLUSION</p>		

OF ADDITIONAL LAND, CHANGE IN TERMINOLOGY.

Mrs G. Moss(600), G. A. Marshall(255), S. & A. Reid(633), Mrs V. Bhatti(634) DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed)

Scottish Environment Protection Agency(311)  
DELETE FINAL SENTENCE OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (207)**

Response and Reasons

Mr M. MacGregor(218) 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.

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.

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.

K. Cadell (651) for J. MacKintosh, J. MacKintosh(628) The Council acknowledge that an initial masterplan was 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.

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. The potential for an access crossing the Dornoch Burn is broadly acceptable in relation to serving a portion of the Dornoch North allocation, the access will still need to demonstrate its technical suitability. The developer has indicated that the access road from Station Square will cross the Dornoch Burn and take a route through the builders yard to the south of the burn. The access point to Embo Road can be accommodated on the point indicated in the representation, there are likely to be added requirements in terms of improvements to the wider road network.

The area of land currently functioning as the Slater's Yard could be incorporated within a masterplan proposal for the overall development of the site without its inclusion in the allocation. The land falls within separate ownership and its inclusion could prevent the consideration of a separate individual application.

The use of the term "masterplan" would be appropriate to the presentation of all salient information relating to the submission of a planning application for the entire site, change accepted.

The wording to "housing use with associated business and commercial uses" is a reference to the mix of development opportunities for the entire site, no change.



Scottish Environment Protection Agency(311) It is accepted that other text within the developer requirements section highlights requirements relating to flood risk and the final sentence is unnecessary.

Mrs G. Moss(600), G. A. Marshall(255), S. & A. Reid(633), Mrs V. Bhatti(634) 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.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DORNOCH - Prospects/General Comment</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Prospects/General Comment Text MB 5 – Map 1.1 MB 7	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (representation ref no.):</b>		
Mr P. Higgins(23), G. A. Marshall(255), A. M. A. Bagott(380) , J Robertson(650) Mr H. Lane(175)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	SDA and allocations	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Mr P. Higgins(23), G. A .Marshall(255), A. M. A. Bagott(380), J Robertson(650) 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. Lack of employment opportunities for incomers who will occupy the new houses.  A greater volume of traffic will be generated through the new housing proposed to be built, higher than average for most towns. Question capacity in the secondary and primary schools.  Mr H. Lane(175) Need a small but appropriate gymnasium in Dornoch.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>Mr P. Higgins(23), G. A. Marshall(255), A. M. A. Bagott(380) , J Robertson(650)</u> SEEK REDUCTION OF OVERALL ALLOCATION LEVEL (assumed)		
<u>Mr H Lane(175)</u> SEEKS PROVISION OF COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL FACILITY		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (190)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>  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 development of a sports barn at the school will offer facilities for the wider public. The local community association are pursuing the potential for the refurbishment of the existing or the delivery of a new 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.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DURNESS - MU1 Adjacent to the shop and across road adjacent to the war memorial</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU1 Adjacent to the shop and across road adjacent to the war memorial Text MB 42 - Map 13.1 MB 43	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
F. Mackay (640) Mr and Mrs Mackay (115) N. Powell (252)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Objections</u></p> <p>Southern portion of MU1 Area behind the village shop should be protected from housing development. This ground offers significant community value/use. Needs to be protected against private development and retained for community benefit only. This is strongly supported locally. This area is very visually and historically significant.</p> <p>Used by both visitors and local people, visitors can park here to use the nearby public toilets and public telephone box. It is used as a local focal point for the following services - RBS travelling bank, mobile library, mobile cinema, mobile sales outlets, and festival events. Suggests the site is the most convenient place for the various recycling bins used by the community. Housing built would not enjoy either outlook or open space (gardens), access being directly onto a road junction.</p> <p>Building would radically alter the nature of what is an essentially rural community by creating an urban environment at its centre. Land available for development at school row and adjacent to the village hall which could provide an opportunity to enhance the environment at Drumlhair.</p> <p>Northern portion of MU1 Drainage is a problem. Location for additional housing negative, the particular area already has a small mass of 'affordable' housing and further development would congest 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. Suggests that 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.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>Land available elsewhere is more suitable for development offering more potential benefits. It is suggested that if compensatory car parking was located at the fank area then this would make a loop road busier. There are also concerns about loss of open outlook/view together with its associated privacy.</p>		

<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>
<p>F. Mackay and Mr and Mrs Mackay ALLOCATE southern portion of MU1 for community use</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Mackay DELETE the Northern portion of MU1</p> <p>N. Powell DELETE all of MU1</p>
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>In a previous draft of the plan the mixed use allocations north and south of the road were separate allocations. However there would have been limited potential within the southern portion of MU1 due to the impact of loss of public car parking which covers much of this site. If compensatory parking can be accommodated within the extended MU1 then the opportunity for development here increases. Parts of the northern portion due to ground conditions/drainage concerns may not be suitable for development but may be suitable to accommodate displaced public parking. The idea of the enlarged site encourages the landowners to work together but safeguards are established to ensure essential public parking is retained.</p> <p>There is a developer requirement to respect the setting of the war memorial and to try and improve the amenity of the surrounding area - enhancing it as an attractive focal point within the community.</p> <p>It is recognised that this area is used as a holding ground for sheep before they go to market. Hence the developer requirement for relocation at the developers expense is necessary in order to protect crofting interests - which would necessitate the creation of a layby to serve another suitable piece of holding ground.</p> <p>The land adjacent to the caravan and camping site may be proposed through planning applications for non residential development because the site is identified for a mix of uses including community and business. Indeed this land benefits from road frontage which could benefit such uses. 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> <p>The detail of the road layout and junction/s will be considered if and when any planning application comes forward. We have consulted roads colleagues in TEC's and an acceptable junction arrangement can be achieved here.</p>
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
<p>None.</p>

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>DURNESS SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 42 - Map 13.1 MB 43	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs M. Mackay (529) Durness Community Council (639)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Consider the envelopes on Durine and Sangomore to be unnecessarily staggered and restrictive. 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 plan is too restrictive.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p>Mrs M. Mackay A WIDER SDA or perhaps NO SDA and just deal with all single house/small scale applications against the wider countryside policy (assumed).</p> <p>Durness Community Council AMEND SDA for a wider envelope and more uniform width.</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>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>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>EDDERTON - H 1 West of Station Road</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 1 West of Station Road Text MB 18 – Map 6.1 MB 19	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Historic Scotland(495)&(501)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Two Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM) lie to the north-east of this land allocation. Mitigation has already been provided; however, suggest strengthening of this text. Do not object to the principle of development within this allocation. 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		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
STRENGTHENING OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS IN REGARD TO CONSIDERATION OF ADJACENT SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
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.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
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."		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>EDDERTON - MU 1 Adjacent Glebe Cottage</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU 1 Adjacent Glebe Cottage Text MB 18 – Map 6.1 MB 19	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr W. Ritchie(514)		
A. I. Sutherland & Son Ltd(543)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed Use allocation (housing/business)	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Mr W. Ritchie(514)</u> Object to close proximity of industrial units to house as proposed.		
<u>A. I. Sutherland &amp; Son Ltd(543)</u> 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 already zoned for housing.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>Mr W. Ritchie(514)</u> DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed) -		
<u>A. I. Sutherland &amp; Son Ltd(543)</u> DELETION OF REFERENCE TO HOUSING POTENTIAL -		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (234)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<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>Housing and economic development are both supported by the planning system, 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 within Edderton 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>		



<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
--

None.
-------

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>EDDERTON - Development Factors</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Development Factors Text MB 18 – Map 6.1 MB 19	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Edderton Community Council(295)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Development Factors	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Objection sees the inclusion 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.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
INCLUSION OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE IMPROVEMENT OF UNCLASSIFIED EDDERTON TO MUDH-A-BLAIR ROAD.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
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. The emphasis of any consideration would be on the provision of necessary infrastructure improvements to facilitate a development to proceed.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>EDDERTON SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 18 – Map 6.1 MB 19	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Historic Scotland (495)		
Edderton Community Council (295)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Extension of settlement development area, addition of further housing and business allocations	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Historic Scotland (495)</u> has objected to the extension on the grounds that the inclusion of land to the north-west of the settlement has potential to cause significant direct impacts on the scheduled monument, also indicating that a potential access to the rear of Carri Blair Crescent had been removed with the approval of new houses removing this as a point of access.</p> <p><u>Edderton Community Council (295)</u> indicate that a further extension to the north-west boundary would facilitate a more harmonious development in the future.</p> <p>Also seek greater provision of business/industrial land in settlement, facilitated by the extension of the settlement boundary to the east, adjacent existing business use..</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>Historic Scotland (495)</u> OBJECTIONS RELATING TO IMPACT ON SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT</p> <p><u>Edderton Community Council (295)</u> SEEK EXTENSIONS TO SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (240)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p><u>Edderton Community Council (295)</u> The extension to the settlement boundary is to allow the development of an access to serve infill opportunities to the rear of existing development on Station Road/Carri Blair Crescent. The area of land is sufficient to form a road access outwith the immediate setting to the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and would afford greater separation than the SAM has from the existing Station Road. Further to this General Policy 4 Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage requires that the impact of proposed applications is considered in their determination. The land referred to does not form part of a formal allocation and other opportunities for infill development do exist within the settlement and any application is determined against all relevant policies.</p> <p>In regard to the removal of an alternative access to the rear of Carri Blair Crescent, the access track serving the new houses at this location did not have the capacity to support a larger number of houses.</p> <p>In respect of the desire to extend the settlement boundary further north-east; the settlement has a more than adequate supply to meet the demands of a growing community. The</p>		

potential for further allocations of land to serve future development will be the subject of a future review of the plan.

Historic Scotland (495)

The inclusion of scrub land within the local plan seeks to augment and replace previously identified business land within the settlement. The current allocation seeks to deliver opportunities for short to medium term business requirements. The development of this site is unlikely to require significant investment in terms of roads infrastructure improvements. A more significant proposal would require more significant improvement to road and junction. At this point in time demand for a greater level is not evidenced; however, monitoring of demand will feed towards future reviews of the plan.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>EMBO SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	General Comments/H1 North of Station House/MU1 West Embo/B1 Holiday Park Text MB 8 – Map 1.2 MB 9	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr A. Watt (157), S. M. Robertson (198), Mr & Mrs B. & I. Jones (145), Mr & Mrs D E Fraser (202), Mr T. Jamieson(227), J Jamieson (229), Dornoch Commnuity Council (254), D R Hadden (258), Mrs L. Robertson (281), Mr D. J. Williams (374), S Williams(375), Mrs M. MacKay (382), Mrs P. Waymouth (383), Mr G. Waymouth (384), D. E. Fraser (385), A. & H. Lyon (392), Mrs E. Wilson (393), Mrs C. Fitzpatrick (407), Mr B. Walters (408), Mrs J. K .Walters (409), C. Grigg (411), Mrs L. Moffat (417), Mr E. Moffat (424), P. Patton (432), S. Anderson (435), Mr G. Fitzpatrick (436), F. & J. Munro (437), J. Watt (444), Mrs J. Cumming (449), C. Gill (450), B. Shillinglaw (451), Mr G. Davidson (452), K. Davidson (453), L. Bissett (454), J. MacKay (455), H. McGrath (457), M. Cross (459), Mrs S. Cross (460), H Hercher(463), Mr A. MacDonald (465), Mrs S. MacDonald (466), Mr M. MacDonald (467), Mr & Mrs W. Hadden (471), D R Sutherland, (472), J. MacKay (475), J. & S. Collett (477), Mr & Mrs A. D. Hutton (478), J. R. Bower (480), E. A. Bower (481), Mr J. R .Cumming (483), K. Holmes (484), C. MacKay (486), Mr J. H. MacKay (487), C. MacKay (488), J. Calder (655), I. Roach (652), M. Roach (653), I. Cumming(654), R. Wilton (656), M. Murray (611)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>		
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><b>General Comments</b> Lack of facilities, no community hall, only post office still open, is housing need proven, private houses available, deficient drainage, water supply/pressure. Single track road to Dornoch dangerous and in need of improvement to twin track to accommodate increased traffic. Concerns with traffic levels to holiday park past village and development should not cross the by-pass. Prefer existing allocations within adopted plan to be retained, pursue compulsory purchase for these sites, no conflict with by-pass as sited on same side as village. Community buyout proposes to provide opportunities for new croft, housing allocations will not be required. Provision of affordable housing, will it be provided in the village or allowed to be bought out?</p> <p><b>H1 North of Station House</b> The specific objection to site H1 is that it is part of an area of public recreation. Proximity to natural heritage interests. Site seems isolated without inclusion of the land to the west, allocated in existing <a href="#">South East Sutherland Local Plan</a>.</p> <p>In regard to the environmental report objections to the Council's assessment of impacts, maintained objections relate to the impact on open space and the potential impact on natural heritage interests.</p> <p><b>MU1 West Embo</b> Consultation has not addressed the varying concerns raised; the allocation is on the "wrong-side" of the by-pass serving "Grannies Heilan Hame" B1 Holiday Park, allocation lies outwith existing settlement boundary, traffic safety concerns, current road standard does not accommodate or encourage pedestrians ie no pavement, crossing of lighting, traffic calming will lead to "old village" being used as rat run defeating the original function of by-pass and in any event will still result in busy traffic through the "new centre". Allocation should require re-routing of the by-pass to allow development to integrate with community. Allocation has been</p>		

previously considered and found not to be appropriate.

In regard to the environmental report objections to the Council's assessment of impacts, maintained objections relate to the impact on off-site road improvements and road safety measures. The relation of the allocation to a "bad neighbour" development, the allocation being contaminated and vacant land. The allocation being outwith the settlement boundary and the potential impact on natural heritage interests.

#### B1 Holiday Park

The impact of the existing development is significant on Embo; further development will only exacerbate this with increased traffic and further reduction of water pressure in high season. Access to the beach frontage is not shown. Draft plan fails to include line of potential new by-pass.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

MU1 West Embo DELETION OF ALLOCATION(assumed)

H1 North of Station House DELETION OF ALLOCATION(assumed)

B1 Holiday Park DELETION OF ALLOCATION(assumed)

#### **Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (240)**

##### **General Comments/MU1 West Embo**

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.

In regard to land previously allocated land (SE Sutherland LP) The landowner has ruled out a large portion of the option favoured by the many of the community, although H2 North of Station House represents the residue of this "option." Compulsory purchase of land is not an appropriate option where other land that can realistically be developed is available.

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.

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. The Local Plan makes reference to an improvement programme to the water supply for the wider area.

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.

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 delivery of traffic calming can be achieved through various physical forms and the introduction of a roundabout at the junction of the by-pass road and Embo Post Office Road would be a solution that would lead to significant reduction of traffic speeds on either sides of the roundabout.

In regard to the provision of affordable housing, the Council's [Affordable Housing Policy](http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4D7A7287-205C-41A9-9DE5-C91A0371962B/0/AFFORDABLEHOUSINGSPGrevisedAugust2008.pdf) is well established and the sequential approach to provision is contained within this adopted supplementary guidance. (<http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4D7A7287-205C-41A9-9DE5-C91A0371962B/0/AFFORDABLEHOUSINGSPGrevisedAugust2008.pdf>). The wider issue of the need for developer contributions will be addressed through General Policy 15 Developer Contributions.

The Environmental Report has addressed all matters appropriately in relation to the allocation.

#### **H1 North of Station House**

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.

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.

The Environmental Report has addressed all matters appropriately in relation to the allocation.

#### **B1 Holiday Park**

The Local Plan policy reflects the existing position in regard to the approved master plan for the future development of the Holiday Park site. The extent of the site is already covered by existing planning permissions and the allocation in the Local Plan reflects an existing approved development. The allocation does not propose any increase in numbers of caravans outwith those already granted planning permission. Access to the beach area is not compromised by these proposals.

#### **Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>GOLSPIE - H 3 Adjacent Macleod House</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 3 Adjacent Macleod House Text MB 10 – Map 2.1 MB 11	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr & Mrs P. O'Brien(346), Mr G. Mowat(521), M. I. MacBeath(524), A. L. Akers(131), D. & M. Bremner(190), S Doward(45)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Noise, disruption, access, adequate parking, availability of services, loss of view, property values, overlooking, anti-social behaviour and down sizing the playing field. Lack of local job opportunities.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF SITE (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (150)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>The allocation H3 Adjacent MacLeod House makes reference in the developer requirements section to the need to widen and improve the access road to meet other 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 does indicate the requirements expected to be provided as part of a development.</p> <p>The allocation does not impose upon the hockey pitch itself but to adjacent land. The plan identifies an adequate supply of land for business and employment opportunities.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>GOLSPIE - MU 1 Mackay House Hostel site</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	<b>MU 1 Mackay House Hostel site</b> Text MB 10 – Map 2.1 MB 11	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
G. Mclauchlin (649), C. Port (627), S. Morrison (592), H. Gibson (585), H. & D. Field (603), J Campbell (631)		
SEPA(311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>		
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>G. Mclaughlin (649), C. Port (627), S. Morrison (592), H. Gibson (585), H. &amp; D. Field (603), K. &amp; J. Macleod(637), J Campbell (631)</u>		
Objections relate to the allocation at the former MacKay Hostel as having potential for business use, with concerns raised relating to the potential increase in traffic flows through Fountain Road.		
<u>SEPA(311)</u>		
The reference to flood risk is not appropriate for this site.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>G. Mclaughlin (649), C. Port (627), S. Morrison (627), H. Gibson (585), H. &amp; D. Field (585), K. &amp; J. Macleod(637), J Campbell (631)</u>		
DELETION OF REFERENCE TO BUSINESS/RETAIL USE		
<u>SEPA(311)</u>		
DELETION OF REFERENCE TO FLOOD RISK		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (391)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<u>G. Mclaughlin (649), C. Port (627), S. Morrison (592), H. Gibson (585), H. &amp; D. Field (603), K. &amp; J. Macleod (637), J Campbell (631)</u>		
The potential for housing and/or business development is identified for the site giving potential options for the development of the site and is appropriate given the proximity of the site to business/retail services on the Main Street. The business/retail element of the plan refers to uses that can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area, this to be clarified in the text.		
<u>SEPA(311)</u>		
The reference to flood risk has been inserted in error at the last draft stage of the plan.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		

G Mclauchlin (649), C Port (627), S Morrison (627), H Gibson (585), H & D Field (585), J Campbell (631)

**INSERT NEW TEXT** after first sentence, "Restrict uses to those compatible with existing residential."

SEPA(311)

DELETE FINAL SENTENCE OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS, "*Need to investigate potential flood risk issue*"

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>GOLSPIE - MU 2 Drumuie</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU 2 Drumuie Text MB 10 – Map 2.1 MB 11	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
R. & J. MacKenzie(545), L. Dow(365)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed Use allocation/Housing business	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p>Current proposed developments in Brora, Dornoch and Golspie are out of proportion for current needs. Lack of detail of proposals for allocation. Planned housing development looks dull &amp; suburban. Too many houses, lack of need, loss of privacy, security and views, loss of trees, natural scrub and vegetation. Cramming of low-cost and rented housing together in the small field, should be fewer houses, a genuine mix and sympathetic to the rural environment.</p> <p>Concerned about the fate of the old farm Steading, although not listed, forms part of the curtilage of two neighbouring listed buildings. Concerned by the decision to persist with the existing access to the new council offices.</p> <p>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 Drumuie along with the natural scrub and vegetation.</p> <p>Implications for the wider infrastructure of Golspie to accommodate growth. Where will residents for this development come from?</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEK CHANGES TO REQUIREMENTS FOR SITE AND REQUIREMENT FOR TREE PLANTING SCHEME. (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>The development of Drumuie will deliver a mix of housing tenures across the site with the exact distribution being the subject of detailed planning applications.</p> <p>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 of housing within the settlement has in recent years been very low, 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.</p> <p>The Drumuie site is guided by the existing adopted <a href="#">Drumuie Development Brief</a>*. The current proposals for housing development are following the Framework 2 option of the brief with variations to the form and density of development.</p> <p>* (<a href="http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/F5B2200F-F81F-4040-A062-">http://www.highland.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/F5B2200F-F81F-4040-A062-</a></p>		

*65ABB0D24F57/0/DrummuieDevelopmentBrief.pdf)*

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 Drummuie Farm Steadings, these are the subject of a feasibility study to determine the options for the conversion or redevelopment of the site.

The Drummuie 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.

The Drummuie 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.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>GOLSPIE SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA - (H 5 Ben Bhraggie Drive (deleted)) Text MB 10 – Map 2.1 MB 11	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
M Cowie(526)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	SDA boundary/housing allocation (deleted)	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Initial objection to site allocated in previous draft of plan, maintained objection assumed to be on basis of continued inclusion of land within the SDA.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF ALLOCATION and CHANGE TO SDA BOUNDARY(assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (240)</b>		
The landowner has indicated a willingness to develop the land for housing how recent deciduous tree planting and creation of a cycle trail through the site brings into the question the potential for development in anything other than the long term. The potential for the development of the site will be the consideration of subsequent plan reviews.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>HELMSDALE - H 1 North of Rockview Place and I1 North of Industrial Estate</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 1 North of Rockview Place and I1 North of Industrial Estate Text MB 16 – Map 4.1 MB 17	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
H 1 North of Rockview Place: Mrs M. Sutherland(186)		
H 1 North of Rockview Place and I1 North of Industrial Estate S Blance Associates for landowner (H1/I1)(523)		
I1 North of Industrial Estate Transport Scotland(659)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing, Industrial allocations	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
H 1 North of Rockview Place <u>Mrs M. Sutherland(186)</u> Loss of greenfield land, increase in traffic and resultant conflict with existing play area. Impact on property values and loss of outlook.		
H 1 North of Rockview Place/ I1 North of Industrial Estate <u>S. Blance Associates for landowner (H1/I1)(523)</u> Seeking inclusion of entire field, within ownership for housing development and not split between housing and industrial uses. Propose housing/business mix of uses appropriate for home working with office/workshop attached to residence across whole ownership ie H1 and I1 with allocation being now mixed use.		
I1 North of Industrial Estate <u>Transport Scotland(659)</u> With regard to access, the developer requirements states “Access through improved existing road.” It is noted that the site is currently served by an existing access onto the A9(T), however, given the presumption against new junctions on trunk roads and for the avoidance of doubt, Transport Scotland would request the wording is changed to state that “Given the presumption against new trunk road junctions, access to be afforded through improved local road network”.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
H 1 North of Rockview Place <u>Mrs M. Sutherland(186)</u> DELETION OF SITE(assumed)		
H 1 North of Rockview Place/ I1 North of Industrial Estate <u>S. Blance Associates for landowner (H1/I1)(523)</u> SEEK MERGE OF LAND, IN THEIR OWNERSHIP, AT H1 NORTH OF ROCKVIEW PLACE AND I1 NORTH OF INDUSTRIAL ESTATE AS NEW MIXED USE ALLOCATION		

I1 North of Industrial Estate

Transport Scotland(659) SEEK AMENDMENT TO WORDING OF REQUIREMENT IN RELATION TO ACCESS

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (157)**

Response and Reasons

H 1 North of Rockview Place

Mrs M. Sutherland(186) 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. The issue of outlook is not a planning consideration but the amenity of existing. The consideration of a detailed application will include issues such as traffic safety and safe routes to school.

H 1 North of Rockview Place/ I1 North of Industrial Estate

S Blance Associates for landowner (H1/I1)(523) The allocation of land parallel to Rockview Place intends to make best use of the existing road and drainage infrastructure to allow residential development to take place in a manner consistent with the existing development pattern.

The allocation to the north of the holding relates well to existing industrial land allocation and offers the opportunity for the relocation of other industrial uses situated elsewhere in Helmsdale. The form of development contained within the existing industrial estate is not considered appropriate for integration with residential. and although the former police station has been the subject of development interest for housing purposes with the investigation of alternative access and indeed part of the building has received permission for conversion to a church hall.

I1 North of Industrial Estate

Transport Scotland(659) Accept the suggested wording in order to clarify the position in regard to the provision of an appropriate access. AMEND REQUIREMENTS TEXT to replace "Access through improved existing road." with "Given the presumption against new trunk road junctions, access to be afforded through improved local road network".

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>HELMSDALE - LT North Helmsdale/West of Primary School</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	LT North Helmsdale/West of Primary School Text MB 16 – Map 4.1 MB 17	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
Mr & Mrs Wood(329)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Long Term Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p>Objection relates to several issues, land used as croft land, current access is unsuitable, insufficient demand for housing on this scale, insufficient employment to sustain a development of this size, inadequate infrastructure, strain on the village's limited resources and the local economy. Recent closure of food shops in the village the remaining one does not meet the needs of the village. Trouble being caused by some young people will be exacerbated by a substantial increase in population, particularly if it brought with it large numbers of unemployed.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (220)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>The plan has allocated the land at North Helmsdale/West of Primary School 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 will the provision of an adequate access, potentially utilising the access to the school, with development This will require more significant investment and is for consideration in the longer term. Development would progress from the eastern side of the allocation through currently unused land.</p> <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 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.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>HELMSDALE - MU 1 Shore Street</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU 1 Shore Street Text MB 16 – Map 4.1 MB 17	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no):</b>		
SEPA(311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
SEPA recognise that the area of flood risk is intended to meet specific water based uses and seek clarification of this in the developer requirements.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SEEK AMENDMENT TO WORDING OF REQUIREMENTS IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL IN FLOOD RISK AREA.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (242)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
AMEND REQUIREMENTS TEXT to insert new sentence after 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence, “ <i>Only water-related or harbour uses would be acceptable within flood risk areas.</i> ”		
<u>Reasons –</u>		
The Council accept the need for clarification of the intended function of the area of the allocation subject to flood risk		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
AMEND REQUIREMENTS TEXT to insert new sentence after 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence, “ <i>Only water-related or harbour uses would be acceptable within flood risk areas.</i> ”		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>INVERSHIN SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AREA AND H1 FORMER BALBLAIR WORKINGS</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	SDA and H1 Former Balblair Workings Text MB 26 – Map 8.3 MB 27	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Invershin Hall Committee(102)		
S. Chalmers(362)		
SNH (326)		
SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	SDA boundary, H1 Former Balblair Workings	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Invershin Hall Committee(102)</u> Seek change to the village boundaries for Invershin, removal of Balblair area.		
<u>S. Chalmers(362)</u> 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.		
<u>SNH (326)</u> Reduction in SDA around Invershin Farm to hold back from the river (SAC). 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.		
<u>SEPA (311)</u> Recommends the allocation boundary is modified to more accurately reflect the medium to high flood risk areas.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>Invershin Hall Committee(102), S. Chalmers(362)</u> MODIFICATION TO SDA AT BALBLAIR WORKINGS		
<u>SNH (326)</u> AMEND SDA AT INVERSHIN FARM PREPARATION OF AN APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT		
<u>SEPA (311)</u> AMEND SDA ALONG RIVER		

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (302)**Response and Reasons

Invershin Hall Committee(102), Sandy Chalmers(362) We enlarged 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.

SNH (326) Land within the SDA is not a carte blanche for development and there is no site allocation for development around Invershin Farm. Proposals will be considered on its merits and if necessary would be subject to Appropriate Assessment. An Appropriate Assessment has been prepared in liaison with Scottish Natural Heritage, the consideration of impacts of development did not identify impacts that have not been addressed by amendments to general policies. No adverse effects on site integrity as a result of this decision.

SEPA (311) There is already a developer requirement for a flood risk assessment to be submitted with any planning application and for housing to be kept back from the river. Given the very low density nature of the proposals, this will be readily achieved. We have added 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".

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>KINLOCHBERVIE - H1 South Of Mackenzie Square</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Development plan Reference:</b>	H1 South of Mackenzie Square Text MB 36 - Map 12.1 MB 37	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs M. Campbell (63) Trust Housing Association (159) D. & M. O'Driscoll (520)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Disruption of environment, wildlife habitat, and view from MacKenzie Square to Loch Inchard. 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. The land appears to be unsuitable for development, being a croft but being composed largely of rock and marsh. Feel H3 would be more suitable site, breaking up developments. Concern over the access arrangements.</p> <p>Questions raised: Demand for more housing? Why not specifically allocate for affordable housing? The site H2 is on a steep slope which has been levelled with infill, would this be stable? How servicing difficulties affect proposed development East of Bervie Road?</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE the allocation		
Or in the case of the Trust Housing Association ensure that resident's issues are considered when proposals are developed for this site.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>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 links between housing and economic development are well founded and 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 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 anyone will have the opportunity to comment on this.</p> <p>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 site's topography along with careful design the impact on existing residents can be reduced and this is encouraged.</p>		

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 access difficulties made the land to the north of Manse Road and further development extending Bervie road unfeasible.

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. It is not allocated for purely affordable as this is within the landowner's discretion, however the affordable housing policy which seeks a contribution will be applied.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>KINLOCHBERVIE - H2 Land at Cnoc Ruadh</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H2 Land at Cnoc Ruadh Text MB 36 - Map 12.1 MB 37	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
SEPA (311) Miss K. Holland (588)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
SEPA - Category 2 and therefore developer requirements needs to be amended.		
The area is open croft land. Feels that sites H1 and H2 are at least in keeping with existing residential housing. Questions demand for housing.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
Miss K. Holland Delete site.		
SEPA would withdraw its objection provided the allocation boundaries are modified to exclude the medium to high flood risk areas and the wording "Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area" is inserted into the Developer Requirements.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
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 of this the 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.		
To meet the housing land requirements it is not an 'either, or' choice. The land north of Innes Place is now only available in the longer term beyond the 5 year lifespan of this Local Plan. H2 came through our Strategic Environmental Assessment as a good site in environmental terms. Importantly it is considered that housing will fit well into the landform here and that it is well located close to services. Also it is common grazings and not considered to be locally important croft land.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
COMMEND CHANGE to reflect revised SEPA wording and amendment of allocation boundary to exclude 1 in 200 year flood risk area.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>KINLOCHBERVIE - H3 Land South East of Kinlochbervie Hotel</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H3 Land South East of Kinlochbervie Hotel Text MB 36 - Map 12.1 MB 37	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
J. K. E. M. Morrison (223)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
It is a croft; there are hundreds of acres outwith the village between Kinlochbervie & Oldshoremore which could be developed; promoting development in the village is against the wishes of the residents. Residents of Manse Road could end up viewing a large block of concrete.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE allocation		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>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.</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 which was then being considered at Manse Road was of a higher value as it is of better arable quality. The viable and suitable options in Kinlochbervie are severely limited already by ground conditions, ownership and topography. Whilst it is recognised that it is not an ideal site because it is inbye croft land it is considered that in the context of having thoroughly explored the opportunities it should have our support because of its wider community benefit allowing for growth.</p> <p>This meets with the sentiment of the Scottish Governments report on the possible use of occupancy conditions in crofting which suggests that, "it is important to ensure land is available for housing developments..." and it goes on to suggest that, "repealing provisions that allow for decrofting will severely limit housing development that are vital for sustaining crofting communities."</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>KINLOCHBERVIE - I1 Reclaimed Land At Loch Bervie Harbour</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	I1 Reclaimed land at Loch Bervie Harbour Text MB 36 - Map 12.1 MB37	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Business and Industry allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
See proposed modification below.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
CHANGE WORDING OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT		
To state that Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area. Only water related or harbour uses would be acceptable within the flood risk areas.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
In recognition that this better clarifies the position and reflects national policy guidance.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
COMMEND CHANGE to reflect SEPA wording.		



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>KINLOCHBERVIE – LT1 North Of Innes Place</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	LT1 North of Innes Place Text MB 36 - Map 12.1 MB 37	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs M. Munro (166) H. MacNeil (194) J. K. E. M. Morrison (223) Crofters Commission (321)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Long term allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Concern over lack of employment prospects and questions whether there is demand for housing. Questions: where the play park would it be relocated to? and where would the compensatory parking be? and why not use the Health Centre road for access? Concern about access through Innes Place for lorries.</p> <p>It is a croft and there are hundreds of acres outwith the village between Kinlochbervie &amp; Oldshoremore which could be developed; promoting development in the village is against the wishes of the residents. Residents of Manse Road could end up viewing a large block of concrete.</p> <p>Crofters Commission 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.</p> <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>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE THE ALLOCATION although perhaps H MacNeil's objection is subject to the detail of what is proposed in terms of access, parking compensation and relocation of the play park being worked through.		

<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>The owner of this croft does not want to see this land developed within the next ten years therefore this site was 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 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 will need to be considered in more detail if and when proposals are drafted. A draft layout could be used to support its inclusion as an allocation when the plan is under review again in the future. The construction traffic arrangements will be dealt with if/when any detailed planning application comes forward.</p> <p>Whilst this land is inbye croft land it was considered on the basis of feedback from our site options consultation 'Sutherland Futures' that other land which was then being considered at Manse Road was of a higher value as it is of better arable quality. The viable and suitable options for development in Kinlochbervie are severely limited already by crofting, ground conditions, ownership and topography. It is recognised that it is not an ideal site because it is inbye croft land. It is considered however that in the context of having thoroughly explored the opportunities within the settlement and readily accessible to services it should have our support because of its wider community benefit of allowing for growth.</p> <p>This meets with the sentiment of the Scottish Government's report on the possible use of occupancy conditions in crofting which suggests that, "it is important to ensure land is available for housing developments..." and it goes on to suggest that, "repealing provisions that allow for decrofting will severely limit housing development that are vital for sustaining crofting communities."</p>
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LAIRG - C1 North-West Of Ferrycroft</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	C1 North-west of Ferrycroft Text MB 28 - Map 9.1 MB 29	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
SNH (326)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Community allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p>Recommends that the developer requirements include an indication of the nature of possible community use. Recommends that the allocation is retained as primarily open land and that any built development should be sensitively sited and designed with regard to the views across the loch.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL COMMUNITY USES		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (301)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p><u>Reasons</u> – The developer requirements will not indicate the nature of possible community use as this is currently unknown. However the developer requirements will be amended to include, “Any development should be sensitively sited and designed with regard to the views from across the loch”.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
<p>COMMEND AMENDMENT OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Amend developer requirements to include, “Any development should be sensitively sited and designed with regard to the views from across the loch”.</p>		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LAIRG - H1 South-West Of Main Street</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 South-west of Main Street Text MB 28 - Map 91 MB 29	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs M. Ross(46) Lairg Estate(153) Lairg Community Council(188) Mr & Mrs D. A. Walker(189) E. Ross(344)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>		
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Mrs M Ross(46), E. Ross(344), Mr &amp; Mrs D. A. Walker(189)</u>		
<p>Lairg is a small village with an eradicated community spirit and cannot sustain a larger population as there is no work. 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.</p>		
<p><u>Lairg Community Council(188)</u> Object to future development of these areas until employment is created within Lairg. Should development go ahead this would put a strain on infrastructure i.e. medical, care of the elderly services etc. Housing would be occupied by ageing/retiring population and as second homes. Prime agricultural Land would be lost</p>		
<p><u>Lairg Estate(153)</u> Wish amendments to wording regarding access and the Masterplan for the site.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>Mrs M. Ross(46), E. Ross(344), Lairg Community Council(188) , Mr &amp; Mrs D. A. Walker(189)</u> DELETION OF ALLOCATION (S) (assumed)		
<p><u>Lairg Estate(153)</u> AMENDMENTS TO REQUIREMENTS REGARDING ACCESS AND THE MASTERPLAN FOR THE SITE.</p>		

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (289)**Response and Reasons

Developer requirements have been amended since previous draft to cover relating to design, preparation of a masterplan, and flood risk.

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.

Housing capacity for allocations is only indicative and will be negotiated during the planning applications process.

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.

The landowner has indicated that the land is available for development. Although the land has an agricultural value it is not classified as prime agricultural land. The development plan does need to identify land for the future development of the settlement and this site does offer a sustainable location at the edge of the settlement.

Amend first point to read, "Existing access to the site could be acceptable for a small number of additional units. A new access via the A836 would be required for any large scale development of the site".

Amend third point to read, "Masterplan required for large scale development of the site to ensure houses are carefully designed to fit with the undulating landform. This Masterplan should also take account of the allocation at MU1".

These changes will allow for a small number of houses to be added to the site subject to agreement regarding the suitability of any existing access points. However, it still stresses that any large scale development, including long term phased development of the site, should be developed via a Masterplan for the entire site.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC****AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS**

Amend first point to read, "Existing access to the site could be acceptable for a small number of additional units. A new access via the A836 would be required for any large scale development of the site".

Amend third point to read, "Masterplan required for large scale development of the site to ensure houses are carefully designed to fit with the undulating landform. This Masterplan should also take account of the allocation at MU1".

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LAIRG - H2 North Of Manse Road</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H2 North of Manse Road Text MB 28 - Map 91 MB 29	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
J. B. H & K Norton(193)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
Access to Springfield not shown or is it intended to provide a different access within the planning consent. How is electrical MU Supply line to be diverted that crosses the site. Land requires extensive draining and water course diversion. On street parking on Manse Road to be resolved by provision of lay-bys or alternative parking areas (off street). Redevelopment limited to 1.5 storeys or less? Design of housing and on street parking. Question allocation with the high infrastructure costs.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE OF ALLOCATION (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (290)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<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 has been amended to remove the land at Springfield and its access from the allocation and also the land at Tynron.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This site usefully adds to the choice of sites for housing within Lairg. Ultimately it will be for a developer to determine whether or not the site is viable in the prevailing economic climate.</p> <p>Both these issues would be dealt with in detail at planning application stage once there are defined proposals available.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LAIRG - LT 1 North Of Milnclarin</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	LT 1 North of Milnclarin Text MB 28 - Map 91 MB 29	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr Sutherland (340)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Long Term - Housing	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p>Consider access to LT1 from Manse Road/Back Road to be unsuitable. This has been one of our concerns. Present access from Milnclarin limits the number of houses which could be built in this area. Concerns regarding any excavations or vibrations in the area of our services.</p> <p>Seek assurance that services will not be disturbed by any development in this area after any scheme is completed. Site is subject to flood risk.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE ALLOCATION (assumed)		
Objector has not indicated that they wish issue taken forward for examination however, neither have they withdrawn.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (296)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<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> <p>Requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment is contained in the Developer Requirements.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Disturbance is not a planning issue but a matter for project management of the construction process, although operations during construction can be controlled through planning condition. There is already a developer requirement for a flood risk assessment to be done for this allocation.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LAIRG - LT2 North-West Of Lochside</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	LT2 North-west of Lochside Text MB 28 - Map 91 MB 29	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs V. Willoughby(178)		
J. B. H. & K. Norton(193)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Long Term - Housing	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Mrs V. Willoughby(178)</u> 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. Need bigger school/doctors/police/transport.</p> <p><u>J. B. H. &amp; K. Norton(193)</u> Manse Road is not suitable for an additional 50 to 75 vehicles as there is no full footpath both sides especially at bottom, no provision for off street parking on Manse Road. 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. Access will be required to ensure safe ingress and egress and better sightlines provided. Query capacity of drainage (foul and storm) system. Need for additional facilities for the young population. Footpath extension required. Is there intention to use compulsory purchase on this site?</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETION OF ALLOCATION (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (297)</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></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</p>		



planning application process.

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.

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 sites become ineffective. If a planning application is lodged for this site it will state how many housing units are proposed for the site. It would be at this stage that a detailed response on footpath requirements could be provided.

There are no compulsory purchase intentions with this site.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LAIRG - MU1 Former Hotel/Outbuildings</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU1 Former hotel/outbuildings Text MB 28 - Map 91 MB 29	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mrs M. Ross(46)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed Use – Tourist accommodation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
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.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
REMOVAL OF RESTRAINTS TO DEVELOPMENT IN REGARD TO PRESERVATION OF TREES (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (293)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
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 and will be protected under General Policy 4 of the Plan.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LOCHINVER - H1 Sheep Pens north Of Inver Park</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 Sheep pens north of Inver Park Text MB 30 - Map 10.1 MB 31	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr G. Dougall (249) SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Objections</u> G. Dougall Taking away yet more natural landscape, closeness of development to our property, would developers install or fund screening e.g. wood fencing to east of our property, would raise objections if new builds more than 1 ½ storey buildings</p> <p>SEPA Objection unless connection to public sewer is added.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p>G. Dougall DELETE allocation (assumed)</p> <p>SEPA Add developer requirement for connection to public sewer.</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>The Council is satisfied that this site is well related to Lochinver and there is capacity within the landform. SNH have not objected to this site.</p> <p>When/if there are detailed plans will depend on the landowner's intentions. The Local Plan identifies suitable sites and gives the developers/landowners certainty that the principle of development is established on these sites.</p> <p>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 from the construction process can be controlled by standard conditions on working hours and access. Mr Dougall's letter has been forwarded to the landowner's representative so they are aware of the potential opportunity to acquire Tigh Guithais.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is considered that the application of Policy 7 is appropriate rather than a requirement for</p>		

connection to public sewer. It may be that the applicant can demonstrate points 1 and 2 which relate to the economic feasibility and not being likely to cause significant environmental health problems. In this case connection to the public sewer would go beyond these requirements and may stymie development.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LOCHINVER - H2 Cnoc A Mhuillin</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H2 Cnoc A Mhuillin Text MB 30 - Map 10.1 MB 31	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland (268) Scottish Natural Heritage (326) D. & M. MacLeod (506)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Objections</u></p> <p>Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland Concerned that it would detract from the privacy of the manse which would also lower its value. They would prefer if the building of houses proceeds, to have the entry from the Stoer road about 300 m from the main road junction. They feel 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>Scottish Natural Heritage 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> <p>SNH fully recognises the need for more housing in this area. Believe that this could be developed to better recognise and protect the local character of Lochinver and the nationally important Assynt Coigach NSA. Having considered the draft layout produced SNH is concerned about the density and visual impact of proposals which they feel will adversely impact on the setting and the character of the NSA. This site is on the edge of the settlement and should follow the existing dispersed pattern of housing.</p> <p>D. &amp; M. MacLeod They contend that tourism is surviving and growing and one of the main industries left in the West Highlands and it is most obvious that inappropriately sited development would discourage tourists impacting on the economy. Lochinver was voted seventh most beautiful village in Scotland and is a very highly rated destination, the tourism offered is sustainable unlike many other economies and as such it is essential that this can be retained within the area benefiting the local community. They also want to retain darkness without street lights.</p> <p>They feel this is an attractive approach to a settlement which has been developed around the head of the loch and is in harmony with the surrounding environment. The most obvious impression of this is from the water, but from the many views of Lochinver from the surrounding area the character is undoubtedly that of a coastal village with probably one of the most impressive backdrops in the country.</p> <p>They ask whether any guidance is provided in the Landscape Capacity study. They feel that the extent of this site does not take into account the existing landscape character. The ground rises steeply from Lochinver and is typical of the unique Assynt landscape. They</p>		

suggest that the most northerly part of the site should be removed from H2 and a smaller area could potentially be developed with minimum impact. This could be integrated within the landscape and contribute to the existing character of Lochinver.

H1 area has previously been considered for development so they question why more emphasis is not being placed on it. They feel it would appear to have much less impact on the area particularly on the skyline, backdrop to Lochinver and arrival/exit to the village. They consider it has greater potential for numbers of houses long term, with a built in gradient to assist services.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland

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.

D. & M. MacLeod and SNH

In earlier drafts of the plan the area of land suggested for exclusion by the MacLeod's was different to that originally suggested for exclusion by SNH. SNH were concerned about development on the southern side of the knolly ridge whereas the MacLeod's concern is over the northern part of the site.

After considering a draft proposed layout SNH expressed concern over the density including the northerly area of this site. SNH objects to this allocation unless the housing capacity is reduced to an appropriate level and the developer requirements include that any application will need to be accompanied by a design statement that is agreed by THC in consultation with SNH (Assynt Coigach NSA) and that housing is limited to 1 ½ storey.

#### **Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**

##### Response and Reasons

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.

It is considered that H2 should continue to be supported. The detail of street lighting and privacy issues can be considered as part of any planning application coming forward. Then the Highland Council will consider the detail of what is proposed, including the siting and design and there will be the opportunity for anyone to make representations for the Council's consideration.

The council appreciates the concern expressed by D. & M. MacLeod and SNH about the development of this site in terms of landscape impact. The site's 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 development should be limited to 1 ½ storey housing. The removal of areas is not considered necessary.

The Landscape Capacity study only identified a small area within the allocation as suitable for development. However the two sites it identifies in Lochinver are not effective, at Baddidarrach because the road network predicated against further development, and north of Inver Park because of ground conditions.

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. On considering specific points in relation to density of housing proposed on the south of the ridge it is considered that the housing capacity should be reduced to 10. It is not agreed that 6 houses will necessarily be inappropriate for the remainder of the site. This will ultimately be a matter to consider in detail with the submission of the full application and design statement. It is recognised that our capacity figures are indicative, and the Local Plan states, "At planning application stage a more detailed appraisal will be undertaken of the actual site capacity in the context of assessing whether the developer's scheme is appropriate."

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

COMMEND 1½ storey housing across the whole site and for the design statement to be considered in consultation with SNH. Also commend a change to the indicative capacity of the site from 12 to 10.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LOCHINVER - H3 Glencanisp</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H3 Glencanisp Text MB 30 - Map 10.1 MB 31	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr N. Gorton (62) Bidwells (540) SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
SEPA The allocation should be 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 and required within the developer requirements.		
Mr N. Gorton Objects to the cost of building a new road and the effect on the environment.		
Bidwells Clients currently have a sporting lease over the Glebe lands and accordingly have an interest in this area. 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. Concern that development would not be in keeping with the designation of this area as a National Scenic Area.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
N. Gorton DELETE allocation		
Bidwells UNCLEAR and it could be inferred that they are not against the principle of development or the provisions in the Local Plan. They state that 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.		
SEPA DELETE this allocation.		



**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**Response and Reasons

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 considered by affordable housing agencies 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 recognised that the capacity should be reassessed when reviewing the Local Plan.

There are developer requirements for this site seeking development to be sensitively sited within the crochan 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. It is acknowledged that the road requires upgrading and the detail will be considered with any planning application if/when it comes forward.

Whilst this site lies outwith the village there is a shortage of effective land within Lochinver. In Assynt the housing completions data has indicated that the majority of development has occurred within the townships and wider countryside rather than within Lochinver. Therefore the Highland Small Community Housing Trust have been working with the Assynt Foundation to develop their housing proposals for this site. They are in the process of tendering for a full feasibility study and one of the key considerations for them will be, 'as far as possible socially and physically connect the proposed development with the main village'.

In recognition that to avoid significant environmental problems, as per General Policy 7 on Waste Water Treatment the level of treatment will need to meet Scottish Water adoptable standards. This is reflected in the tender brief along with the need to work with Scottish Water and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency on this matter.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

COMMEND CHANGE TO DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT to ask for Scottish Water adoptable standard for waste water treatment.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LOCHINVER - I1 Culag Harbour</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	I1 Culag Harbour Text MB 30 - Map 10.1 MB 31	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Business and Industry allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
See modification sought.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
CHANGE WORDING OF DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT to state that Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area. Only water related or harbour uses would be acceptable within the flood risk areas.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
To reflect amended SEPA wording which offers better clarity as to the Highland Council's position on flood risk on this site.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
<u>Response</u>		
COMMEND CHANGE suggested to developer requirement.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>LOCHINVER - Settlement Development Area</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 30 - Map 10.1 MB 31	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Albyn Housing Society (499) H. MacDonald (210) Scottish Natural Heritage (326)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Albyn Housing Society The density changes to H3 welcomed but concern that the Plan falls short in addressing the lack of land for development in the Lochinver area which is uniquely constrained by topography and geology and this begs the question: Is this plan going to deliver effective land? A response to this might be to take a (perhaps more radical) look at the land south and west of the river towards the harbour which might benefit from a more in-depth analysis of all sites within the settlement boundary to look at issues of commercial relocation, the scope for development within and around the Culag Wood, alternative uses for existing buildings and the scope, if any, to examine whether the edges of the playing field offer any scope for development in the event that there could be some flexibility in the playing field location.</p> <p>H. MacDonald 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 a shed or barn. There needs to be exceptions to the Local Plan which help crofters regenerate their land more easily.</p> <p>Scottish Natural Heritage See modification sought.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p>Albyn Housing Society They would like additional housing allocations and feel that this could be achieved through relocation of commercial uses and potentially at the playing field if an alternative site can be found.</p> <p>H. MacDonald Include Baddidarroch within the SDA.</p> <p>Scottish Natural Heritage All allocations should be limited to 1½ storey housing. Regarding the extension to the SDA to the south, in the Culag area, and the relevant bullet point under Development Factors, SNH suggests that the proposed new crofts be described as “forest crofts” and that the wording under Development Factors is changed, to reflect the link to “effective woodland practice” as described at 3.4.1(d) in the plan.</p>		

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**Response and Reasons

An amendment was made in order to offer scope for forest croft development at Culag woodlands. The scope for development in Culag wood is limited by the terms of the lease held by the Culag Community Woodland Trust (CCWT). Forest crofts are therefore considered the only housing development that may comply with the aspirations of the CCWT and the terms of their lease. The area has therefore been supported for this type of development through inclusion within the SDA with a development factor encouraging forest crofts.

If any proposal comes forward for the relocation of commercial uses or the playing field then these can be considered on their merits. The playing field lies within the SDA and is not specifically allocated as open space. Therefore it is not safeguarded at that location. Applications would fall to be considered on their merits and against the General Policies of the Local Plan.

Furthermore it is considered that a sufficient housing land supply has been identified considering that the housing allocations will be supplemented as historically has been the case by small scale or single house development.

It is felt that a restriction to one and half storey across all the allocations is perhaps too prescriptive and we should consider proposals on H1 and H3 on their merits. Particularly in the case of H1 where the landform should be able to accommodate some two storey development.

Baddidaroch is not included within the Settlement Development Area (SDA) 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. Therefore anyone should discuss with the Council any proposals and get advice.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

COMMEND CHANGE TO THE DEVELOPMENT FACTOR to mention effective woodland practice.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>MELNESS – Melness General Comment, Settlement Development Area And Policy 17 Commerce</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	General Comment, Settlement Development Area and Policy 17 Commerce Text MB 42 - Map 14.2 MB 43	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Melness Crofters Estate (528) Tongue Community Council (242)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area and General Policy	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Tongue Community Council What agreement for building development outwith the plan map because in Midtown and Skinnnet no development allowed by landowner except for crofts to allow stock movement from crofts to common grazing. Therefore concern regarding overcrowding of development.</p> <p>Melness Crofters Estate Regarding the "Small Village" categorisation of Melness and the criteria within Policy 17 (Commerce), the Board notes that the Council does not feel that this disadvantages Melness. The Board, however, still considers that, because Melness lies some 5 miles from Tongue across the Kyle of Tongue, and there is no public transport between the two communities, it is only fair that jobs services and amenities should be encouraged to locate in Melness as well as in Tongue.</p> <p>Would help to retain younger people in Melness, particular difficulty at present due to the lack of such provision in Melness. The Board suggests that Melness and Tongue (or the Kyle of Tongue) should be considered together as one "Sub-area Centre" in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Regarding the community's desired extension of the SDA to the south, the Board considers that, in particular, a large site to the north of Midtown has long been identified by the community as the most practical site (the only suitably flat site on which to play football) for a sports pitch and building (ref: outline planning permission, 00/00112/OUTSU, approved 25/08/00). The Board therefore requests that this site is allocated in the Plan. Suggest that the SDA should be extended at Eilean Creagach as it is included in the proposed pier redevelopment.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p>ADDITIONAL SDA's for other townships and WIDER EXISTING MELNESS SDA (assumed) – Tongue Community Council</p> <p>CATEGORISE MELNESS as a small village, ALLOCATE LAND granted outline planning permission at 00/00112/OUTSU for erection of a sports/leisure building, and extend the SDA at Talmine Pier to include Eilean Creagach - Melness Crofters Estate.</p>		

<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>
--

<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></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 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>Part of the judgement of proposals within the SDA will be in terms of how compatible they are with the existing pattern of development which will prevent overcrowding. There will be scope for developments outwith the SDA subject to the provisions of wider countryside policy and any natural and cultural heritage features.</p> <p>It is considered that since there is no general presumption against it is not suitable here to allocate land for a sports pitch or sports building. This position reflects the sites relative sensitivity. The detail will be important in determining the suitability or otherwise of a proposal because it lies outwith the established linear pattern of development at Midtown. With regards to proposed extension of SDA onto Eilean Creagach given the prominence of the location within the NSA and the potential landscape impact it should not be included within the Settlement Development Area. This also reflects the sites relative sensitivity. Proposals should be considered on their merits the detail will determine its suitability or otherwise. It should be noted that the majority of this land is within a 1 in 200 year flood risk area and will therefore only be suitable for water related and harbour uses.</p> <p>Acknowledging the points made by the Melness Crofters Estate in this representation it is considered that the change should be made to reflect the complementary services provided in the communities of Tongue and Melness and so that applications are considered on the same terms for Policy 17.</p>
---

<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
--

<p>COMMEND CHANGE POLICY 17 to include Melness/Tongue as a sub area centre and carry that change into the vision of the plan mentioning Melness in 4.21 of the plan as a key village. Also acknowledge that Scourie having been mentioned as a key village in 4.21 should have been included as a sub area centre in policy 17.</p>
---

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>MELNESS - H1 West of Joseph Mackay Court</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 West of Joseph Mackay Court Text MB 42 - Map 14.2 MB 43	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Scottish Natural Heritage (326) Tongue Community Council (242)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Scottish Natural Heritage 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.</p> <p>Tongue Community Council West of H1 above settlement area deemed suitable for development by land owner</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p>Scottish Natural Heritage SNH maintains its strong recommendation (given this is within a NSA) that a design statement is required here to take account of landform and views and that this should be agreed by THC in consultation with SNH. It is SNH's view that there is scope only for one more unit behind those at JMC and that it should be limited in height to 1½ storey. Further development of this allocation should be from the access point indicated at the west and should follow a linear pattern along the road, enhancing the appearance of the existing development.</p> <p>Tongue Community Council Extend H1 to west (assumed)</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Responses and Reason</u>		
<p>A design statement is a necessary safeguard within the NSA. It is felt that there may be scope for more than one additional unit in the area behind the JMC development (at the eastern end of the H1 allocation) however the advice of SNH will be taken into consideration when dealing with any planning application. Land directly adjacent H1 on its western edge lies within the Settlement Development Area which offers adequate support for any proposals that come forward.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
<p>COMMEND SNH REQUIRMENT regarding need for design statement in consultation with SNH.</p>		





<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>MELNESS – MU1 West of Craggan Hotel</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU1 West of Craggan Hotel Text MB 42 - Map 14.2 MB 43	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr J. P. Mackay (367) Tongue Community Council (242) Mr D. MacLennan (552) J. Mackay (316)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>Mr J. P. Mackay A crofter who has already applied to acquire this land for development. He is concerned that the Highland Council is proposing to develop his croft land and the impact this allocations development would have. He is concerned that it would encroach on the privacy of himself and guests. As the land in question is much higher he feels that the residents of the houses would be looking directly into his bedrooms, lounge and bar. It would interfere with any future development of the hotel. He has various concerns over the access, potential to interfere with deliveries, along with surface water drainage concerns.</p> <p><i>(Background: The site came forward for consideration as one of the community's suggestions which were collated by the community council and submitted during the early stages of the Local Plan review. A letter was sent in March 2008 after several attempts to phone him were unsuccessful. An explanation of how the site was identified and the purpose of the Local Plan was clarified along with the fact that the Highland Council had no intentions to develop this land. It was explained that its allocation would establish the principle of development on this land when considering any future planning application. The land is currently community owned by the Melness Crofters Trust.)</i></p>		
<u>Other objections</u>		
Suggestion that land to the south-west of MU2 suitable for housing and development.		
Concern regarding overcrowding of development. Township and beyond lies within a National Scenic Area - development would have a detrimental effect on the landscape, sits prominently on the skyline and will be visible from a considerable distance. The settlement pattern is linear and therefore 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 as only infill fits with the strong existing settlement pattern.		
The proposed area is of some archaeological significance having foundations dating to either pre or just past clearance i.e. about 1800 or before. There have neither been recorded or excavated. There is also a 19th century artefact in the area.		
The predominant ground conditions are rock and as such development extremely difficult. There are extensive drainage problems with the site and at the rear of his property resulting from numerous springs occurring over the total site area. Access to the site will be difficult to achieve.		

Any connection to the foul drainage network would result in a requirement to track a considerable distance to secure a suitable connection point and concern that there are capacity issues within the existing network. Any connections to existing utilities would require significant upgrading works which could have a detrimental effect on the landscape.

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

EXTEND the then MU2 (now MU1) to South West - Tongue Community Council

UNCLEAR - Mr J. P. Mackay

DELETE ALLOCATION (assumed) – J. Mackay

UNCLEAR - Appropriate development of the Craggan Hotel might not be objective however housing or light commercial development would be totally objectionable - David MacLennan

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**

Response and Reasons

Any developer is required 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.

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.

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. If sensitively approached development can be accommodated here without having a negative impact on the NSA. If/when a planning application comes forward anyone has the opportunity to make representation on the detail of what is proposed. Proposed extension to south and west could be considered with the detail of any planning application but the landscape impact within the NSA may predicate against this.

There is no scheduled status and the Highland Council archaeology unit does not have any records relating to this land. The potential presence of archaeological remains can be dealt with if/ when a planning application gets submitted.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>PITTENTRAIL – MU1 Mart And Adjoining Land</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU1 Mart and adjoining land Text MB12 – Map 5.1 MB12	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
SEPA(311) Mr D.L. & Mrs M.A. Butterworth(620)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed Use – (Housing/Business/Commercial)	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>SEPA (311)</u> Allocation is in a Category 2 Flood Risk area. Would like allocation boundary amended to exclude the medium to high flood risk areas and the wording, “Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area” to be inserted into the developer requirements.</p> <p><u>Mr D.L. &amp; Mrs M.A. Butterworth(620)</u> Land would require raising because of the railway line and flooding which would mean loss of views. Contamination survey required.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p><u>SEPA (311)</u> AMENDMENT OF SITE BOUNDARY AND ADDITIONAL WORDING TO DEVELOPER REQUIRMENTS</p> <p><u>Mr D.L. &amp; Mrs M.A Butterworth(620)</u> DELETION OF SITE (assumed)</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p><u>SEPA (311)</u> By keeping the potential flood risk area within the site allocation, it allows for it to be included and taken into account fully within the flood risk assessment for the entire site. By stating in the developer requirements that built development should avoid the flood risk area, it ensures that once the outcome from the flood risk assessment is known, no built development will be allowed on areas that through the assessment may have been identified more accurately as being affected by flood risk. It may also allow the potential for work to be undertaken as part of a development scheme to alleviate the potential flood risk in the area. Amend last line of developer requirements to read, “Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area”.</p> <p><u>Mr D.L. &amp; Mrs M.A Butterworth(620)</u> Loss of private views is not a material planning consideration. The site already has developer requirements for a flood risk assessment and a contamination assessment. The results of such assessments would inform the nature of the specific development proposals and any particular mitigation measures to be included. There is opportunity through development to bring about improvements on this site which is in a prime location within the settlement.</p>		

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

AMEND DEVELOPER REQUIREMENTS TEXT.

Amend last line of developer requirements to read, "Flood Risk Assessment will be required, built development to avoid flood risk area".

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>POINT OF STOER - H1 West of the school</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 West of the school	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Assynt Crofters Trust (140) Mr I. MacLeod (144) Free Church of Scotland Assynt Congregation (293)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing Allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
<p>There is no actual title to the ground, 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. Also concern expressed about the scale of housing proposed next to the existing resident who chose a quiet retirement.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE the allocation		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<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. With regards to the quietness of the area, this is not a planning reason for limiting the capacity of the site. However disruption with the construction phase can be controlled through conditions on the planning consent.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>POINT OF STOER - MU South of the Radio Mast</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU South of the Radio Mast Text MB32 Map 10.2 MB32	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Assynt Crofters Trust (140)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed Use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objections</u>		
Assynt Crofters Trust understood that Clashnessie Common Grazing Committee has been in contact with the Council regarding the correct boundaries of the shaded area. Otherwise the Trust, as landowner, supports the site being included. However the number of units may be unrealistic, given the number of amenities, services in the area.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
Correction of the boundary of the allocation and possibly a reduction in number of units (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
No further information has been submitted regarding the boundary from the Clashnessie Grazing Committee and if this is to be pursued it needs submitted for the reporter's consideration. Both parties have been to be advised of this and sent a map to help submit any proposed amendment to the boundary.		
It was felt that the Highland Small Communities Housing Trust previous suggestion of 20 units was too high and 15 was felt to be appropriate, whilst it is also acknowledged that the site may deliver fewer given the mixed use nature of the site and depending on what proposals come forward.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
COMMENT THAT ONLY THE BOUNDARY SHOULD BE AMENDED to reflect planning consent issued (as shown on the Local Plan Errata sheet) and if further information is submitted consider further amendment of the boundary.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ROSEHALL - H 1 Rear Of The Post Office</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 1 Rear of the post office Text MB 25 – Map 8.5 MB 25	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
A. C. Snody(75)		
E. Smith(376)		
Lord Marks of Broughton(551)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>A. C. Snody(75)</u> Need to know more about housing - private, rental, council? Too close to Cassley Drive, too enclosing on housing already there. Loss of Rosehall Trails Path.		
<u>E. Smith(376)</u> 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.		
<u>Lord Marks of Broughton(551)</u> Lack of facilities, no employment, too large scale development inappropriate.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>A. C. Snody(75), E. Smith(376)</u> DELETION OF ALLOCATIONS		
<u>Lord Marks of Broughton(551)</u> REDUCTION OF OVERALL ALLOCATIONS		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (34)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>The type of housing provided will be determined by the landowner/developer and would be tested through 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.</p> <p>Reference to maintenance of Rosehall Trails path is included in the developer requirements.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		





<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>ROSEHALL – Settlement Development Area (H 2 Opposite The Post Office (Deleted))</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H 2 Opposite the post office (deleted) Text MB 25 – Map 8.5 MB 25	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Bracewell Stirling for Balnagown Estates(638)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area boundary /housing land (unallocated)	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Bracewell Stirling for Balnagown Estates(638)</u> Object to Site H2 being removed from the Local Plan. The representations raised which resulted in the recommendation to remove H2 from the Local Plan can be addressed and resolved. Assume the Highland Council's (HC) had a desire to provide housing in small, rural settlements to sustain the community and local services. The boundary of the allocation could be moved away from the river to the stone dyke to provide a 23m buffer to the river bank, allowing access and removing area that may be at risk from flood risk. A planning application was lodged in September 2008 for development of the site. The rationalisation of activities on the estate are aimed to make the enterprise sustainable in the longer term, housing development forming part of this.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>Bracewell Stirling for Balnagown Estates(638)</u> SEEK RE-INCLUSION OF SITE OPPOSITE POST OFFICE/EXTENSION OF SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (33)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>  The deletion of the site from the previous draft plan was to take account of the River Oykel SAC.  The reduction in size of the allocation to take into account the effects on the setting of Invercassley House and impact on its proximity to the River Oykel SAC left two small areas of unlinked land, on either side of the kennels. The remaining 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.  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 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.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>SCOURIE – General Comment</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Scourie Text MB 34 - Map 11.1 MB 35	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Dr. J. Balfour (290)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	General Comment	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
<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. Generally speaking the total proposed should be reduced as not justified and will probably end up as holiday houses.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
REDUCTION in numbers although it is clear by how much.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reason</u>		
<p>No change. Scourie now only has an estimated capacity of 8 houses on allocated sites and we have anticipated that there is a need for around 20 houses over the period to 2018. However the role however of single house development both within the SDA where there is ample scope and outwith 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 planning applications on the basis of whether the proposed development will meet local need but tries to ensure we are realistic and offer sufficient opportunity for both through our Local Plans.</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>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>SCOURIE - H1 West Of The School</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 West of the School Text MB 34 - Map 11.1 MB 35	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
See modification sought		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
REQUIREMENT for connection to public sewer.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
It is accepted that because it will be economic to connect to the public sewer it can be added as a developer requirement.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
COMMEND CHANGE and add requirement.		



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>SCOURIE - Settlement Development Area</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 34 - Map 11.1 MB 35	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Dr J. Balfour (290)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
Feels that the potential density of houses around Achlochan requires reduction. This part of the village has an open landscape and should not be urbanised.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
Exclusion of land within the Settlement Development Area (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
The site was previously allocated for 4 in the November 2007 Deposit Draft of the Sutherland Local Plan. This was because the site area suggested that an allocation of 4 could be made in line with typical rural density levels and this would allow a contribution to be sought as per the affordable housing policy. However in appreciating why the level proposed was challenged and after considering the form of the land and the current spacing of the surrounding properties it would be better to retain within the Settlement Development Area. There is scope for some development and any specific proposals can be considered on their merits having regard to the plan text for Scourie and the General Policies of the plan.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>SCOURIE – General Comment</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Scourie Text MB 34 - Map 11.1 MB 35	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
J. Balfour (290)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	General Comment	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
<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. Generally speaking the total proposed should be reduced as not justified and will probably end up as holiday houses.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
REDUCTION in numbers although it is clear by how much.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reason</u>		
<p>No change. Scourie now only has an estimated capacity of 8 houses on allocated sites and we have anticipated that there is a need for around 20 houses over the period to 2018. However the role however of single house development both within the SDA where there is ample scope and outwith 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 planning applications on the basis of whether the proposed development will meet local need but tries to ensure we are realistic and offer sufficient opportunity for both through our Local Plans.</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>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>SCOURIE - H1 West Of The School</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 West of the School Text MB 34 - Map 11.1 MB 35	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
See modification sought		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
REQUIREMENT for connection to public sewer.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
It is accepted that because it will be economic to connect to the public sewer it can be added as a developer requirement.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
COMMEND CHANGE and add requirement.		





<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>SOUTH BONAR INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - I1</b>	<b>44</b>
	<b>South Bonar Industrial Estate</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	I1 South Bonar Industrial Estate Text MB 24 - Map 8.2 MB 24	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr S. Copely(90)		
Scottish Natural Heritage(326)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Business allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Mr S. Copely(90)</u> Concern regarding long term future of site with rising sea levels, units should be relocated to higher ground.		
<u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u> 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 has been produced.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<u>Mr S. Copely(90)</u> Seeks provision of alternative business allocation.		
<u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u> Preparation of an Appropriate Assessment and consideration of impacts and mitigation to natural heritage designations.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority (287)</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<u>Mr S. Copely(90)</u> The existing Industrial Estate will remain as an allocation. There are existing businesses located on the Industrial Estate which need to be supported. We have amended the developer requirements to state that a Flood Risk Assessment will be necessary when submitting a planning application.		
<u>Scottish Natural Heritage(326)</u> An Appropriate Assessment has been prepared in liaison with Scottish Natural Heritage, the consideration of impacts of development did not identify impacts that have not been addressed by amendments to general policies. No adverse effects on site integrity as a result of this decision. Decision was taken to retain allocation. No adverse effects on site integrity as a result of this decision.		

<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
--

None.
-------

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>STRATHY - H1 Strathy West</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 Strathy West Text MB 33 – Map 16.1 MB 33	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr D. Khalil (92)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
<p>Feels a crash guard should be installed above the house at Strathy West because of the risk. Dangerous junction with partly hidden access is dangerous for increased traffic and pedestrian usage without pavements. Suggests that a better road access to Strathy West needs be designed for this poor visibility bend. He finds the proposed "Strathy West Housing" 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.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
SUPPORT FOOTPATH from allocation along the river and into the village and BETTER ROAD ACCESS to Strathy West.		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>The junction and road serving Strathy West is considered to be acceptable by our roads colleagues for a small amount of development; beyond that, stopping further development or access improvements will need to be considered. There is therefore a developer requirement for possible access improvements.</p> <p>The connection to the existing pavement network will be dealt with through any planning application. However wider aspirations in relation to footpath provision should be considered through the Council's work on Core Paths Plan for Sutherland. This route/path does not appear to be currently identified.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>TONGUE - H1 West Of Varich Place</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H1 West of Varrich Place Text MB 40 - Map 14.1 MB 41	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr and Mrs Stewart (610) J. and Revd K. Ferguson (645) S. Plass (25) Mr S. Coghill (40) Mr and Mrs Nicholson (94) Mr I. Keith (129) J. Taylor (192)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Objectors</u></p> <p>Consider that there is viable ground to develop inside a community and there shouldn't be an exploitation of farmland or any other nature areas outside the existing village envelope. Concern regarding loss of amenity and fit with settlement pattern (two aerial photos submitted) and the resultant impact on the NSA - in an area dependent on tourism.</p> <p>Reference to Highland Council Planning Policy Guidance 'Designing for Sustainable Development' (November 2006), concern about a 'suburban style development in a rural context'.</p> <p>There is a feeling that there is no clear demand for additional housing given available employment. Considers it worth taking the experience in Bettyhill into account before designating a substantial provision for additional housing in Tongue.</p> <p>Positive opportunity for partial reallocation of H1. An amenity area would provide viewpoint seating for both tourists and village residents with excellent views over the Kyle and the Castle area. Desire for this amenity area which would provide easy access to the path up to Castle Varich and to the village facilities without involving additional car parking in the village. Suggested that this would be a valuable addition to the National Scenic Area and improve visitor and parking facilities for the village as whole. Suggested that the existing play area could be relocated to this site below the houses freeing the existing play area site for additional housing.</p> <p>The landowner Lord Strathnaver came to meet with the residents. It is alleged that the landowner conceded that southern area was inappropriate and proposed the top of the field next to Varrich Place as a more suitable site.</p> <p>Other concerns are over the sewer at Loyal Terrace being inadequate and traffic congestion. Considers that a tree belt is a good idea not in front of Varrich Place but continuing along the main road between the row of new single storey houses and the road.</p>		

**Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

ALLOCATE THE PART OF H1 west of Varrich Place for community/tourism uses instead of housing J. and Revd K. Ferguson

DELETE PART OF H1 WEST OF VARRICH PLACE Mr I. Keith, Mr and Mrs Nicholson, Mr S. Coghill

EXCLUDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING from part of H1 West of Varrich Place. If the modified plans are now that the area below Varrich place not be used for affordable housing, but the alternative area offered by Sutherland Estates accepted then I would withdraw my objection – J.Taylor

DELETE ALLOCATION (assumed) S Plass and Mr and Mrs Stewart

**Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority**Response and Reasons

It is important that Tongue has the opportunity for growth in its own housing stock. If the Local Plan does not identify land for housing then it will be poorly placed to attract businesses or to retain its younger people. An effective housing land supply is necessary in both Tongue and Bettyhill.

There has been no indication that plans for an amenity area and additional car parking are in the pipeline however it is considered that other sites would be at least equally or better suited for this purpose. The criteria for finding land suitable for housing which needs to be close to services and facilities, with an acceptable impact on the landscape and views, and of suitable topography etc means land suitable for housing is a scarcer commodity.

The southern part of H1 which is west of existing housing, was identified in the Landscape Capacity Study (LCS) to reinforce the existing cluster of houses at Varrich 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 is not in crofting tenure, and to the best of our knowledge the loss of this area is not an unacceptable impact on the local agricultural resource.

After considering the adjacent land carefully particularly in terms of its landscape impact and affect on public views, the council 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 (southern part which is west of existing housing) is a suitable site but it is not considered viable for affordable housing development. Therefore the Council supported its extension.

Sutherland Estates have not asked for the southern part of H1 to be excluded from the Local Plan. They did however offer adjacent land to affordable housing providers. They consider that the southern part of H1 will not be economic to develop for affordable purposes. There is a supporting representation from Sutherland Estates for the current H1 allocation.

With regards to tree belt on the original H1 this might be a possible mitigation measure should odour nuisance be raised as an issue here. However Scottish Water had not received complaints so had not been investigating this matter. If this is a significant problem then it needs to be followed up by contacting Scottish Water who can produce an Odour Management Plan if there is a complaints history.

The Local Plan will not seek to determine where the affordable housing should be located as anywhere within the allocation is considered appropriate in principle. It is considered it should be a matter for the applicant to discuss with the Council in respect of a specific site layout proposal at planning application stage.

**Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC**

None.

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>TONGUE - H2 South of Loyal Terrace</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	H2 South of Loyal Terrace Text MB 40 - Map 14.1 MB 41	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Tongue Community Council (242) Mr A. & Mrs F. Gunn (262)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Housing allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<p><u>Objections</u></p> <p>Tongue Community Council Objection to loss of croft land (asking us to see submitted letters from Community Council and Grazing Committee).</p> <p><i>*No letters were submitted with representation. However the Grazing Committee and Community Council did submit representations in response to the 4 outline planning applications being considered, 3 for erection of a house and 1 for a conversion of an outbuilding to residential unit (2 sites partly within the SDA and two within the H2 allocation). These applications were refused at the 3 March 2009 committee contrary to the recommendation of planning officer to grant subject to conditions.</i></p> <p><i>Below is a summary of the Local Grazing clerk's representation to these applications.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Object strongly to proposed housing development on any valuable crofting land; such developments are not conducive to the future of crofting.</i></li> <li>• <i>There are few opportunities for young people to build a home and stay in the area and crofting remains one of them. A housing development of this nature takes away valuable land and prospects for crofting in the future.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Grazings Committee made representation through our community Council to planners that this area was croft land and as such we would not support its inclusion as an area for development in the Local Plan.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Below is a summary of Tongue Community Council's objections.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The proposed developments are not in the community interest.</i></li> <li>• <i>Concern that it is still allocated for housing</i></li> <li>• <i>Concern over roads and drainage, road widening was planned years ago and has been sidelined, and lack of footway.</i></li> <li>• <i>Do not support using croft land when alternatives exist within community.</i></li> </ul> <p>Mr A. &amp; Mrs F. Gunn (262) Object to this area, loss of croft land when there is other common grazings land available for housing. Also the access to this site and the area to the north is dangerous and difficult. Poor drainage and flooding have affected the houses on the west side of the road (own included) and springs continue to pour water into poor drainage systems. Object strongly to houses built where mentioned but would welcome houses built in the area to the east of (marked area) and support in particular low cost developments.</p>		

<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>
<p>UNCLEAR - REMOVE southern corner of H2 and extend allocation to south east into common grazings – Tongue Community Council's objection to the November 07 Deposit Draft. The map submitted with their objection to the November 08 Deposit Draft also suggests they might only want part of the site removed but the text at the bottom seeks removal of all of H2.</p> <p>REMOVE southern corner of H2 - Mr &amp; Mrs F.&amp; A. Gunn</p>
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>
<p><u>Response and Reasons</u></p> <p>There has been support from the owner for its inclusion, and the Crofters Commission have not objected. 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 an unacceptable impact on 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 therefore there is a measure of doubt over whether the whole of the site is effective for housing development.</p> <p>However development at the southern corner would help open up a larger site by establishing the initial part of the access road which must run through this land. This is the only suitable access through to service the common grazings land. The marginal nature of making developments feasible here means that the length of access required before housing (if not accepting development on this land) will most likely predicate against its development.</p> <p>It is considered that the housing land identified is sufficient at this stage but the access arrow indicates that future Local Plan revision will consider extension here. The surface water drainage arrangements can be secured through the relevant policy and the detail will be considered through the planning application process.</p>
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
<p>None.</p>



<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>TONGUE - MU1 West of the Manse</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU1 West of the Manse Text MB 40 - Map 14.1 MB 41	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr J. Barlow (309)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>  Considers that only no development will protect the integrity of the older buildings Manse, Church, Hotel which are essential to the history of the village. Feels that their setting should be enhanced not threatened. This area was designated an open space area and this should not change, with landscaping and hedging all possible. The steadings of the Old Manse are listed (B) and in any development have to be conserved & subject to listed building regulation. Feels this should predicate against any development.		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE ALLOCATION (assumed)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>  It is considered that the integrity of these buildings and their settings can be protected whilst allowing development on the allocation. It is considered that these issues can be dealt with and mitigated through the detail of proposals however the sensitivity of maintaining the setting and a visual link between the Church and the Manse is acknowledged in the developer requirements and a design statement will required with any planning application.		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>TONGUE – MU2 North Of St Andrews Church</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	MU2 North of St Andrew's Church Text MB 40 - Map 14.1 MB 41	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Mr J. Barlow (309) SEPA (311)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Mixed use allocation	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection</u>		
<p>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.</p> <p>SEPA – see modification sought.</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
DELETE ALLOCATION (assumed) – Mr J. Barlow (309)		
REQUIREMENT FOR CONNECTION TO PUBLIC SEWER – SEPA (311)		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>There is detailed planning permission granted on this site for the Fire Station. The Local Plan seeks to establish the principle of development here however detailed proposals would become available with any full or detailed planning application. At which point there is an opportunity for representations if anyone wishes to make comments on the proposals. There are developer requirements to safeguard the setting of the church and address any impact on the setting of Tongue House designed landscape, and to ensure a design statement accompanies any application here.</p> <p>It is considered that the application of Policy 7 is appropriate rather than a requirement for connection to public sewer. It may be that the applicant can demonstrate points 1 and 2 which relate to the feasibility and not being likely to cause significant environmental health problems. In this case connection to the public sewer would go beyond these requirements and may stymie development.</p>		
<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>		
None.		

<b>Issue (ref and heading):</b>	<b>TONGUE – Settlement Development Area</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Settlement Development Area Text MB 40 - Map 14.1 MB 41	
<b>Body or persons submitting a representation raising the issue (reference no.):</b>		
Scottish Natural Heritage (326), Tongue Community Council (242)		
<b>Provision of the Development Plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Settlement Development Area	
<b>Summary of representation(s):</b>		
<u>Objection:</u>		
<p>Whilst the LT allocation has been removed the area has now been included in the SDA. Reference to low density development is mentioned in the development factors here, which is welcomed, but SNH maintains its strong recommendation that reference is also included here to the requirement for linear development reflecting the landform, and the avoidance of clustering. A single access from the track to Hysbackie is also preferred.</p> <p>See modification sought – Tongue Community Council</p>		
<b>Modifications sought by those submitting representations:</b>		
<p>DEVELOPER REQUIREMENT for linear development reflecting the landform and the avoidance of clustering. A single access from the track to Hysbackie is also preferred - SNH</p> <p>REMOVE PRIME CROFT LAND from north eastern area of SDA – Tongue Community Council</p>		
<b>Summary of response (including reasons) by planning authority</b>		
<u>Response and Reasons</u>		
<p>This site was allocated in an earlier draft of the plan with an indicative capacity of 10 to reflect both the edge of settlement location and to mitigate the effect on the water environment. 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. The developer factor for dispersed housing is appropriate and ensures acceptable landscape impact. However it is considered that the specific requirements suggested should not be added as it may not enable best use of the sites capacity.</p> <p>With regard to Tongue Community Council's objection it is considered that the loss of croft land is a comparatively small area of the overall croft and potentially does not represent an unacceptable impact on the resource. The Crofters Commission have not raised any objection.</p> <p>It is therefore considered appropriate to give some policy support by including it within the Settlement Development Area. However formal consultation with the Crofters Commission at application stage would be appropriate to ensure these interests are given some expert consideration.</p>		

<b>Any Further Plan Changes Commended by THC</b>
None.