

<b>Issue10</b>	<b>Beechwood Campus</b>	
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	Policy 10 (Para 11.7, Page 38)	<b>Reporter:</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number)</b>		
Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (53), Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (118), Westhill Community Council (147), CB Richard Ellis for Grosvenor Eastgate Unit Trust (193), Turberry Consulting Ltd for Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) (240), C Stafford (272), Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) (326), GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd for land at Beechwood (473)		
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	Beechwood Campus	
<b>Councils summary of the representation(s):</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area may have either hazardous installations and/or pipelines whose consultation distances may encroach on development areas. (53)</li> <li>• Fully support this policy &amp; fully welcome the first requirement of the policy stating that links to the city centre need to be in place at an early stage. (193)</li> <li>• Agrees with the statement at paragraph 11.6.1 (240).</li> <li>• Pleased that paragraph 11.6.2 recognises that the Campus will deliver a range of opportunities however there should be a more detailed description of those activities in Phase 1 especially commercial/business opportunities and the regional sports centre. (240)</li> <li>• Pleased that paragraph 11.6.3 acknowledges that phase 2 of the Campus will be an important land supply for business land in Inverness. However concerned that this paragraph also allows for alternative uses of the land in phase 2 (as per map 6) and objects to the inclusion of the second sentence and the allocation of the land for Residential Institutions. (240).</li> <li>• Pleased that policy 10 supports Inverness Campus. Accepts phase 1 requirements but bullet point 2 should read, "Pedestrian and cycle bridge links towards Inverness Retail and Business Park and later phases of the campus site". (240)</li> <li>• Supports that phase 2 is unlikely to proceed before 2016 however would like policy 10 to state that: "Phase 2 of the Campus is a priority development within the Corridor, which will be allowed to proceed prior to the delivery of strategic infrastructure subject to there being sufficient existing infrastructure capacity to mitigate the impact of the development proposed." HIE reserves the right to comment further on the appropriate level of contribution to the link road and other strategic infrastructure.(240)</li> <li>• Change Allocation for Campus to Education/Mixed Use (240)</li> <li>• Map 6 identifies land east of the TLR as open space. Confirmation is sought that the use of this land for playing pitches and ancillary facilities is consistent with the open space designation (240).</li> </ul>		

- Supports continued allocation of land north east of railway for residential (240).
- Supports the mixed use allocation on the Campus land to the south east of the TLR (240).
- Should be provision of a link through adjoining land to the north to the green bridge proposed access across the A9 into the Raigmore Estate. (473)
- This policy should be subject to Habitats Regulations Appraisal. (118)
- Reference should be added to indicate there should be avoidance of any adverse affects to the Inner Moray Firth SPA/RAMSAR site. (118)
- SEPA support this policy and agree that any development proposals should be subject to a Flood Risk Assessment and the provision of a Drainage Strategy to demonstrate safeguarding of watercourses and floodplain. (326)
- The allocation must include provision for a rail halt and associated shuttle service into town, providing a useful "park and ride" facility. (147)
- The representation takes issue with the statement, *"The Council supports the development of the first phase of Beechwood Campus during the period 2011-2016 and the second phase after 2016."* because it is too 'open ended' and vague as a policy with respect to the support for the second phase. The Council must make clear what it is and what it is not going to support in terms of subsequent phases of development at the Campus site. (272)
- Pleased that paragraph 11.3 identifies Inverness Campus as one of the three key elements of the spatial strategy for the East Inverness area. Also agrees with paragraph 11.6.1 (240).

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

- Include Developer Requirement to provide pedestrian and cycle access through City to Inverness Retail and Business Park via Stoneyfield (473)
- Under the sub heading "Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage" the following should be added, "avoidance effects to the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar site." (118)
- Policy should make reference to proximity to hazardous installation/ pipeline. (53)
- Provision to be made for a rail halt. (147)
- Further detail to be included in policy for phase 2 of Beechwood Campus (272)
- Remove option for Residential Institutions in Phase 2. (240)
- Amend second bullet point of policy to read, "Pedestrian and cycle bridge links towards Inverness Retail and Business Park and later phases of the

campus site". (240)

- Augment Policy 10 to read, "Phase 2 of the Campus is a priority development within the Corridor, which will be allowed to proceed prior to the delivery of strategic infrastructure subject to there being sufficient existing infrastructure capacity to mitigate the impact of the development proposed." (240)
- Confirmation of land for open space will be able to be developed as play fields/sports pitches (240)
- Change Allocation for Campus to Education/Mixed Use (240)

### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by Planning Authority:**

#### Developer Requirements

- The planning permission for the Beechwood Campus Phase 1 has now been granted planning permission ([09/00887/PIPIN](#)).
- Developer requirements are in place to secure pedestrian and cycle links towards Inverness City Centre to the west and to Inverness Retail and Business Park to the east. Provision for access improvements to the wider area are also included in developer requirements related to green networks. Wording has been suggested to combine bullet points 1 and 2 of the Transport Developer Requirements. This would not be a fundamental change to the policy and would perhaps deal with the issues in a more succinct manner.
- Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage – an additional developer requirement related to the Inner Moray Firth SPA and RAMSAR site. Protection of the natural heritage is covered by Policy 58 – Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage which classes the site of international importance. Therefore it is considered that the plan is sufficient in this regard, however as other features covered by Policy 58 have been included in this area of the policy for consistency it may be an acceptable change.
- Hazardous Installations – It has been suggested that the allocation is in proximity to a hazardous installation/ pipeline. It is considered that this issue is sufficiently dealt with by Policy 31 – Physical Constraints of the Plan.
- Rail Halt – It has been suggested that within the policy provision should be made for a rail halt. This has been investigated previously, and is highlighted in the East Inverness Framework in the [A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework](#) (Figure 4, Page 22) The Reporter may wish to specify that this be included as an aspiration for the later phases of the campus development, although it does need to be recognised that this will involve a co-ordinated effort by a range of stakeholders, including Network Rail.

### Clarity

- Phase 2 detail – The inclusion of further detail for the second phases of the campus development has been requested. The Highland wide Local Development Plan sets out the principle of the types of land uses which may be acceptable within phase 2 of the development, by allocating land to the east of the railway line for a mix of residential and other uses, and the land to the west of the railway line as green space. The reporter should also note that there is an undetermined planning application for the entire campus site which has not yet been withdrawn ([09/00256/OUTIN](#)). The design of the potential east link between Inshes and Smithton (shown indicatively on Map 6) which is currently being undertaken by Transport Scotland, will be very important to determining the exact nature and location of future uses. It will be for future planning applications for the wider site or updated through future planning applications to move these proposals forward.
- Open Space Uses – Clarification has been sought over the open space allocation at the south of Beechwood and its potential uses. The Council maintains the view that the majority of this land should be made available for recreational space or open space which provides a setting for the campus site. Built development should be only related to the open space provision.

### Changes to Policy

- Removal of residential institutions uses in phase 2 – This inclusion of this use class was to help provide for a wide range of uses which have been promoted on this site. This included the aspirations by the Scottish prison Service for a prison in this location. Highlands & Islands Enterprise as landowner has now determined that this use does not fit with the strategic vision for the site, and as a result, the Reporter may wish to change the allocation on this part of the campus site.
- In respect of the request to augment policy to indicate that phase 2 of the campus is a priority development able to be brought forward prior to delivery of strategic infrastructure, The Council has undertaken a wide range of work which has enabled the first phase of the campus (as well as other developments in the A96 Corridor) to progress ahead of strategic infrastructure interventions. This has been supported by a transport model (in partnership with Transport Scotland). This is a consistent approach across the developments in the A96 Corridor and it would not be reasonable to depart from this consistent approach for one development. As a major element of the strategic transport infrastructure (A96-A9 trunk Link Road) runs through the allocation at Beechwood it would not be reasonable to allow the second phase of development to go ahead without the solution for this infrastructure requirement being clearly understood, and the opportunities for other local linkages being in place or being the subject of further design..

- Change Allocation for Campus to Education/Mixed Use – While Map 6 identifies the site as mixed uses, Policy 10 – Beechwood and the supporting text specifically refer to the site as being for campus uses. Therefore it is considered that the plan sufficiently addresses the issue raised.

**Any further plan changes commended by the council**

None.

**Reporter's conclusions:****Reporter's recommendations:**