

Highland Council Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan

Comments received for the consultation that ended on 13th December 2013 ordered by Site

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

CD1 and CD2 should be removed from the development plan and preserved as green space upon which development is not permitted. CD1 should be become the village green.

Representation

Both of these sites represent an integral part of the green space that that is historic to , and interwoven with, the structure of the village. CD1 (the old school playground) is the space to which the other houses relate to .It has always been accessible and open. It is the only such green space within the existing village. It must be preserved as such.This is the space around which the village was constructed or has developed.This space should be developed as a village green in such a way that people can use and enjoy it. CD2 is the space that links the village to the Big Wood. The slope of the field leads right into the wood. It is historic rough grazing and borders close to the castle. The elevation would mean any development looked down on the village. It has important conservation value (e.g. barn owls feed here) and it has unique amenity value. Both of these open spaces provide the context within which the village sits. The village is a compact settlement but it is also a ribbon development i.e. houses are built along the single street which winds around the playground and beside the field that CD2 is. If you remove these spaces the whole nature of the village is lost. Cawdor Village is hidden until you find it but then , because of the spaces it opens up. These green spaces are essential to preserve the uniqueness of this village.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Confirm continued support of the inclusion of this site within the Plan.

Allocated to

Customer Number	04025	Name	Ian Moore	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.9 to 4.96	
Reference	CD2		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The proposed site in Cawdor Village at location CD2 is not appropriate for infill housing development. The Proposed Plan should be changed so that the focus of any housing development for Cawdor is on new building being undertaken on the outskirts/outer fringes of the village, not in the core historical/conservation centre of the village.

Representation

It is not appropriate to permit infill housing development at location CD2 in Cawdor for the following reasons: 1. Main Street in Cawdor, the access road to the proposed CD2 site is a single carriageway road, bordered on one side by existing period housing and on the other by an ancient dry stone wall and meadow. It could not be adapted to provide safe and functional access to CD2 without considerable physical damage to Main Street and significant detrimental impact to the very nature of that part of Cawdor as a conservation village. 2. Main Street in Cawdor, and the network of single carriage roads in the heart of Cawdor village, could not support high traffic volumes which would be the inevitable result of infill housing development in the village. 3. Site CD2 is raised slightly above the rest of the Cawdor Village, with the impact that any housing would be above the sight lines of the rest of the village and completely out of keeping with the village as a conservation area. 4. There is no supporting explanation or evidence in the Proposed Plan on why specifically site CD2 is in anyway appropriate for infill housing development. It would also block current public access to the Cawdor Woods. 5. There is no supporting explanation or evidence in the Proposed Plan on why CD2 should or could support 10 homes, as is suggested in the Plan. This volume of housing in only 0.44 ha is completely out of keeping with the volume of housing and also how Cawdor village houses are located, in relation to each other close to the site, and throughout the rest of the village. 6. Proposing high density infill housing in a conservation area/village like Cawdor does not take account of the opportunity to have housing development on the outskirts of the village which would not damage the historical heart of the village. If there is to be development, infill should be strongly avoided. 7. CD2 is close to the borders of both the Cawdor Castle grounds and also the Cawdor Woods SAC. As sensitive environmental sites, it is thoroughly inappropriate to insert 10 homes so close to these locations. The land on which CD2 is proposed is a valuable green space in the village, and should be valued and protected as the 'lungs' of the village. 8. It is presumed that The Cawdor Estate are the principal financial beneficiaries of having site CD2 being sold for housing development. However, there is no benefit to the existing village inhabitants. To villagers, it would represent the loss of valuable green space, lack of access to Cawdor Woods, increased traffic in the core conservation heart of the village, devastating damage and loss of original stone walls and other period features along the throughfares in and around Main Street.

Allocated to	Cawdor	CD2	Opposite Old School	
--------------	--------	-----	---------------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

Proposed development in Cawdor Village at CD2 should be abandoned. Any development at Cawdor should commence on the north side of the village in the vicinity of the new school. The original intention was to restrict new build to the north side of the village - the agreed area of expansion - and carefully monitor infills in the heritage core.

Representation

Development infills in core heritage areas of Cawdor village should be strictly controlled. The proposal for 10 dwellings at CD2 is inappropriate because: 1)access by very narrow lane is already dangerously congested 2) CD2 development represents loss of much loved green space for village amenity 3) CD2 is a meadow of significant beauty and local history. Building here is unwanted and would destroy the balance and ambience of the old village which is much admired by all who know it.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

That this space is essentially retained as farmland with a small area that relates to the rear of the existing West End cottages having the potential for a small number of houses .

Representation

This land is good quality farmland and should be preserved as such. Any building on this land would be visible from the Western approaches. The hidden nature of the village would be lost. The number of houses in this area alone would dwarf the existing village. A development here , on its own , is entirely out of keeping with the unique village that exists.

Allocated to

Customer Number	04389	Name	David Vaughan	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.96	
Reference	CD4		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

That this space is essentially retained as farmland with a small area that relates to the rear of the existing West End cottages having the potential for a small number of houses .

Representation

This land is good quality farmland and should be preserved as such. Any building on this land would be visible from the Western approaches. The hidden nature of the village would be lost. The number of houses in this area alone would dwarf the existing village. A development here , on its own , is entirely out of keeping with the unique village that exists.

Allocated to	Cawdor	CD4	CD4 Cawdor expansion	
--------------	--------	-----	----------------------	--

Customer Number	04125	Name	R J Thomson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Site(s): CD6 -Cawdor expansion	
Reference	Site(s): CD6 -Cawdor expansion		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The area on the Site CD 6 Cawdor expansion shows the southern boundry as splitting my house, Kirksyde Cottage, in two and placing two thirds of my land withinn the CD 6 area designated as being for residetail and business development. Obviously the house cannot be split so please correct your plan to reflect that my property, including the land, is not included in the site, CD 6, highlighted for development.

Representation

Other than the sites CD 1; CD 2; CD 8; CD 9; CD 10 and CD 11 there is no need to have any other site developed. The sites I have detailed are more than enough to cater for expansion of the village. Any further development would expand the village out of all proportion and totally lose is unique character. The areas CD 3; CD 4; CD 5; CD 6 and CD 7 are currently farming and should remain so.

Allocated to	Cawdor	CD6	CD6 Cawdor expansion	
--------------	--------	-----	----------------------	--

Customer Number	04089	Name	Fraser Douglas	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	CD9 & CD10		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

These two areas, CD9 & CD10, should not be considered for development at all.

Representation

How can Highland Council propose to utilize this prime agricultural land for development when it is farmed by a sitting tennant who I believe does not want to relinquish the fields? These areas were previously proposed for similar plans some time ago and were rejected then. Why have they come back? Nothing has changed, except we the objectors convinced the authorities to reduce the speed limit on Newton Road from 60 to 30mph. Newton Road is single track with no designated passing places. The traffic using it just now struggles and varies from articulated lorries, tractors with farm machinery, cars, bikes and pedestrians. There is no way the road could cope with the additional volume of cars all these proposed houses would generate. There are no designated pedestrian pavements either. The present sewerage system will not cope with all the proposed house building. Please refer to your own figures to confirm this. Likewise, the water supply useage would be under extreme pressure. There are no jobs available in this area so what is being proposed is another dormitory township with the soul-less environment these kind of places end up. Any house building should be done in a modest and low density fashion in the area adjacent to the new school where children would not have the dangers of the infamous B9090 imposed on them. The whole idea of expanding the Cawdor village in such a proposed fashion is an absurdity. The castle and village attracts visitors from all over the world and for them to be presented with a housing scheme, would by reputation, affect the turnover of the castle.

Allocated to	Cawdor	CD9	CD9 Cawdor expansion	
--------------	--------	-----	----------------------	--

Customer Number	00511	Name	Mrs C Stafford	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	Paragraph 4.90, Page 100	
Reference	Cawdor Conservation Village		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

I object to the bullet point which states, ‘Expansion of settlement forms part of the wider growth strategy for the A96 Corridor’. I would like this bullet point removed. I ask for the removal of this bullet point because it is clear that expansion of this number (over 300 new homes) is definitely not the amount of development which was apparently approved as part of the consideration of the A96 Masterplan (a masterplan which was then set out in a ‘concise strategy document’, the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework). This is a very important distinction and readers of the IMFLDP must not be left with the impression that the numbers for the village arose as a direct result of the A96 masterplan work ‘approval’.

Representation

I object to the bullet point which states, ‘Expansion of settlement forms part of the wider growth strategy for the A96 Corridor’. I would like this bullet point removed. I ask for the removal of this bullet point because it is clear that expansion of this number (over 300 new homes) is definitely not the amount of development which was apparently approved as part of the consideration of the A96 Masterplan (a masterplan which was then set out in a ‘concise strategy document’, the A96 Growth Corridor Development Framework). This is a very important distinction and readers of the IMFLDP must not be left with the impression that the numbers for the village arose as a direct result of the A96 masterplan work ‘approval’. A more detailed rationale for this objection is as follows. At their meeting on Wednesday 14 March 2007, and after some debate, The Planning, Development, Europe and Tourism Committee produced the following ‘Decision’: The Committee AGREED the recommendations as set out in the report, subject to the inclusion of point (vi) below: i. amendments to the draft A96 Corridor Masterplan as set out in the Annex to the report; ii. that a concise Strategy document, taking account of the amendments at (i) above, be issued as interim guidance, pending (iv) below; iii. that priority development status be accorded to the proposed Inverness College/UHI Campus and associated amenity/sports provisions at Beechwood, to enable implementation of this strategic project prior to 2011, having regard to policies 2.8(vii), 2.41(v) and 3.1 of the adopted Inverness Local Plan; iv. a revised developer contributions protocol for the A96 corridor, to be applied as the interim framework for negotiation of essential s.75 Infrastructure Agreements on qualifying sites within the Corridor, pending (iv) below; v. that the revised Masterplan be fed into preparation of the strategic Highland Local Development Plan scheduled for later in 2007, subject to consideration of outstanding Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) consultation responses from the statutory agencies by the incoming Council; this to facilitate the early completion of statutory plan-making procedures, including provision for any objections to be heard at an independent Public Local Inquiry; and vi. to recommend to the new Council that a formal strategic partnership, without executive powers, be formed to facilitate liaison between the major bodies involved in the proposals. If we focus on points (i) and (ii) of the ‘Decision’ For point (i) - The annex to the above noted report, ‘Appendix 1’, summarised the non-statutory ‘consultation’ that had taken place in early 2007 and noted the Council’s response to it. With respect to Cawdor village, the submission made by the landowner was summarised by the Planning Authority as: “Scope for at least 240 houses to be added to Cawdor village based on new school, other services and village amenities. It is important to note that the original representation, on which the Planning Authority’s summary had been based, had asked for development to be brought forward to the 2006-2011 timeframe and for the build rate to be at least 60 dwellings per 5 year period. – to cover 4 ‘periods’; hence the 240. The Planning Authority’s response to this request was: “Cawdor is already recognised in the Strategy as a key village capable of expansion. There is an existing stock of zoned land and planning consents here. Given its special built conservation value, any additional proposals will need to pay particular attention to the heritage considerations, and will require to be progressed through the formal development plan process. The rate of development should respect the threshold of a maximum 25% housing increase in any given ten year period. Development will be liable to the developer contributions framework. RECOMMENDATION: No Change” With respect to the ‘approved’ A96 masterplan; the consultant’s suggested growth figure for Cawdor village appears to be 237 in total and is assumed to cover the 35 year period from 2006 to 2041 and hence assumed to include the already existing Nairnshire local plan allocation of 30. For a 20 year plan period this would equate to a total growth of no more than 140 houses, whereas the IMFLDP carries forward a figure from the HwLDP of more than 300 – an allocation which I believe derives from the developer interest rather than, as I have just set out, from the original A96 Masterplan ‘approval’ figure.. With respect to point (ii) The A96 GCDF was prepared as a concise strategy document and interim guidance. Councillors agreed that the strategy document was required to take account of amendments (as presented as appendix 1 of the Report) to the draft masterplan. This A96 GCDF was not a rewrite or an update. It was simply to be a more ‘readable’ version of that which had been approved in March 2007 taking into account the amendments.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General		
Customer Number	04372	Name	Tim Smith	Organisation	Cawdor Community Council
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	See 5	
Reference	See 5	Type	Change	Comment Late	No
Comment Changes					
As per section 5					

Representation

Please find attached Cawdor and West Nairnshire's Community Council original response to the IMFLDP dated June 2012. Interestingly enough we haven't as yet received a response to this so we won't hold our breaths !!. Whilst some recent events have changed our original response the section relating to Cawdor Village is still in our mind current and indeed more so given the number of proposed units to be built has increased and is therefore valid as part of the updated response to you. Since the original submission we have signed up along with the other Nairnshire CC as per the recent letter dated 19th November 2013 to Steve Barron that there should be a different approach to long term plans for the IMFLDP, to take greater account of local knowledge/aspirations for the local area together with infrastructure to be in place and funded prior to development approval. Other points we would like to raise are as per below

- "In light of the recent economic changes we would question the validity of the aspirational population growth figures and suggest that they be revised before the final submission of the IMFLDP".
- (In 2012, the annual gain from migration into the Highland Council area was only 87 as opposed to the projected annual gain of 1650, on which the IMFLDP was based. From 2013, it appears there will be a natural population decrease with more deaths than births. The revised Plan should now reflect the change in local demography).
- Planning permission already granted between Inverness and Nairn is for around 10,000 houses but there is very little building activity taking place, which questions the alleged "huge demand for housing in the area" quoted by planners and forming the basis of the plan. There is also a disappointing number of job opportunities in Inner Moray Firth Area in contrast to Easter Ross which seems to be attracting more industry and suggest more of the housing growth should take place there. The
- Inverness Airport Business Park is not attracting the companies which were to provide the job opportunities in the area, as predicted.
- There is a significant loss of areas of prime agricultural land, enlarging towns and villages many with inadequate roads and infrastructure and without job opportunities, thus creating dormitory settlements and putting even greater pressure on A96 as main artery. Cawdor Village
- Cawdor & W N C Council's disappointment that their response to IMFLDP MIR dated 29th June, 2012 which followed consultation with local residents, did not result in any material changes to the plan
- Whilst areas planned (CD1-8) for village expansion are owned and controlled by Cawdor Estates areas (CD9-10) are currently farmed by tenant farmers. Areas (CD1-8) are more easily assessable for the local school and other village services and are more suitable for a reduced level of expansion. Organic development along Newton Road is preferable in order to preserve the historic character of the road. The area of trees between Newton Road and CD9 has specific historic significance
- Residents welcome a degree of expansion, the proposed 600% increase is considered by many local residents and other Nairnshire residents as excessive and would result in loss of prime agricultural land. The proposed housing density is a further concern of residents who highly value the rural ambience of the area.
- Current use of the B9090 as an unofficial Nairn by-pass must defer any major expansion of villages like Cawdor until the A96 from Inverness to Nairn is made dual carriageway, as proposed, combined with a firm commitment to by-pass Nairn, Improvements to the B9090 will also be necessary and funded to cope with increased vehicle, cycle and pedestrian traffic prior to major building work taking place.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00984	Name	The Trustees Of The Cawdor Scottish Discretio	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Administrator Yvonne Macdonald		G H Johnston Building Consultants	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	Mixed Use CD3-10 Cawdor Expansion		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The Proposals Map (parcels CD3-10) should be adjusted to reflect precisely the “search area” identified in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan: this should be represented as a whole area CD3.

Representation

This objection concerns the Proposals Map and its representation of CD3-10. The Highland-wide Local Development Plan (adopted 2012) (policy 22) identifies a search area for Cawdor Expansion (masterplan). This was determined after Examination and endorsed by the Reporter. The search area is identified as a whole and composite area; it is the principle on which a masterplan is to be prepared. The representation of that development potential in the Inner Moray Firth Local Plan fragments that whole and composite area into the piecemeal land parcels CD3-10. In so doing, it distorts the principle of a whole and comprehensive masterplan; and it omits land identified as part of the search area in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. For example, the grey shaded area on the plan to the south east of CD7 should be included within the mixed use area as this area has the potential to play a key and pivotal role in the new village centre at this location. This representation seeks that the whole and composite masterplan search area as identified in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan is carried through in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan because:

- the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (Proposals Map) omits land included in the search area which comprises land with development or redevelopment potential. That includes the farm buildings at Ballichnockan and land west of the Cawdor burn. No evidence has been lodged by Cawdor Estate - the owner of all of the land affected - as proponents of the Masterplan; or by the planning authority or in any representations made in respect of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan that inform or justify the omission of that land. If these omissions arise as a result of any concern for flood risk, then the Flood Risk Assessment lodged to support the outcome of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan indicates these areas not to be at risk. That information was presented to the Highland-wide Local Development Plan Examination and is available to the planning authority;
- the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (Proposals Map) insofar as it fragments the search area with development potential has no relevance to corresponding policy. The Plan does not differentiate the parcels CD3-11 in policy or refer to them independently; but it does refer to the parcels CD3-11 collectively at para. 4.93. Thus, the Proposals Map and the policy do not coincide, and the parcels CD3-11 therefore appear to have no rationale and impose purely arbitrary restrictions that serve no purpose but could unnecessarily restrict the masterplan from achieving its full potential for a well-designed overall settlement;
- the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (Proposals Map) does not convey the comprehensive masterplan approach promoted in the development plan. As indicated in representations to the Highland-wide Local Development Plan a comprehensive approach is essential to securing the development plan objectives through a masterplan and its related public process, and in particular, essential to respecting the character of the conservation village, design quality and coherent layout, a balanced land use mix, proper phasing of development, proper infrastructure planning, and a viable market proposition. The fragmented and piecemeal representation of that objective confuses the purpose and process of a masterplan, and runs counter to the development plan objectives and the landowner aspirations; and as also indicated to the planning authority, representations undertaken to date as part of the public masterplan process thus far. The representations lodged on behalf of The Trustees of Cawdor Discretionary Trust in respect of the Main Issues Report invited the planning authority to reflect the terms of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and avoid artificially fragmenting the search area. The Trustees are extremely disappointed at the planning authority’s response.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04365	Name	Rosina Robertson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.96	
Reference	CD1-10		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The extent of the proposed expansion of Cawdor Village is grossly excessive and requires to be scaled down. While a proportion of development in areas CD5-7 and CD11 could be viewed as desirable, other proposed development is not.

Representation

A six-fold increase in numbers of houses will ruin what is a historic village and an important tourist attraction in the area. I question the validity of the aspirational population growth figures for the IMF area in light of recent economic changes and suggest they be revised as in 2012 the annual gain from migration into the Highland Council area was only 87 as opposed to the IMFLDP projected gain of 1650. Planning permission already granted between Inverness and Nairn is for around 10000 houses and this should more than satisfy demand for the foreseeable future. The whole plan for the Inner Moray Firth Area requires to be reviewed. Proposed plans for Cawdor will result in the loss of a considerable area of prime agricultural land and create yet another dormitory settlement in the Inverness hinterland. There are very few employment opportunities in the local area which will mean incomers will have to commute to other locations causing even more pressure on the B9090 and A96. Problems of congestion on the A96 have resulted in the B9090 becoming an unofficial Nairn By-pass and further traffic on this road will exacerbate this situation. Areas CD9&10 should be preserved as agricultural land as this land is tenanted land and its loss will impact negatively on the farm business. There is an area of trees with special historic significance between CD9 and Newton Road and these will be compromised by development of this area. CD8 should remain as largely open space in what may, if a reduced level of development takes place, become the village centre.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01027	Name	Mr Hugh Robertson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.96	
Reference	CD1-11		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The proposal to build over 300 new homes in Cawdor Village is grossly excessive and requires to be scaled down.

Representation

A six-fold increase in numbers of houses will ruin what is a historic village and an important tourist attraction in the area. I question the validity of the aspirational population growth figures for the IMF area in light of recent economic changes and suggest they be revised as in 2012 the annual gain from migration into the Highland Council area was only 87 as opposed to the IMFLDP projected gain of 1650. Planning permission already granted between Inverness and Nairn is for around 10000 houses and this should more than satisfy demand for the next 18 years. The whole plan for the Inner Moray Firth Area now requires to be reviewed. Proposed plans for Cawdor will result in the loss of a considerable area of prime agricultural land and create yet another dormitory settlement in the Inverness hinterland. There are very few employment opportunities in the local area which will mean incomers will have to commute to other locations causing even more pressure on the B9090 and A96. Problems of congestion on the A96 have resulted in the B9090 becoming an unofficial Nairn By-pass and further traffic on this road will exacerbate this situation. Areas CD9&10 should be preserved as agricultural land as this land is tenanted by me and its loss will impact negatively on my farm business. As tenant I may well be faced with a costly legal confrontation with the landowner as I do not wish these strategic livestock areas to be removed from my tenancy. There is an area of trees with special historic significance between CD9 and Newton Road and these will be compromised by development of this area. CD8 should remain as largely open space in what may, if a reduced level of development takes place, become the village centre.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04347	Name	Halde Pottinger	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.96	
Reference	CD1 and CD2		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

CD1 and CD2 should be removed from the development plan and preserved as green space upon which development is not permitted. CD1 should be become the village green.

Representation

Both of these sites represent an integral part of the green space that that is historic to , and interwoven with, the structure of the village. CD1 (the old school playground) is the space to which the other houses relate to .It has always been accessible and open. It is the only such green space within the existing village. It must be preserved as such.This is the space around which the village was constructed or has developed.This space should be developed as a village green in such a way that people can use and enjoy it. CD2 is the space that links the village to the Big Wood. The slope of the field leads right into the wood. It is historic rough grazing and borders close to the castle. The elevation would mean any development looked down on the village. It has important conservation value (e.g. barn owls feed here) and it has unique amenity value. Both of these open spaces provide the context within which the village sits. The village is a compact settlement but it is also a ribbon development i.e. houses are built along the single street which winds around the playground and beside the field that CD2 is. If you remove these spaces the whole nature of the village is lost. Cawdor Village is hidden until you find it but then , because of the spaces it opens up. These green spaces are essential to preserve the uniqueness of this village.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04347	Name	Halde Pottinger	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.96	
Reference	CD3,5,6,7,9,10		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

The overall scale of development is not commensurate with conserving the existing settlement. The number of proposed houses should be reduced by a factor of 10 i.e. a maximum of 30 houses.

Representation

The effect of this proposal would be to destroy the existing settlement. It would constitute a complete disregard for any kind of conservation. The uniqueness of this village would be lost in the face of such a massive development. The proposal represents a whole new settlement. It must be scaled down so that it is in keeping with what is here just now.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01259	Name	Mr Phil Anderson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.90 to 4.96. Cawdor	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

I would like the scale of the proposed development, reduced to a level in line with the organic growth requirements, of the existing settlement. I would like a reduction in the amount of prime agricultural land, that would be lost to this development. I would like the development limited to the proposed development areas, which are adjacent to new school.

Representation

I consider the scale of the proposed development to be wholly inappropriate; it will ruin the village by changing it beyond any recognition. Whilst I see the need for the settlement to grow, the proposed development is excessive. I question the requirement for a further 300 residential units over the next 18 years, an increase of over 500%, which also goes against the conservation area status of the village. I question that the school has sufficient capacity to support the village growing by 500%. The development of prime agricultural land should be kept to an absolute minimum. Some of the land is amongst the highest grade of agricultural land in Scotland and also tenanted, the loss of this will impact on the existing tenants businesses. The development should be restricted to areas adjacent to the new school, where the traffic and pedestrian infrastructure, has already been upgraded. Unless planning consent is conditional on a certain number of home/work units, the chances that Cawdor remaining a dormitory village but at a larger scale are considerable.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04517	Name	W.E. Innes	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	CD9, CD10		Type	Change	Comment Late No

Comment Changes

Additional requirements

Representation

Whilst being a recent resident of Cawdor, there are points which I feel should be considered. When I purchased my Plot, considerable restrictions were set by the Cawdor Estates and your Development Contribution Department with regard to: • Wet harl external finish • Design and finish of Porch • Slated Roof • Venicular Windows. On these Developments I would consider that the finishes be consistent and be added to the Development Plan in the form of a development Brief. The existing road, Newton Road, is unsuitable for additional traffic and access should be off the B9090 to retain Newton Road as it is. However, on looking at the proposals I would suggest that Development on CD9 may be a step too far but in the Terms of Planning I suspect that CD1/CD2 will be priority and the remainder will follow, this is unclear from the plan. Whilst I am not against the Development, extreme care and consideration should be maintained so that everyone is treated in an equal manner as previously demanded by Cawdor Estate.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04348	Name	Victoria Pottinger	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

CD1 and CD2 should be removed from the development plan and preserved as green space upon which development is not permitted. CD1 should be become the village green.

Representation

Both of these sites represent an integral part of the green space that that is historic to , and interwoven with, the structure of the village. CD1 (the old school playground) is the space to which the other houses relate to .It has always been accessible and open. It shoul db e developed into a family green. It is the only such green space within the existing village. It must be preserved as such.This is the space around which the village was constructed or has developed.This space should be developed as a village green in such a way that people can use and enjoy it. CD2 is the space that links the village to the Big Wood. The slope of the field leads right into the wood. It is historic rough grazing and borders close to the castle. The elevation would mean any development looked down on the village. It has important conservation value (e.g. barn owls feed here) and it has unique amenity value. You can indeed see the castle from this area, building here would destroy the tourism associated. Both of these open spaces provide the context within which the village sits. The village is a compact settlement but it is also a ribbon development i.e. houses are built along the single street which winds around the playground and beside the field that CD2 is. If you remove these spaces the whole nature of the village is lost. Cawdor Village is hidden until you find it but then , because of the spaces, it opens up. These green spaces are essential to preserve the uniqueness of this village and to preserve it's conservation. Building to such a scale would cause Cawdor to lose it's character, and would immediately affect the people and associated tourist avenues.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	01257	Name	Mr & Mrs Douglas And Pauline Fraser	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	CD9 & CD10		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Removal of CD10 from the Plan

Representation

The proposed development of CD9 and CD10 was opposed several years ago; nothing has changed since. Newton Road is not suitable for development. We still have prime agricultural land currently used by a tenant farmer who does not wish to relinquish the fields to a soulless development of dormitory houses. There is no present or future prospect of employment in Cawdor; this will turn out to be be just another commuter town, with endless rows of houses empty during the day and causing traffic chaos morning and evening. Allocation of use for housing is one thing, but business and retail? Have you done any research into how many business and retail failures there have been in the Cawdor area over the last 20 years? Do you really think in the real world that people will 'shop locally' in this day and age of retail parks and the internet? Unless you are planning another Tesco Park in Cawdor, retail and business use is a fairy story of the first order. Then there is the loss of habitat for fragile wildlife species; it would be incalculable - red squirrels are quite a common sight here for now, but how long would that last with the decimation of the woodlands that would result from development in area CD9? Plovers, lapwings and oyster catchers nest every year in the fields in zone CD10, although numbers are declining rapidly and would disappear altogether under this development plan. I understand that land is 'released' for development in consultation with local landowners; why are there no plans for development south of the B9090 apart from CD1 and CD2. There are huge tracts of open space further south. Could it be that that would be too close to the landowners back yard? Newton Road is a single track road, leading on to a B road with limited visibility in both directions. Current traffic levels are high due to the use of the B9090 as a 'rat run' for traffic trying to escape the traffic light abundance in Nairn; OK, so you could lop down a few hedges to improve the visibility - but what about the bridge; what about the actual width of the road with no pathway for all the new residents walking their children to school? There is no immediate prospect of a by-pass in Nairn through lack of finance, so what are the chances of road improvements to the B9090? Nil is my guess. I would ask that you reconsider removing areas CD9 and CD10 of the Inner Moray Firth Development Plan as unsuitable for use as housing, retail and business use.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

That this space is essentially retained as farmland with a small area that relates to the rear of the existing West End cottages having the potential for a small number of houses if needed.

Representation

This land is good quality farmland and should be preserved as such. Any building on this land would be visible from the Western approaches. The hidden nature of the village would be lost. The number of houses in this area alone would dwarf the existing village. A development here , on its own , is entirely out of keeping with the unique village that exists. The history of the village would be lost with the building of a brand new housing area.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

The overall scale of development is not commensurate with conserving the existing settlement. The number of proposed houses should be reduced by a factor of 10 i.e. a maximum of 30 houses.

Representation

The effect of this proposal would be to destroy the existing settlement. It would constitute a complete disregard for any kind of conservation. The uniqueness of this village would be lost in the face of such a massive development. The proposal represents a whole new settlement. It must be scaled down so that it is in keeping with what is here just now.

Allocated to

Customer Number	04348	Name	Victoria Pottinger	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The overall scale of development is not commensurate with conserving the existing settlement. The number of proposed houses should be reduced by a factor of 10 i.e. a maximum of 30 houses and should not be built in the area of the original settlement whatsoever as to destroy the unique area.

Representation

The effect of this proposal would be to destroy the existing settlement. It would constitute a complete disregard for any kind of conservation, the wildlife or people who stay here. The uniqueness of this village would be lost in the face of such a massive development. The proposal represents a whole new settlement. It must be scaled down so that it is in keeping with what is here just now.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00273	Name	Mr Ralph Treadgold	Organisation	Cawdor And West Nairnshire Community Council
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section			Paragraph		
Reference	CD3-10 (Cawdor Expansion)	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Reduced level of housing allocations in Cawdor

Representation

My concerns are mainly for the Cawdor area as it appears that they have not listened to the views of the people who submitted there views or objections as nothing had changed significantly from the original plan that has followed Cawdor Estates "Masterplan" that the Estate devised many years ago when it appeared that the economy was going well. Although the number of houses planned has diminished I believe it is still excessive for Cawdor and should be reviewed due to the present economic climate and the fact that these houses were all subject to the increase in employment in the local area. Can I ask Highland Council where this employment base is coming from because for the foreseeable future I don't see anything happening in the Highlands for many years. Any plan should now reflect the changes in the demography as it would appear that the annual gain in migration during 2012 was only 87, as opposed to the projected gain of 1650 on which the IMFLDP is based. The road network in and around the Cawdor/Nairn area would have to be improved significantly if the number of houses that is proposed goes ahead. As the Scottish Government have not committed to the Nairn by-pass this would also generate an additional amount of cars in the Cawdor area as the B9090 is used as a "rat-run" by motorists who wish to by-pass Nairn. The infrastructure in the Nairn area needs to be in place and funded before any development gains approval. I also have concerns on the access to any development in the Newton Road area, the road is just not suitable for the amount of traffic this amount of housing would generate and widening it would be a major undertaking and not feasible in places. This area of Cawdor would also become a ribbon development in many peoples opinion and the destruction of habitats for wildlife, especially red squirrels, oystercatchers, is of concern. I would object to any significant building along Newton Road as it would also become a satellite area of the main village of Cawdor and lose some of its distinctive character. Planning permission has already been granted for 10,000 houses between Inverness and Nairn, as very little building activity has taken place since this has been granted, I question the need for more housing in the surrounding areas. There are very few job opportunities in the Morayfirth area in comparison to the Easter Ross area so I would suggest that this is an area of growth were more housing should be concentrated on. The Inverness Airport Business Park does not seem to be attracting the companies that are supposed to be providing the job opportunities as predicted, this is going to have a major impact on the need for housing in and around the airport. I would also question Conservation status of the village as well once Cawdor has been built up to this high density. Yes, there is a need for more housing in and around the Cawdor area, however, if it was organic growth and land was made available for this would be more in keeping with the way Cawdor has grown over the years. Whilst many residents in the Nairn and Cawdor area see the need for more housing, many of them question the proposed 600% increase and the loss of prime agricultural land that will put pressure on the inadequate roads and infrastructure. If houses are to be built in Cawdor the areas that should be considered are in the village itself and around the school.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04503	Name	William Innes	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	C9 & C10 (Cawdor)		Type	Change	Comment Late
					Yes

Comment Changes

Whilst I understand that development is the key for better facilities. This has to be balanced on design and finishes materials.

Representation

Being an owner of a new house recently built. The finishes spec externally by the landowner (estate). The quality demander was very high. I would therefore expect the same be demanded on any new development. Also Newton Road would not be suitable for any new development and access should be off the main road on to any development site.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	04235	Name	Margaret Gilchrist	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.90 - 4.96	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

I do not believe that site CD 2 should be developed. I believe that site CD 1 should be developed in a manner which is sympathetic to the historic surroundings of the central village. I feel that sites CD 3 to CD 11 should be developed with caution and only after detailed consultation with local residents and stakeholders. If the whole area were developed I am concerned that this would irrevocably change the unique feel and character of the village.

Representation

I own and live in a house in the centre of the village of Cawdor. I have lived in the house since 1974 (39 years) with my husband until 2011 and since then on my own. My house faces towards the proposed site CD 2 (opposite the old school) and my garden directly abuts the proposed site CD 1 (the old school playground). I am not against development in the centre of the village, however I am concerned that it does not take place in a way which seriously damages or destroys the unique historic feel and look of the village. I believe that it should be possible to develop site CD 1 in a way which enhances the community in the village. This site, although in the centre of the village, is well protected by mature trees and other properties and I feel that an appropriately designed development scheme, which retains the trees and the main stone buildings of the old school would not detract from the look and feel of the village. I am, however, very concerned about and oppose the proposed development of site CD 2 (opposite the old school). Such a development would destroy the current open aspect and relationship between the centre of the village and the historic Cawdor wood. The fact that the wood is directly visible and accessible from the centre of the village is a key aspect of the unique character and charm of the village. The development of site CD 2 would, I believe, have a materially adverse effect on the historic character and amenity of the village and would have a directly negative impact on the quality of life of the village residents. I am concerned that the extent of sites CD3 to CD11 may also have a very significant impact on the nature and character of the village. In all, the areas flagged for potential development are significantly larger than the current area of the entire village. I am concerned that the development of this entire area, even over a 20 year period, would simply be too much for the current village to take and there must be a danger that the current charm and character would disappear. However I understand that there is a need for development generally and understand that the existing community and facilities could support some growth. If there is to be development in some of these sites (as noted above, I believe it should be some, not all) then such development should only be done cautiously and after detailed engagement with local residents, the community council and other stakeholders. Clearly there would also need to be a lot of work done on local infrastructure too.

Allocated to	Cawdor	General	General	
--------------	--------	---------	---------	--