

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 and Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

Allocated to

Customer Number	01813	Name	Mr Neil Galloway	Organisation	Macdonald Estates
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Mr Alex Mitchell		James Barr	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Macdonald Estates Plc are seeking changes to land allocations in East Inverness, to allocate the land at Balloch Farm, as identified in the attached Development Framework Document, for mixed uses. Specifically, it is sought that land to the north and northwest of Sites IN86 and IN87 should be allocated for residential development and associated uses in connection with the promoted community uses identified at Sites IN86 and IN87. In addition, Macdonald Estates Plc are seeking the inclusion of the overall site of Balloch Farm (as identified in the attached Development Framework Document), within the settlement boundary of Inverness.

Representation

The adopted Highland Wide Local Development Plan recognises that there is development pressure in the Inner Moray Firth Area, and this demand needs to be addressed whilst acknowledging the constraints that exist in the area. Not only do housing land allocations need to provide land for future housing requirements, but also to meet the backlog of housing provision which is the effect of the “economic downturn”. This approach should be adapted in the progression of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, by promoting effective sites able to meet current and future housing needs in the area. The Summary of Issues and Recommended Responses to the Highland Wide LDP Main Issues Report provided by Highland Council stated that Balloch has the potential to contribute to the wider strategy for Inverness, and the longer term strategy beyond this local development plan. In addition, the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan Main Issues Report recognised the development potential promoted for Balloch Farm, and identified part of the site for mixed uses (MU31), which in the Proposed Plan (Committee Version) had been retained within the settlement boundary, albeit without any specific land allocation. We acknowledge the previous recognition that this land has the potential to provide for the future growth and expansion of Inverness to meet housing need and demand, and believe that there is no justification for the removal of the potential development opportunities at Balloch Farm. As such, the site of Balloch Farm – as promoted in attached Development Framework Document - should be progressed within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. Therefore, we object to the proposed designation of part of site at Balloch Farm as outwith the settlement boundary of Inverness (in part), and object to the sole allocation of Sites IN86 and IN87 for community and open space uses. We believe that the site of Balloch Farm, in its entirety – as promoted in the attached Development Framework Document - has the potential to create an attractive residential environment, together with community and open space uses, which the current allocations promoted in the Proposed Plan do not recognise. As such, the site in its entirety should be recognised as a mixed use development opportunity, including the community uses as promoted in the Proposed Plan. We believe that Balloch Farm creates a short-medium term opportunity to promote development in the A96 corridor, and specifically the Inverness Housing Market Area, where other sites are constrained. In addition, the promotion of development on the site of Balloch Farm for housing with associated mixed uses, would also allow for the extension and improvement of recreational facilities at Culloden Academy, the formalisation of green/open space in the area, the provision of community uses for use by proposed and existing residents, and the creation of an established buffer between the settlements of Culloden and Balloch. The overarching benefits of the proposed development at Balloch Farm, in terms of Culloden Academy and designated open space/green space provision should not be forgotten in the consideration of the site for the development of mixed uses, including housing. In relation to the promotion of the land at Balloch Farm for future development, we wish to comment as follows: • The site is flat and developable, and is effective within the short-medium term, in phases if appropriate. • The promotion of mixed uses in the development of Balloch Farm would provide community facilities in an area where they are currently lacking. This would be of benefit to proposed and existing residents. •The green buffer promoted along Barn Church Road, and the retention of land to the south of Barn Church Road (as detailed in the Development Framework Document) for green/open space ensures that there is no coalescence between the settlements of Culloden and Balloch. • Proposed road works are promoted as part of the wider development proposals for Balloch Farm. We note that A96 trunk road improvements are currently being progressed, and this will continue within the lifetime of the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. In addition, this site benefits from accessibility to the local public transport system and the proposed development encourages walking and cycling through the site and beyond with the creation of walkways/tracks throughout the site. • We acknowledge that the proposed development will result in the loss of farmland. However, we believe that the proposed development has wider benefits to the community and creates an attractive development site that can accommodate growth in the Inverness area. We propose that Balloch Farm should be identified and supported through the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan as an effective development site for mixed uses, including housing, with cumulative benefits to the local communities of Balloch and Culloden. This site promotes a viable development opportunity able to be progressed within the lifetime of the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. As detailed in the

supporting Development Framework Document, Balloch Farm has the potential to provide residential uses constituting of approximately 500 homes, community facilities, local shops and recreational space. The potential allocation of this land for future development also creates the opportunity to provide land for the expansion of, and improvements to, Culloeden Academy and introduce public facilities and services that are not currently available in the local area. The proposed layout and setting of the development opportunities at Balloch Farm promotes a sensitive expansion area which integrates the built and natural environment, and retains the semi-rural character of the wider locale. This is an effective and viable housing site that can be realised within the lifetime of the local development plan. The Council should consider allocating sites that can be potentially delivered in a shorter timeframe to avoid deficiencies emerging in the provision of housing land. This would ensure and adequate and generous land supply is available. The full potential of Balloch Farm as a housing release site is detailed in the accompanying Development Framework Document prepared by Mill Architects.

Allocated to	East Inverness	General	General	
--------------	----------------	---------	---------	--

Customer Number	00324	Name	Dr Donald Boyd	Organisation	Westhill Community Council
-----------------	-------	------	----------------	--------------	----------------------------

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		
---	--	--

Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	4.17
---------	---------------------------	-----------	------

Reference	IN73 Easterfield Farm	Type	Support	Comment Late	No
-----------	-----------------------	------	---------	--------------	----

Comment Changes

Representation

Easterfield Farm (Para 4:17; IN73) We welcome this being allocated for junction improvements.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN73	Easterfield Farm	
--------------	----------------	------	------------------	--

Customer Number	04514	Name	John & Avril Thomson	Organisation	
-----------------	-------	------	----------------------	--------------	--

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		
---	--	--

Section	Development Allocations	Paragraph	
---------	-------------------------	-----------	--

Reference	IN74	Type	Change	Comment Late	No
-----------	------	------	--------	--------------	----

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

It is difficult to give considered comment on something which gives little or no detail as to the type of homes that may be constructed however based on the scant information provided I would have to say that eight homes would appear to be rather excessive on a parcel of ground which was originally earmarked to accommodate only three houses. Further if the area marked out in red is accurate then it encroaches on to land which was part of the Castlehill Phase 2 estate and blocks off part of the pathway leading from Castlehill Park to Caulfield Road. This is a pleasant unspoiled parcel of land used by the local population to exercise their pets. There is also a varied wildlife including roe deer and various forms of birds predominately crows which inhabit the rookery in the established woodland close by and I can only presume that excessive building would only have a detrimental effect on the survival of all wildlife. Unless you can convince me otherwise and I look forward to your comments I would have to object to your proposal on the reasons I have stated.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN74	Caulfield Road	
--------------	----------------	------	----------------	--

Customer Number	00324	Name	Dr Donald Boyd	Organisation	Westhill Community Council
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.17	
Reference	IN 74 Caulfield Road		Type	Change	Comment Late

Comment Changes

Housing over-capacity.

Representation

Para 4.17 IN 74 Caulfield Road We note that our earlier suggestion that this should be open space has not prevailed. We are concerned that eight houses is over-capacity in view of the proximity to mature woodland with a risk of falling, and existing footpaths.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN74	Caulfield Road	
--------------	----------------	------	----------------	--

Customer Number	03982	Name	Brian Boag	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	IN74 - please ensure that any future dwellings fit	
Reference			Type	Change	Comment Late

Comment Changes

please add the comment that future dwellings must fit the existing area, that is, bungalow houses.

Representation

Ref IN74 - please add the comment that future dwellings must fit the existing area, that is, bungalow houses. Please ensure that future lans comply with the statement that the existing footpaths are to remain.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN74	Caulfield Road	
--------------	----------------	------	----------------	--

Customer Number	03989	Name	Irene Fox	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN74		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Planning application ref 06/00494/FULIN 23/05/06 was granted for the erection of 5 bungalows (reduced to 3) outline approval was granted on the meeting dated 30th January 2007. Agenda item 2.12 Report no PL12/07 it states "6. POLICY 6.1 The Inverness Local Plan identifies this site as being within an amenity area which the Council will safeguard against development not associated with its purpose and function. The development of the site for 3 housing plots is therefore not in accordance with the provisions of the Local Plan." Can you please explain the circumstances that have arisen to increase the number of houses to 8.

Representation

I would like this to be reverted back to the original outline planning permission for 3 houses.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN74	Caulfield Road	
--------------	----------------	------	----------------	--

Customer Number	04154	Name	Paul Bova	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN75	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Please see my previous Objections

Representation

[redacted] OBJECTION LETTER NUMBER THREE 10 December 2013 Dear Sirs I addressed fluvial flooding at the south west/rising groundwater in my “objection number one”. I now wish to draw attention to additional flooding problems where Tower Brae Burn runs adjacent to the North Eastern boundary of the Resaurie North site. **TIMELINE** When the Resaurie North site was allocated in 1994, another site a very short distance away was also allocated for new development and what is now Cranmore Drive was built there. Tower Brae burn has twice flooded homes there, in 2002 and again in 2006. Therefore, given the close proximity of Tower Brae burn to the Resaurie North site, and rainfall in Inverness tends to be localised, the presence of this burn introduces an additional issue where flooding risk is not limited to the southwest or from rising groundwater. It should also be noted that this burn is not mapped by SEPA, pointing up the limitations of the SEPA indicative flood mapping in development planning, and thereby their restricted input. Tower Brae burn is a typical moorland burn, steep in gradient with a fast response time. As the land flattens out, such a burn will typically dump its sediment/boulders as it slows down and spills out as the land flattens. That should have been fairly obvious in 1994 when these sites were allocated for development, but it was omitted entirely. The land is quite clearly flattening out at this point. I attach “Screen capture TBB” and also “Screen capture site”. These are low resolution screen captures from a 2011 video clip. I cannot upload the video to the IMFLDP as the upload limit is 10MB, and the video is 19.7MB, but I can supply a copy of the video clip on a cd if required. The position is when the Tower Brae burn blocks up with sediment and boulders (as it has done for many years) it floods into the Resaurie North site. The depth of flooding on the Resaurie North site I estimated at the time of filming to be over a foot which is in broad agreement with the video clip which shows the water level above the base of the Heras fencing. I also have a video of groundwater under pressure bubbling at the land surface. What is clear from all this is that during times of flooding, groundwater and Tower Burn seek relief on the North site/there is a clear fluvial relationship at this boundary. Whereas under “no restriction” about a dozen houses, hard standing and car parks would replace this open land, therefore groundwater could not seek relief, and any water presently taking relief over the land surface will be impeded by development, said water will be repelled, thereby ‘reloading’ the burn/adding directly to the flood risk in the wider catchment toward Cranmore Drive. Further, this demonstrates the philosophy adopted around 2007 is flawed:- The inclination of the Tower Brae burn during times of flooding is to flood out to the North site. Whereas, The philosophy of the North site development will direct surface water generated by the development toward that burn. Therefore the two are acting in opposition, further amplifying the risk. Unfortunately under the “no restriction” approach, such matters are simply not important I agree land should be allocated to meet development requirements, but only land with the least environmental or amenity value. In the instant case, one of the worst possible sites to allocate for development is Resaurie North. People and the water environment will be at increased risk with more and more building, right on top of areas that already have acknowledged flooding problems. In terms of the local plan process, these are significant matters arising but not considered and the principle for development in this area cannot be relied upon to support an allocation for housing, and the reliance upon consent 09/00231/FULIN in the IMFLDP is in the wrong context. I adhere to my previous comments. Paul Bova

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

Please see previous comments

Representation

[redacted] I wish to add to my previous comments. I made reference to planning report PL124/08 and the local plan aspiration that the Resaurie North site would produce development, based on the philosophy adopted at that time. At 7.3 and 7.4 in that planning report, the development of the North site is apparently based on a philosophy that buildings will tie-in with the ridges of the existing phase 1 scheme. At 8.1 it also states; “The proposed flats have been reduced from 5 to 3 storeys and given the location within the site below the embankment on the east boundary, can be considered appropriate. On balance, the proposal would be acceptable”. In that regard, I attach photo entitled “Barnview 14 September 2013”. Phase one is visible in the background/behind the trees. It is noteworthy that the ridge line of the most recent property under construction in the foreground effectively obscures the tree line and the ridge lines of phase 1. Under your presumption for housing additional properties such as that would be placed directly adjacent to my property. When they are built, they will be the significant and dominant feature, a continuous line of ridges on the sky line. Therefore, development of the North site cannot be contained within the existing landscape, and the philosophy supporting the building work has failed to adhere to the building lines. It has also in effect re-written and set a presumption in the Local plan, where the building lines on the North site have been permitted to ‘break out’ from the previous setting below the hill on the east. The horizon no longer has trees or a hill, rather it is obscured full height by ridges. That also impacts in equal measure on the other neighbours here. The forward impact is on the wider area; given these buildings are overtly prominent from the public road, people using the national cycle path route to the UHI via Caulfield Road North etc. Beyond, this it also impacts on your proposed development at Ashton Farm. Unfortunately, the Highland Council IMFLDP document produced in spring 2012 “Inverness City and Fringe” appears to ignore such relevant local plan issues:- At 7.11 the document makes a virtue of the planning permission 09/00231/FULIN, classifying it as the “significant pro” in the promotion of the site. Whereas, the issues arising, directly attributed to a planning permission, cannot represent a “significant pro”. To the contrary, that is a significant “con”. I therefore return to my previous comments that Resaurie had historically been considered as an important traditional urban edge setting in the context of Ashton Farm and the adjoining Green Wedges. Yet, under the IMFLDP consultation these areas are now, for some inexplicable reason, divorced. For example:- Ashton Farm IN82 is ‘rolled into’ the IMFLDP, agreed at the PED meeting 21 September 2013 item 11 - 4.3; "The HwLDP includes some development sites that lie within the Inner Moray Firth (IMF) area. These sites have been tested through an independent Examination and so the principle of development has been accepted. The vast majority of these sites have been “rolled forward” into the Proposed Plan with little or no change. It is therefore intended that any Proposed Plan content that was previously approved through the HwLDP should not be reexamined through the IMFLDP process. At the Examination stage of the plan we will ask Reporters to acknowledge that the principle of development of these sites has already been accepted, and that only the Plan content that was not previously approved through the HwLDP should be subject to Examination through the IMFLDP process. Minor changes such as the mix of uses or phasing would be open to comment. Some of the same sites now have an extant planning permission, for example at Delnies, Tornagrain and Stratton. It is intended to take a similar approach to these sites.” Therefore, the consultation is already closed down in the context of the IMFLDP, where there can only be “minor changes”. People are being consulted on sites in the IMFLDP for the first time, but other sites are coming in from the HWLDP which have already been settled. That is not logical, nor is it democratic. Had you considered IN75 in the HWLDP you would have avoided this detriment. Highland Council should not be asking for a ruling from the reporter for “agreed development in principle”. This is at best a piecemeal approach and not pursuing sustainable development planning, giving rise to a detriment in amenity. FURTHER POINT ARISING Your IMFLDP instructs me development of the above site is to be in accordance with planning permission 09/00231/FULIN for 64 houses. I do not agree:- Timeline Event – 5 March 2010 Planning permission for 64 houses is granted in respect of application 09/00231/FULIN Event - 9 May 2011 Highland Council received complaint drawings submitted in support of application 09/00231/FULIN were in error, where our property had been misrepresented and ‘inflated’ by approximately 8 feet, and other existing properties had also been inflated. Highland Council failed to provide a meaningful response at that time. Event - 3 May 2012 Eventually the fact that such discrepancies had been present during the course of the application 09/00231/FULIN was finally disclosed and accepted in an email from Allan Todd to the developer, where he explains in submitting their planning application (as a result of these discrepancies) the developer may have misled the planning committee with regard to their various assessments, the planning officer and the neighbours. Event Spring 2012 IMFLDP advises development of IN75 is now to be in accordance with 09/00231/FULIN and is promoted on that basis Event 8 June 2012

These representations are as submitted to the Highland Council and have only been changed (redacted) to exclude private contact details and invalid comments.
The Highland Council will in due course summarise them and provide a response to those issues raised which are relevant to the development plan.

Letters from Chief Executive on the matter of discrepancies in 09/00231/FULIN. He advises that Highland Council, rather than revoke planning consent 09/00231/FULIN, are to invite the developer to submit a further application for planning. Event - 2 November 2012 Developer submits 12/04232/FULIN - application to vary consent 09/00231/FULIN. Event - 26 March 2013 Planning report for 12/04232/FULIN explains; 9.5 “It is these issues that committee needs to consider. The principle of the development is already clearly established through the allocation of the site for housing development in the Inverness Local Plan, and through the planning permission granted in 2010. Indeed, the development is already well progressed, apart from the houses at the southern end of the site. This is not an opportunity to revisit the original consent”. 10.1 “The application relates solely to plots 23-34 to the southern boundary of the housing site and the only change to the house details is to reduce the roof pitches and to lower the ground levels which together result in a reduction in the ridge heights of these houses by some 600mm. The principle of the development already granted planning permission in terms of consent 09/00231/FULIN is not altered by this proposal and does not form part of the consideration. The material considerations in the context of this current application are the design changes and the extent to which the reduction in the roof pitches and ground levels is detrimental to visual amenity or affects surface water drainage/flood risk. It is considered that this is an appropriate solution which addresses the inaccuracies of the original site survey for these particular plots and maintains the expected impacts on neighbouring properties. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission is granted”. Event - 26 March 2013 Application 12/04232/FULIN to vary consent 09/00231/FULIN was approved where committee resolved to grant planning - without decision being put to a vote. Event - 20 May 2013 A Highland Council report conducted by the TECS Department entitled “Barratt Homes Reconciliation of Level Information” continued to consider the impact of these discrepancies by providing a site wide analysis of the changes in floor levels. It is noteworthy that on page nine they state; “In trying to balance the needs to address the opposing constraints of flood risk and residential amenity, some compromise has to be reached. The design approach used by Barratt’s is reasonable and appears to take account of the decision to reduce the level of the houses closest to the existing houses...” Discussion of timeline and events (i) The letter 8 June 2012 explains in effect that to deliver the 64 houses as originally intended 09/00231/FULIN needs the support of an application to vary, due to the fact that the existing properties at Resaurie were misrepresented. The requirement for a further application means that planning permission, in effect, does not exist for 64 houses. The explanation from the planning report 26 March 2013 is notably unambiguous - the application to vary was not an opportunity to revisit that original consent. That is in agreement with the drawing “Location Plan A3952 P (-) 21” (submitted in support of 12/04232/FULIN) where the red lined area pertaining to the application entitled “site boundary” does not include the existing development 09/00231/FULIN. The decision notice issued in respect of 12/04232/FULIN also contains instruction to submit a notice of initiation of development for this permission. Therefore, under these circumstances, 09/00231/FULIN will not necessarily deliver 64 houses:- Original application 09/00231/FULIN and 12/04232/FULIN are disconnected entities. The concerns explained in the email dated 3 May 2012 (pointing out the committee were potentially misled in terms of the information presented and their respective assessments) cannot be addressed by 12/04232/FULIN. Members resolved to grant 09/00231/FULIN based on errors of fact. Had such discrepancies been disclosed at that time, a different decision may well have been reached, because the decision is not taken solely on the proposal in terms of ridge levels and ground levels based on a few section drawings representing one boundary. Whereas, under 12/04232/FULIN one boundary is all that can be considered. Actually, the approved drawings under 09/00231/FULIN and 12/04232/FULIN permit very similar lines of vision and ridge comparisons. whereas, the fundamental error was in the representation of the existing properties. (That is accepted in internal communication) A height discrepancy of eight feet on our property also affects any comparison view across the site toward phase 1. Under 12/04232/FULIN, only the properties immediately adjacent are amended, leaving those properties forward of phase 1 in situ and not corrected. I already explained this under my comments on the building lines not fitting within the existing area. Drawing all this together The allocation of the site IN75 for 64 houses in the IMFLDP (where development is to be in accordance with 09/00231/FULIN) is not competent:- There are errors of fact presented under 09/00231/FULIN. Further, there is a misrepresentation with regards to the relationship/presentation of the existing setting of Resaurie, that planning permission and Phase 1. Additional uncertainty is introduced through planning application 12/04232/FULIN and 64 houses will not necessarily be produced. (ii) Contrary to the belief in the planning report 26 March 2013, the existence of 09/00231/FULIN does not provide a “principle of development” for any application to vary. Actually, the opposite is probably the case, in that the issues arising (the requirement to deal with discrepancies) exposes a more fundamental problem:- The TECS survey dated 20 May 2013 reveals development is effectively dependent on the “opposing constraints of flood risk and residential amenity” being resolved. Indeed, firstly on the levels issue, there have been comprehensive alterations since application 09/00231/FULIN was presented. These are not actually limited to plots 23-34 as claimed under 12/04232/FULIN. To demonstrate this, I attach PDF document entitled “Alterations in levels 2009 – 2013”. These issues arise certainly in part due to the mandatory approach for developer management of flooding which is the required approach to ensure the building work can progress. There is no scope for avoidance of building in an area prone to flooding. The development management process in respect of IN75 is in taking decisions on issues which should be considered as part of the local plan consultation. Yours sincerely Carol Christie

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number	04096	Name	Carol Christie	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN75	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Resaurie North IN75 (H58) no longer allocated for housing

Representation

[redacted] Highland Council Development planning Glenurquhart Road Inverness IV3 5NX Re: your letter dated October 2013 INNER MORAY FIRTH CONSULTATION IN75 29 November 2013

Dear Sirs I question the promotion of the site Resaurie North (H58) IN75 as a realistic continuing contribution to the land supply on the following grounds:- GROUND ONE – “rolling over” I refer to email 26 July 2012 where Tim Stott Highland Council explains to Paul Bova the site IN75 (H58) was allocated for development from the early 1990’s. Also the site was not included in the 2004 public inquiry and would have been rolled over in the IMFLDP as an undeveloped allocation from a previous plan, and also by 2010 benefitted from a grant of planning. Timeline and discussion If we refer to the Local Plan Map in 1994 supplied by Tim Stott, the Resaurie site IN75 was at that time part of a larger site (ref 6.1.3 c) extending to 4.8 hectares, upon which it was suggested 72 Houses was appropriate. The policies at that time required that to develop that site, the Resaurie Road (substandard in width) had to be upgraded. I attach the my first photo file entitled “Resaurie Historical” which records most of that site as it was then where obviously this entire area was open fields/farmland. (The building on site was demolished in 2010). In addition to the flooding in the photo, the land further left in front of the building was also prone to flooding. (Evidence of a large water body was subsequently acknowledged in an amphibian report conducted in respect of the North site). That larger site was then divided into two sites around 1998 in the deposit draft as “Resaurie North” and “Resaurie South”. To show that in approximate terms I now attach my second photo file entitled “Resaurie Historical Division” As can be seen, the flooded land, and the land that extended in front of the building was separated from the higher land. The preferred view I suppose would have been to build on the better land away from the flooding. The South site was allocated for 32 houses, and the North site (what is now IN75) did not carry any suggested number of houses. The Local Plan also continued to note the access constraints that in order to develop the North site, the Resaurie Road still had to be upgraded. However a new option was added where it was possible to develop the North site by taking access from the South site/Murray Road. The approximate location is marked on the photo as “phase 1 access” 68 Houses were subsequently built on the higher South site in 2004, while the North site remained undeveloped. However, the original allocation of 72 for the combined larger site had effectively been met by 2004. Indeed, Highland Council were on notice of problems with the North Site in 2004 by the Public Local Inquiry Volume 2 where Reporter Janet M McNair states at 23.14.15 "The fact that the Culloden House and Resaurie North sites, which are allocated in the adopted plan, remain undeveloped, suggests they may be ineffective" While I do not know the reasoning behind that observation, for the purposes of my letter, I would think the noted constraints would lead to a situation where developing the North site would take considerable investment, therefore any allocation suggesting the site was suitable for development for housing would likely attract an element of over development to recoup such any investment. The Highland Council’s Draft Housing Land Audit December 2005 at page 79 lists the site not in its category of effective sites, rather it is in the category of “Constrained” sites where the infrastructure issues are still present. Notably though, a figure of 60 houses has appeared as suitable for the North site. The logic supporting the allocation of the site is further in question given the Local Plan adopted in 2006 contains an explanation at 2.24 that the supply of housing was met in the area - the completion of established targets was expected by 2010. Yet again the site is included in the Local Plan with no suggested number of properties. Having set out the timeline and notable events up to 2006 I want to return to the explanation provided by Tim Stott that the site would have been rolled over into the IMFLDP as an undeveloped site and also in 2010 benefitted from a grant of planning. I want to drill a little deeper into the circumstances surrounding the land audits supporting the local plan:- Highland Council’s Draft Housing Land Audit December 2005 referred to above which at page 79 as stated lists the site not as effective, rather it is “Constrained”. If we then move forward to the “Housing Land Audit 2007 Local Plan Sites” at page 8, the North site still carries the infrastructure constraint (and there is also now an ownership constraint) but suddenly the site is now not constrained - rather it is “effective”. There also is the notable additional aspiration for 107 units on site. The Housing Land Audit 2005 explains that to assess a site as being effective, it must be demonstrated that within the period under consideration the site will be available for the construction of housing being free of constraints. However, that does not appear to be so in the instant case:- Actually, on the face of it there is no good reason why the site should be effective in 2007 because the same constraints (and the additional ownership constraint) prevail. However, it is noteworthy these changes in 2007 coincide with Barratt submitting a planning application 07/00542/FULIN for 107 Houses on the North site. (That application was considered a good idea by the planning officials who attached a recommendation for committee approval). The fact that the application was subsequently refused in 2008 is perhaps of less significance than its existence per say, which provided the benchmark from which a further

application could be measured as allegedly acceptable, which is the approval Tim Stott refers to in 2010. Evidence that the site was rolled over into the IMFLDP as an undeveloped site? Subject to a freedom of information request (and a subsequent appeal through the Scottish Information Commissioner) Highland Council (in broad agreement with the email of Tim Stott) explains there are no communications speaking to the reasoning why the site was continually allocated. Given the numerous events above, it is highly surprising that all this happened on its own, without any recorded human communication, particularly the change from constrained to effective. This begs the question – in the absence of any development planning explanation, is this site a realistic and appropriate continuing contribution to the supply of housing? The events since Barratt built phase 1 is the causal link to everything that has ensued from that point forward. It would appear the site was not rolled forward on its merits as an undeveloped site previously allocated for housing (a status which is highly questionable) rather it is only now an effective site if developed by Barratt, and accordingly the continuing contribution of the site and it being left in the development plan are called into question. GROUND TWO – “Infill” The Highland Council in their precognitions in support of the adoption of the 2006 Local Plan document “THC Issue 13 Green Wedges” state – "4.22 Existing development at Resaurie is fragmented, low density and traditional in form. It is characteristic of the urban edge - adjoins a long established public access route - and is quite separate from the predominantly public sector housing at Smithton. This pattern gives a measure of transition from the built up urban area towards the Ashton campus site identified in the Action Area. 4.23 Local residents derive considerable amenity from this situation, as does the wider public" Therefore the setting of Resaurie has historically been viewed in development planning process as an important benchmark, intertwined with green wedge areas and Ashton Farm. Therefore when considering the allocation of the site IN75 for housing, if we actually consider that in the proper context 1300 are proposed a short distance away, there is no justification for the cramming of 64 houses on a site which previously performed the established function on the urban edge. What this demonstrates is that the assumption by Tim Stott and in the IMFLDP that site IN75 is a “natural infill site” part of the “urban area of Culloden” is wrong:– According to the photo attached, the area was open land at the point of allocation of the larger site – it is not part of Culloden. However, if it is considered now as a “natural infill site” then the scale form and density of the housing that is proposed adjacent to my property, will be set in accordance with the South site phase 1, rather than the proper setting of our property that is embodied in the urban edge recognition above. That point, and indeed the reliance placed on the phase 1 providing the presumption for the development of the North site, is demonstrated by reference to the planning application 07/00542/FULIN where permission was sought for 107 houses and flats. At item 2.1 in the planning report PLI 124/08 it is explained that An approval of Reserved Matters was granted for 68 Houses to the east of the application site per consent 05/00353/REMIN and for the houses known as Rowan Grove/Court/Way. (There are no reserved matters for the North site). Further, at 7.3 it is explained that the Local Plan identifies the (North) site for residential purposes in terms of Policy 97 (V) with no restriction on the number of residential units to be developed on the site, and it is alleged that given the density in the first phase of the development and in Smithton, the mix of houses and flats is acceptable at the densities proposed, since it allegedly helps to provide for a mix of densities across the wider area. At 7.9 it is explained that 2 storey houses have already been approved in the Phase 1 scheme. That report is clearly wrong having regard to the urban transition status and the photo attached. In conclusion of this ground You are opening up my property to a comprehensive loss of residential amenity by placing immediately adjacent extensive high density two storey houses adjacent. Furthermore, you do not have any justification to do this, because you are unable to provide any reasoning for the principle of development for the site. To suggest the site was allocated as “urban infill” is a leap of faith. Conclusion of this letter While the Highland Council take the view that the successive inclusion of the site in the local plan process continued to justify the principle of development, actually that is an entirely subjective view on their part. The reality is I was not notified the site was proposed in 1994 as suitable for 72 Houses, nor was I notified in that context on each “rolling over” occasion. That is exemplified by the fact that I reacted instantly in 2007 to the notification served by Barratt, and have not acted in a taciturn manner or acquiesced since. This notification served on me dated October 2013 (which accordingly I am now responding to) is the first I have been served in the context of reference to the site and your development planning process. The above suggests following the division of the original site, the North site was no longer a meaningful contribution to the supply of land because the constraints suggest it can only be developed from phase 1, and the feasibility of achieving that is in some question. The site as an allocation from a previous local plan may be put to better use, for example, as a recreational/urban edge open space or woodland/wetland. Yours sincerely Carol Christie Note The Documents referenced are all Highland Council documents and can be obtained from the planning department.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number	04154	Name	Paul Bova	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN75	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

I challenge your presumption for use allocation regarding IN75 according to the matters raised in my representations.

Representation

[redacted] OBJECTION LETTER NUMBER ONE 6 December 2013 Dear Sirs INTRODUCTORY COMMENT You served the above notification on me inviting comments on the “Highland Council proposal for development of the above for the following use; 64 Homes...We have previously asked for peoples’ views on the possibility for allocating the land for development.” While you may previously have asked for views, that was through the placement of notices in selected public places, not serving notice alerting those adjoining the land, explaining the proposals. You also directed me to the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, which states that for site IN75; “Development is to be in accordance with 09/00231/FULIN” - which is a detailed permission for 64 houses. Therefore, there was a conflict:- Your Local Plan notification seeks comment on the proposal to allocate land use for housing, but the IMFLDP is constraining development so it must adhere to the merits of a planning permission for housing use. I had to trace your process; The PED meeting 18 January 2012 approved the Main Issues Report “Appendix 1 (1) draft”. The site IN75 is included in that proposal, but NOT specifically allocated for same use as in the previous plan. It is stated in that report the site is a natural infill site and close to facilities, and these are the stated significant “pros”. The loss of Woodland and local access are stated “cons”. Therefore, the PED arrived at a well settled view in January 2012 without any apparent reliance or influence from planning consent referred to in the IMFLDP. From all this your instruction that development must be in accordance with consent 09/00231/FULIN, conflicts with both the terms of your notification and your PED Committee approval timeline, where consultation was clearly intended without reliance on a planning permission. The reference to “local access” problems is noteworthy in that regard. COMMENTS The site was allocated as part of a larger site of 4.8 Hectares in 1994. The problems at that time were local access issues. That larger site was subdivided into two sites, Resaurie North and Resaurie South beginning around 2001. DISCUSSION RESAURIE SOUTH The Tulloch Homes drainage strategy for the South site (dated 2002) observed surface water run -off and appropriate drainage is required to develop the site. Test pits were dug which recorded minor seepage of shallow groundwater. Therefore, the South site is affected primarily by surface water - in broad agreement with its slope characteristics. Around 2002 planning permission was in place on the South site for 32 Houses. DISCUSSION RESAURIE NORTH In 2005, the site was “constrained”. In 2006 the Local plan at Policy 97(v) did not provide a suggested number of houses for the site. However, by 2007, the site had changed to “effective” coinciding with a ‘new’ desire for development of the site/delivery of 107 houses by 2012 materialised at this same time:- This was embodied on page 8 of the “Highland Council Local Plan Housing Land Audit Local Plan Sites (used to identify housing needs over the Local plan period). This in agreement with application 07/00542/FULIN submitted for 107 houses, also submitted at this time. It appears from this the local plan process is being driven by this application and any development philosophy attached. Bore holes were inserted at fairly equal separation across the site to a depth of 7.0 metres. Subsequently these filled up from that depth in winter of 2007, generally speaking achieving the level of the natural ground surface. It is noteworthy that the subsequent planning report speaking to that application advises at “Policy” 7.3 “The Local Plan identifies the site for residential purposes in terms of Policy 97 (V) with no restriction on the number of residential units to be developed on the site.” I will discuss that statement in detail later. While it is not mentioned in that report, an amphibian survey noted evidence of a large water body immediately adjacent to Resaurie Road, at the Northwest boundary, a watercourse/culvert pipe was however noted discharging into the southwest boundary of the site leading from beneath the railway. Under explanation, that is water flowing from the direction of Cradlehall - where the SEPA flood map indicates an area of fluvial flood risk. Prior to the creation of that SEPA flood map, a plentiful supply of water is recorded in the area:- On the historical Ordnance Survey maps the Resaurie area has numerous water markers, drainage ditches, artesian wells and issues to the rear of our property. There is also a watercourse in the same location as the culvert that discharges into the southwest of the site. On the 25 inch to a mile OS map from 1868 there are two permanent ponds at Cradlehall. While the depth is not stated, the surface area of one pond scales off at approximately 75 square metres. The other sluice pond at 1100 square metres. There is a further sizeable pond southwest at Castlehill, which scales off at approximately 600 square meters, as well as numerous springs and issues. Given the numerous different types of water features present such as watercourses, ponds, springs and issues a complex hydrology exists in the area; there is groundwater under pressure (springs and issues) and fluvial waters. It is particularly noteworthy Roy’s Military Map of Scotland of 1747, referred to as the “great map” (recording Scotland prior to the significant road building and development that ensued shortly thereafter) details a river tributary branch flowing into Castlehill. According to the scale, that branch would extend into Cradlehall/Resaurie/Ashton. DRAWING THIS TOGETHER The North Site, on flatter land would appear to exhibit different features than

the South site where the North site has rising groundwater levels from depth and water flowing toward the site from the direction of an area of fluvial flood risk. The aquifer/fluvial based flood water and natural drainage inclination for the area appears to flow through Castlehill, Cradlehall, Resaurie, Ashton Farm towards the Firth. Therefore, building on that North site could well affect the wider catchment. FURTHERMORE A river tributary contributing to flooding through the area represents a considerable flood risk which, at any point in time, could become even more active than it is now and overwhelm the area. This has already caused concern in 2002 when following heavy rainfall (notably to the southwest of our property) our neighbours garden, pavement outside their property and the driveway of our property all burst open under force of water. It is noteworthy that the historical areas' of ponding at Cradlehall are on the approximate land height as our street. FROM THIS PROBLEM'S ARISE WITH THE "ROLLING OVER" OF IN75. (i) Flooding is a problem on the Resaurie North site IN75. However that was not previously considered or noted as a constraint in 1994, therefore it is a significant matter arising. Further, the philosophy introduced in the planning report PLi 124/08 for "no restriction" on the amount of development is also a new matter introduced into that process, the local plan did not suggest a number of dwellings. Further in that report, reference was made to a generic guide as to what constituted "high density". Taking that guidance, density proposed was in line with the maximum in the guide, and therefore deemed acceptable. Therefore under "no restriction" the land (where there is considerable volume of water movement and storage) will have buildings and extensive hard surfaces covering and inserted into it. The land must accept whatever density is desired. There is a notable disconnect between the Local plan aspirations/development of the site, and the local conditions, where the latter are apparently not really important of there is "no restriction" and high density are the desire. This means that no matter what part the land (or any part of the land) plays in the wider catchment, the presumption must be for high density housing. The approach adopted can, at best, be concerned solely with the acceptance of any risk arising on the site. Whereas, SPP7 required that "Planning authorities must take the probability of flooding and the risks involved into account during the preparation of development plans and in determining planning applications...." Actually the local plan position was being influenced by the philosophy in 2007, where the targets were set for the amount of housing that was allegedly needed, and that the site would produce. That is however not considering any risk in the wider catchment, arising from that presumption for "no restriction" as required by policy under development planning. (ii) There is a further failure:- By 2007 water flow noted from the culvert appearing on one corner of the site would be 'managed' to make way for development. Whereas SPP7 at that time required more than that; the probability of flooding from all sources and risks involved from the placement of the development in the wider catchment (where the risks are present and there is considerable water movement) was omitted. (iii) A further shift in Planning Policy took place when SPP (adopted in January 2010) advocated the new requirement for the restoration of natural flood risk management, avoidance of developer based flood management and avoidance of development in areas prone to flood. Flood waters are dissipating on the North site, and also, filling up below ground. Under the "no restriction" extensive concrete foundations, roads, pavements and car parks are built on that green space, comprehensively reducing volume of green space - for example, intention to build over former water body in the amphibian survey. Highland Council will probably say something like "no problem", because there may still be green spaces following development. However, SPP was changed imposing a requirement where natural flood management be restored - whereas the approach adopted is a reduction of that natural capacity where green space and bog land is replaced with concrete. Even the out of date SPP7 acknowledged the cumulative effects of development, especially the loss of flood storage capacity, should be factored in. Under the approach adopted, development on land prone to flooding cannot be avoided. Your Local plan presumption for allocation of the land for housing use is therefore contrary to SPP and your own policy of flood avoidance. (iv) The IMFLDP SEA in respect of IN75 notes the site adjoins an area where flood risk is an issue and requires a flood risk assessment/DIA. However:- Any such requirement carries a presumption for the land use suggested (housing). Under the requirement imposed, the developer need only consider the risks relevant to any development so proposed, which does not consider the suitability of the land use in the development planning process. In the circumstances as you are proposing, the development planning decision is moved out of the hands of the authority. The question being asked is - how can we build on this land? Whereas the right question is SHOULD that land be built on? (v) Historically people settled in areas where aquifer production is high because there was a plentiful supply of water, either from watercourses/artesian wells. (That should be patently obvious from the late Neolithic and early Bronze Age settlements noted on Ashton Farm and by the features in the area). However in general terms, populations have converged/expanded around original settlements, whereas the need generally speaking no longer arises to obtain water in that historical manner. However continuing to specifically target development/growth into such areas has loaded the natural environment to the point where now this is a serious problem – as exemplified by the flooding problems here in East Inverness.

CONCLUSION Reliance on a 20 years old principle of development is in error because the sub division, matters which came to light, changes in Scottish Planning Policy and the consideration of wider environmental issues represent significant changes in circumstances. The development plan/Local plan land use approach from 2001 is misdirected, explained above (i) – (v) and you are obviously exposing my property to increased risk. Paul Bova

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number	04150	Name	Sandy Robertson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.17	
Reference	IN75		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

remove this site from the allocation. It is unsuitable

Representation

Objection to promotion of site IN75 in IMFLDP 1. Lead in Groundwater A letter from the Principal Contaminated Land Officer dated 20 February 2012 refers to the British Geological Survey which explains that groundwater in the area east of Inverness exhibits relatively high lead levels derived from granite and metasediments, and the elevated lead measured in the groundwater at the site by Barratt agrees with that survey. Indeed, the tests conducted by Barratt in 2007 revealed that lead was present in the groundwater on average four times higher than the WHO permissible limit for human ingestion. In some bore holes the level was ten times above the permissible limit. In their geo environmental interpretative report, Barratt state no humans can come into contact with this groundwater, therefore there is no need to conduct a risk assessment. However, the approved site layout 70329/040 identifies a pond and other surface areas for the storage of groundwater. Therefore, if the groundwater is already known to be contaminated with lead (irrespective of the housing scheme being hooked up to the mains water supply or not) the storage pond and other areas on site nominated will no doubt contain that water with elevated levels of lead, and if consumed by children or pets will certainly represent a clear specific and present risk. It has not been demonstrated, either by the consent or the SEA, whether the land can support the development so proposed and the site should not have been included in the IMFLDP by Highland Council using that consent as justification as suitable for housing. Indeed, the SEA conducted in respect of site IN75 positively excludes provision for any assessment of groundwater. 2. Pond Management Barratt, the developer, noted there were two ponds on site, one permanent and one temporary and these represented a flood risk that could be managed subject to condition. The ponds would be retained, re-engineered as on site flood management measures. However, by email 19 June 2012 M Macleod to S Black, it is revealed that Barratt filled in that permanent pond as it represented a health and safety concern. Highland Council subsequently served a breach of planning control notice on Barratt dated 22 June 2012, providing Barratt with the option of (i) immediately completing the works they had proposed where these ponds would be re-engineered; (ii) reinstate the pond or (iii) submit an application to regularise the breach. None of these was done. It was 16 months later that the storage pond was worked on. However, any re-engineered pond as a flood management measure will similarly represent a similar health and safety issue as was present for Barratt’s workers as for the public once said pond is completed. The principle of development in 1994 is relied upon consistently by the planners. However that did not factor in such matters required to deliver the development. Therefore this represents a significant matter arising, where the continued inclusion of the site in the local plan as a contribution to the supply of housing is in question. 3. Land Contamination The minute of the PED Meeting 23 September 2009 records concerns about land contamination and a lack of testing of the site. In response the Principal contaminated land officer explained “..the developer would not be able to proceed with the development until the site had been fully investigated, remedial work undertaken, and this work validated to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority...Assurances having been given that Local Members would be kept informed of progress, and that the site would be free from contamination before construction commenced, Mr D Henderson, seconded by Mr G Farlow, MOVED that the application be approved as set out in the report” On the 14 October 2011, the site was deemed to have been properly assessed, tested and decontaminated as per the requirements of the planning condition. However, neighbours remained concerned that significant quantities of waste could still be witnessed partly submerged on site. Accordingly they submitted complaints to the Highland Council for example in a letter dated 29 January 2012 they state “Since the second week of November 2011 residents have witnessed significant quantities of waste continuously being recovered from the soil and indeed the workers on the site have expressed concern at the extent of the waste. Given the above and that you appear to consider the works pertaining to the Remediation Strategy completed is the site still contaminated or not”? In response the Highland Council officials adopted a robust position, claiming the site had been tested and remediated properly. However, documents obtained under freedom of information reveal the position stated by Highland Council in response to concerns and complaints was deeply misleading, that the site had not been assessed and decontaminated as claimed:- In an email exchange dated 2 February 2012 involving Barratt’s site agent Jeff Calder, contaminated land and Mr Gibson the contaminated land department state; “From visiting the site there is a bit (area 4m x 4m) that was missed in the investigation and should have been removed as part of the remediation. So I have asked for validation of the soils under this area” (Emphasis) An amendment to the site validation certificate took place as a result of this. Then on the 14 March 2012 Barratt’s agents reveal there were actually further requirements to deal with contamination. They state:- "There have been three areas where suspected contamination has been discovered previous investigation targeted this location and trace levels of soluble PAH were detected in soils, but appear to have 'missed' the main source...as you can see, we had a tight

offset herringbone grid, but these seem to have 'slipped through' the net" This is of some concern firstly because the assurances provided to the planning committee were not upheld. Rather than the site being free of contamination prior to work starting, the opposite had been the case and unfortunately by this time in 2012 numerous foundations, roads and infrastructure had been laid. Yet another addition to the site validation certificate took place on the 14 June 2012. Therefore there was considerable uncertainty surrounding the status of the site having been properly assessed and remediated. Further gross contamination is evident every time further earthworks are conducted on the various bunds, including further car waste metals and demolition debris. In conclusion of Land Contamination In such circumstances, the allocation of the site in the IMFLDP based on the status of that consent is not realistic because that consent, with buildings and infrastructure covering the land, is a significant obstacle in demonstrating the site is properly as assessed suitable for housing as suggested and not a risk to the public.

4. Footpath The Local plan in 1994 notes the intention of Highland Council to upgrade Resaurie Road in 1998 and also to provide a footpath. That is broadly reflected in a memo dated 1 April 2008 where Mike Stephens Roads department provides advice to the planning officer that the fence line of the site must be moved away from the Resaurie road by a further 2.5m to allow for future road improvements, including the provision of a cyclepath to national cycle path standards. It was explained in the planning report to committee in 2009 that this had been agreed with the developer. The planning consent contained the requirement that prior to the start of work on site a revised site layout should be submitted showing the 2.5m set back to allow for the footpath. However that did not happen, Colin Ross of Roads department explained in a letter dated 17 July 2013 "...While this secured the delivery of the footway/cycleway by the developer it did not require any change to the site layout to allow for the 2.5m width to be routed behind the passing places at the locations initially requested. A change to the site layout would have been required to achieve this and that option was simply not available." This was because the planners did not enforce the condition about the drawing. While the footpath (not a cyclepath to national standard) has been built in 2013 to the benefit of pedestrians, it was not possible to set the fence line back the required 2.5m and still fit all the houses on the site (as explained above). Thereby, the available space for vehicles has actually been reduced under the Barratt regime. Indeed, it is particularly noteworthy that the Council has not responded to the concerns submitted about vehicles having to stop and reverse against the flow of traffic. There is therefore a detriment to the area due to this reduction in available road space, when vehicles meet now they very often have to stop and reverse against the flow of traffic and therefore the inclusion of the site in the IMFLDP as suitable for 64 houses is highly questionable because it appears the Council is placing a priority on the provision of cramming 64 houses on the site, whereas there is no explanation why that is preferred to the issue of a reduction in road safety. For all the above reasons, we object to the promotion of site IN75 in the IMFLDP For Resaurie Residents Association, Sandy Robertson.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number	04173	Name	David Riach	Organisation	
-----------------	-------	------	-------------	--------------	--

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		
---	--	--

Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	
---------	---------------------------	-----------	--

Reference	RESAURIE INVERNESS IN75	Type	Change	Comment Late	No
-----------	-------------------------	------	--------	--------------	----

Comment Changes

Object to Housing land

Representation

[redacted] Object to land at Resaurie IN75 for 64 houses. We have lived here 30 years and our property 'Ashville' adjoins that land and sits below the level of Caulfield Road North. Houses have already been put on that land at the Tower Burn end which are way above the existing houses here see photo RIDGE DECEMBER 2013 and that cannot be right. Housing on that land will also look straight into our bedrooms and conservatory there will be a serious loss of privacy for us. Another point is Caulfield Road is a blind bend and barely room for one car. See photo ROAD CORNRIGGS ASHVILLE 2013 that is taken beside our timber fence. There was accident with injury in summer 2013 when a car and a motorbike were in collision. More accidents are likely. Your plans mean more people coming and going from that site making road safety worse when it continues to be a problem to this day. Yours sincerely David Riach

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number	04154	Name	Paul Bova	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN75		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Challenge presumption for use allocation of IN75 please see my representations, the site is not suitable for the use suggested.

Representation

[redacted] OBJECTION LETTER NUMBER TWO 6 December 2013 Dear Sirs I adhere to my previous comments in “OBJECTION LETTER ONE” and in this letter I challenge further the “rolling over” of above site in the local plan. BACKGROUND The Local plan 1994 explains the 4.8 hectare site 6.1.3(c) site was not free of major constraints. Paragraph 6.1.3 advises to develop the site constraints need to be resolved. Access is a problem. “Local Access Roads” at 6.4.4 prescribes in order to develop the site, Resaurie Road (Caulfield Road North) must be widened, along with the provision of footpaths. This work was to be conducted by the Council at a cost of £194,000 in 1996-98. Therefore, given matters were to be addressed by the Highland Council (whereas development of other sites in the area required cost of any road improvements to be met by developers) this highlights the Council had a keen interest in development of this particular site. 2001 A significant change arises where under the Local plan consultative draft, the larger 4.8 hectare site was subdivided in two, Resaurie North and South sites. In order to develop the North site, the Resaurie Road must be upgraded, or alternatively access could be taken from the South site. This is therefore the first time the site, as it is now (IN75) appears in the local plan allocated for development. 2004 The North site did not have any planning permission. However, there was permission for 32 Houses on the South site. Despite that, Barratt built 68 houses on the South site, which they labelled their “phase 1” scheme. 2006 There is not any suggested number of properties for the North site. 2007 Highland Council report PLi 124/08 speaks to a Barratt Planning Application 07/00542/FULIN submitted June 2007 in respect of North site, where permission for 107 houses was sought. At 4.1 “Area Roads wish to see the fenceline on Caulfield Road North set back by a minimum of 2.5 metres to allow for future improved provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Caulfield Road North is part of the National Cycleway Network the Local Plan identifies it as a cycle route. On Caulfield Road North Area Roads suggest the formation of 2 passing places with one located at the emergency exit and the other further south opposite Ashville (this passing place would be funded by the Council).” MY COMMENT The wish for Road fence line set back to allow footpath/improvements demonstrates under sub division of the site, there is continuing requirement to upgrade the Resaurie Road - even when alternative access is offered from Phase 1. The suggestion of passing places demonstrates even with a 2.5m setback to provide additional land, there will be insufficient space on the road for vehicles; if passing places are proposed, vehicles will be stopping and reversing (against the flow of traffic) giving rise to increased safety risk on the road. Further, will housing constrain the National cycle route? These represent matters arising material to the local plan status of the site. Your presumption for housing means road safety issues and loss of amenity are imposed on the local residents and the wider public. At 7.3 “The Local Plan identifies the site for residential purposes in terms of Policy 97 (V) with no restriction on the number of residential units to be developed on the site.” MY COMMENT How can you justify “no restriction” when the original larger site suggested 72 Houses, and the South site already produced 68 Houses? “No restriction” meant high density (picked out from a generic table guide) is considered acceptable and driving the approach, where development is spread out as far as possible - compounding existing local issues. Further, I doubt this report was the first time the approach for “no restriction” and high density was considered, given the report carries a recommendation for approval. Prior support must surely have been provided to drive the feasibility of the North site. “No restriction” facilitates development of a site with numerous constraints. Moreover, in this context, “No restriction” is effectively a development planning decision:- If say 10/20 houses had been considered acceptable then it is not realistically buildable, overdevelopment is required because significant number of properties would be required to overcome the various constraints. Perhaps unwittingly, the land was ‘unlocked’ contributing to resolve the ownership problem which, at that time was after all, a noted constraint in the local plan Housing Land Audit. At 7.8 “The access onto Caulfield Road North is for emergency purposes only and is not to be used for other traffic, which will take access off the existing road in Phase 1. Construction traffic would have to use the existing access off Murray Road and not the existing access to the site from Caulfield Road North.” MY COMMENT It should be obvious the North site and Phase 1 are separate entities, there is no common access connecting the two. Further, there is a comprehensive land drop between the two sites. Therefore, there is not any “access off the existing road in Phase 1” - there is no relationship between that road in phase 1, and the North site. Nor is there an “existing access off Murray Road” - the road leading off Murray Road into Phase 1 - terminates in phase 1. “Access” linking the sites would have to be established via an act of construction. However, as the agreement is construction traffic must enter the site from Murray Road (which is not possible) there is therefore no access into the North site, other than from Resaurie Road. Development of the North site continuing on this basis would not be possible because the local plan (explicitly) makes development dependant on the matter of access being resolved. Whereas, the only way to resolve this according to the local plan, is

to upgrade Resaurie Road to deliver development, which is a matter material to the local plan status of the site. 7.8 continues “The housing layout does not provide for any houses to have access direct to the road, but this can be covered by condition.” MY COMMENT Requirement for such condition further examples the issue of road safety is attributed to the increased use of the Resaurie Road arising from the development. At 7.10 “The exit onto Caulfield Road North is necessary but restricted to emergency purposes.” MY COMMENT Again, even under sub-division where access can now be taken from Phase 1, access from Resaurie Road is still a necessity in any development to make up for shortcomings of that sub division. Indeed, the site does not represent land capable of being developed from phase 1 without safety issues arising. Condition 16 states No development shall take place unless details of the emergency barrier/bollards onto Caulfield Road North are submitted... It shall be designed to allow for access by emergency vehicles only and not by normal vehicular traffic which shall take access from Murray Road at all times. Reason: In the interests of road traffic and pedestrian safety and in recognition of the need to allow emergency access for fire engines and other emergency vehicles. MY COMMENT While “normal” four wheeled vehicles perhaps might not be able to use that emergency access, bicycles, motorbikes mopeds and pedestrians can access the site to and from Resaurie Road compounding the road use. This is compounded if we consider since 1994 there has been additional development in Cradlehall, Resaurie. There are approximately 200 car movements per day and a significant increase in cycling, pedestrians (both commuters and recreational) horses and care in the community all using the road (without factoring any increase generated by development of the North site). HOUSING AUDIT 2007 The “Housing Land Audit 2007 Local Plan Sites” used to identify housing needs over the Local plan period at page 8 explains the North site now carries the notable new aspiration for 107 units on site by 2012. MY COMMENT The development planning promotion of the North site is clearly driven by the philosophy of that application 07/00542/FULIN intention to develop the site. IN SUM Under “my comments” above I explained the local plan approach is contrary to the principle of development. In addition, there are significant changes in circumstances arising material to the local plan status of the site where the sub division of the site failed, there is no access from phase 1 and to compound that, there is a continuing requirement to improve Resaurie Road, pointing up the shortcomings of the local plan alternative access solution.. If the site was “rolled” forward on this basis, a presumption for housing is at best a detriment to the area where existing local issues are made worse by “no restriction” on development. I have therefore highlighted the problems arising. However it is necessary to list the events which followed as these are also in context, relevant to the decisions above in the local plan:- 2008 ONWARDS 07/00542/FULIN was refused in December 2008. Barratt submitted application 09/00231/FULIN approximately three months later. Planning report relating to that application explained the matter of access to the North site was addressed during the phase 1 development (2004). Once consent was granted in 2010, Barratt wrote 23 June 2010 stating access to the site was required from Resaurie Road until the new access from phase 1 was completed. Indeed, in subsequent emails Barratt repeated the only way into the site was from the Resaurie Road. They explain (for example on 1 September 2010) they looked at other options, but that was the only way in. Planning officials in response confirmed they were aware of and sympathetic to, this problem. Barratt did take access from Resaurie Road for 18 months – but did not upgrade the road. Actually, during this time they frequently blocked the Road loading/unloading plant impeding people getting in and out of Resaurie. Residents complained to Highland Council. In reply the Council advised they had no ambit to intervene. VERBAL AGREEMENT In subsequent letters to me and my MSP, the Chief Executive of Highland Council disclosed something else was actually happening:- A “verbal” agreement was in place with Barratt to cover this access from Resaurie Road until such time as the new access from Phase 1 was constructed. The Chief Executive describes this verbal agreement as “regrettable”. While he does not reveal when that agreement was made, we know access was addressed in 2004. In 2010 all parties confirmed this had already been looked at. There was no access, apart from Resaurie Road. MY COMMENT This deliberate act (even retrospectively) condoning access from Resaurie Road defeats the land allocation. It is a misrepresentation of the site status, given the Resaurie Road is the only way in to deliver development, and must be upgraded in that regard. This is material to the principle of development. It is reasonable to presume this “agreement” is relevant from 2004, suggesting further matters material to the Local plan status have not been considered. IN CONCLUSION Sub-division of the larger site appears to have been notified via “leaflet summarising nature and purpose of local plan being displayed at public places” sub-division actually executed during the time period between the consultative draft 2001/adoption of the plan 2006. In any case, that, along with all the issues detailed under “my comment”, represent significant changes in circumstances, calling into question the continued “rolled over” site allocation in the local plan. The principle of development cited from 1994 allegedly providing the basis for the continued allocation of the site IN75 for housing can no longer be relied upon. I am affected directly by all issues raised under “my comment”. All this is contrary to the convention that Local plans need to take local circumstances into account. Whereas in the instant case some issues are circumvented, while others are compounded through “no restriction”. Setting aside if they should or not - the ends do not justify the means. Paul Bova

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number	04096	Name	Carol Christie	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN75 Resaurie North		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

See my previous comment

Representation

[redacted] Re: your letter dated October 2013 INNER MORAY FIRTH CONSULTATION IN75 11 December 2013 Dear Sirs The IMFLDP instructs me that development of the above land IN75 must be in accordance with planning permission 09/00231/FULIN. I do not agree with that:- Firstly, On the Resaurie Road (Caulfield Road North) it was previously enough space for two cars to pass one another without issue. To demonstrate that I attach Photo CAR ON ROAD GOOGLE 2008 (obtained via download from Google). Whereas, adhering to your suggested benchmark planning permission in the IMFLDP, the road is now narrowed in width and it is no longer possible for two cars to pass, they have to reverse on the road to find a passing place. Further, many cyclists and pedestrians still use the road, and this lack of useable road space is a concern. There is barely enough room for a car and cyclist. I attach the photo “CYCLIST ON ROAD”. I also refer to email dated 17 October 2012 from Tim Stott to Malcolm Macleod, where he explains that the philosophy supporting the development of site IN75 was that any issues arising were to be managed, because they were “local” issues. In my view, if the local plan recognised Caulfield Road North as part of the National Cycle network, and that is also the main route connecting this area to the new UHI Beechwood Campus, then what happens on the site IN75 is important to both the locals and the wider public from a strategic point of view. The issues raised are therefore not local, and the presumption with planning permission 09/00231/FULIN should not be driving the local plan consultation process. Secondly, It is recorded in process for some considerable time that this situation surrounding the road/footpath was causing some concern. Whereas the Highland Council IMFLDP document produced in spring 2012 “Inverness City and Fringe” appears to ignore that fact entirely:- At 7.11 the document actually makes a virtue of the planning permission 09/00231/FULIN, classifying it as the “significant pro” in the promotion of the site in the IMFLDP. That is clearly in error, a detriment to useable road width and thereby safety directly attributed to a planning permission cannot represent a “significant pro” – that certainly does not represent a sustainable development. Further, in response to a petition signed by nearly 100 people directly who were concerned and directly affected by this loss of road space, Highland Council claim this reduction in useable road space is actually an improvement for the area, as it encourages vehicles to slow down. However given they conducted zero consultation on that - how can Highland Council understanding the matter? For example, the road is used by Tractors with trailers for Farm access, Oil deliveries by 30 tonne trucks, coal deliveries and home parcel delivery by 7.5 tonne trucks. Many people at Resaurie have vans for work, there is also regular towing of horse box trailers using the road for access and horse riders. Therefore, even if the speed is reduced, the problem of reduced road space persists. In the case of this road, the vehicle is not merely ‘a visitor’ where the residential status must be enhanced and public transport encouraged. That is the wrong approach. Conclusion Highland Council in their local plan process continue to promote and allocate the land as suitable for housing, yet during that time, the road, a publically adopted asset that was previously capable of allowing two way traffic flow, was narrowed to a single track road. The reliance on that planning permission as a ‘pro’ is not appropriate as in practical terms it represents a “con” - before anyone even occupies a house on that site, the wider area experiences a detriment. That does not represent the pursuit of sustainable development planning. Yours sincerely Carol Christie

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN75	Resaurie	
--------------	----------------	------	----------	--

Customer Number	00985	Name	Macdonald Hotels	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Administrator Yvonne Macdonald		G H Johnston Building Consultants	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN76		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

1. Clarify the extent of transport improvements required or cross reference to the HwLDP and refer to the need for a Transport Assessment if proposals brought forward in advance of wider improvements to the network. 2. Delete the housing capacity figure. 3. The Plan should explain: (a) how the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar can be determined; (b) What a recreation access management plan is; and (c) why mitigation works are required in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail for land allocations distant from it.

Representation

Our client, Macdonald Hotels Ltd, welcome the fact that the Proposed Plan continues support the Stratton Lodge Hotel site for housing development. However, as with previous stages of the preparation of the LDP, the Proposed Plan fails to clarify the servicing and phasing relative to the Highland wide LDP provisions. This is not helpful and neither is the lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network in the area. The reference in the draft Schedule 4 response to our comments on the MIR about dependency upon others for transport improvements was all too easily dismissed as being “noted” and then by stating that this “is a reality given the site’s location and need for connectivity to local and strategic road networks.” The response goes on to say that “there is no quantitative need to accelerate the supply of housing land within or close to the City. Earlier phased proposals would have to be justified by developer funded transport assessment and not be prejudicial to sensible future transport improvement options.” The list of transport provisions in the HwLDP relating to the development of the area to 2016 as per Phase 1 is extensive and, as previously asserted, our clients are concerned that most of these provisions/ requirements will depend on the action of others. As such, the restoration/ redevelopment of the former Stratton Lodge Hotel will be significantly delayed whilst commitments are made. For example, the recent consultation exercise by Transport Scotland on options for dualling the A96 gave no confidence that even the initial improvements between the Smithton and Inverness Retail and Business Park roundabouts would be delivered in the near future. We also question whether the need to contribute to transport improvements some distance from Stratton Lodge, such as at the Inshes roundabout, is fair and reasonable. Our clients have recently had to deal with the fall-out from further extensive vandalism of the former Listed hotel (a serious fire), which has more or less completely destroyed the building. If the building can be saved, which is a serious doubt, at the very least remedial works need to be undertaken in the near future. In doing so our clients have to be mindful of the development potential and how realistic the provisions of the LDP are to allow an acceptable proposal to be prepared and delivered. The feasibility of restoring the building also depends on a degree of enabling development within the grounds. However, if such development triggers off the need to meet the extensive list of developer requirements and/or await implementation of many of the transport provisions listed in the HwLDP then we anticipate that any hope of saving the building will disappear. As such, the requirement to respect the fabric and setting of the Category B Listed building will no longer be relevant. In addition, we question how the housing capacity of the land allocation can be stated in the Proposed Plan when a Flood Risk Assessment and the retention and management of the mature policy woodland “may affect developable area” (wording in the document)? Furthermore, as IN76 is indicated as a Phase 1 housing site in the HwLDP we are concerned that taking account of the whole range of development factors, it may not be financially feasible or acceptable to the roads authority without allowing access through the open part of the clients’ land (IN84) in conjunction with some early development of it. In this regard the indication of our clients’ part of this allocation in the HwLDP as Phase 2 or part of the Milton of Culloden land is not helpful. The housing capacity figure of IN76 can only realistically be determined by a feasibility study of the restoration/redevelopment of the Listed building together with the transport, flood risk and tree/woodland assessments which will provide development parameters for a suitable design solution. Finally, we seek clarification about the meaning of the first sentence of the “Requirements” listed under this allocation. How can the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar be determined? What is a “recreation access management plan”? Why would mitigation works in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail be required for the development of this allocation?

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN76	Stratton Lodge	
--------------	----------------	------	----------------	--

Customer Number	04483	Name	William Calder	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN78	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Additional developer requirements to safeguard surface water drainage, car parking and construction effects.

Representation

In response to notification of planned development of Sites(s): IN78 - Land east of Smithton Free Church; As a tenant of 87 Murray Terrace I have a few issues to raise on the proposed site IN78. I note the proposed development will back onto the current car park. I am concerned over access to and the functionality of the car park during and post development. This car park is used to full capacity and the loss of parking bays will add to the congestion and double parking problem present within Murray Terrace currently. Potentially increasing the risk of damage to privately owned vehicles. Could you provide information regarding proposed access to the development during and post construction as well as areas of planned storage of materials for the site? In addition the immediate area is prone to surface water ponding during heavy rainfall due to limited soil porosity of a gloamy clay soil makeup. Further detail is sought on what measures have been put forth in the planning document by the developer to address the risk flooding is not increased both during and post construction. Dust and blow away materials from the site is a concern in relation to maintaining a clean living environment. Runoff of water and other soluble materials from the site is a concern in relation to the risk of pollution upon the immediate area.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN78	Land east of Smithton Free Church	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------------------------	--

Customer Number	04484	Name	Ken Maclellan	Organisation	
Agent Name and Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN78	Type	Change	Comment Late	Yes

Comment Changes

Deletion of site

Representation

My objections to this proposed housing development taking place as are follows: The land is zoned for amenity use. Access would be of major concern. Use the Culloden Woodlands regularly and find that tower road is very busy road indeed, from early morning till late evening. The last thing needed is traffice hold up, particularly as vehicles approaching heading down hill are usually moving at speed. Access from murray Terrace would be an absolute no go. Only as far back as August 2011, I was struck by a motor vehicle while standing on the payment. Hospitalised, our of work and still bearing the cost. Access through the church property area would not be welcomed either, the church has a large congretation which is growing, along with the daily activities and evening classes at both the community centre and church hall. Every available parking space currently there is required, especially when functions take place. The ground owned nby the church is managed very well, with all the necessary groundworks being carried out as required. The last thing I wanted is more pressure put on me as a result of this work interfering with my surrounds. Rubbish like bottles, cans, paper, and all sorts of rubbish get discarded regularly from the main road and pavement area above. A play area with access by path will only create a much worse situation for me. The proposal of "landscaping" "waste ground" sounds ominous, to this experienced person, all ground/rubble bull dozed into the corner putting more pressure onto what is already above me. At this moment I do have limited daylight from both facing rooms (living room and main bedroom) if further trees were surrounding it would totally block out my daylight. Noise level would be increased, when my windows were open, and, as this road above is regularly perhaps surprisingly used by a lot of younger people, I feel that any "play area" is more likely to be abused. Flooding in this area has been well highlighted in the past, so the last thing one wants is to be directly below another development. Increased noise levels from all sides give position, it would be pretty much like being totally resident on a building site. Everybody seems to have cars, so this private development proposal will attract more vehicles to this contained area. There are far too many contentious issues regarding this development, I feel it should be dismissed and continue to be available for amenity use.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN78	Land east of Smithton Free Church	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------------------------	--

Customer Number	04366	Name	Allan Robertson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	1.Introduction		Paragraph	Page 3 'Next Steps'	
Reference	The adoption process		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

In 'Next Steps' any change by the Council to the Reporter's recommendations proposed by the Council must be advertised for further comment. If the Council decides not to adopt the Reporter's recommendations the further objection process should be explained to those frustrated by the non-adoption.

Representation

In 2006 the Reporter's recommendation for Upper Cullernie Farm were rejected on the whim of one Councillor who had not taken a public part in any discussion other than appearing to sympathise with the objections of Community Council and those living near the proposed site. In 2006 following the Council's formal adoption of the Local Plan I wrote to the Scottish Executive/Scottish Government objecting to the non-adoption of the Reporter's Recommendation. In spite of my specifically drawing my MSP's attention to my letter of objection I received a letter of apology from the Scottish Exec/Govt for their having mislaid my letter and advising me that in the interim the Local Plan had been adopted/approved. Both of my suggested changes would give more transparency to the planning process which is often viewed cynically by the public. In spite of the diligence of officials, politicians working behind the scenes lay themselves and their motives open to unnecessary suspicion.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN79	Upper Cullernie Farm	
--------------	----------------	------	----------------------	--

Customer Number	04366	Name	Allan Robertson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	IN79	
Reference	IN 79 Upper Cullernie Farm		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Clarify whether this policy refers only to the present development of which the planning permissions are referred to. It should be made clear that no more houses will be allowed here. Explain what is meant by the 'junction improvements at Cullernie Road' - Cullernie Road is beside the village shop. The development joins what remains of the old road, from Balloch to the Nairn Road, which was diverted when the Barn Church Road was built. Explain what the reference to a flood assessment means and includes. Add a map which shows Where IN79 is.

Representation

Reference to existing planning permissions does not indicate whether that is intended as a limitation. We have already seen the number increase. More hard surfaces mean more run-off in wet weather. The surface water drainage does not work - during wet weather the road from the site drains on to the existing road; and the incorrect partial amendment of the old road's cross-fall now leads water from that road into our and our neighbours' gardens (as a result of incomplete adherence to the original planning conditions). Also, the partial re-surfacing of the old road is too flat and smooth which means that any dampness in freezing weather is held and turns to ice without the benefit of a texture which allows a grip for feet or tyres. Traffic calming measures should be added to the old road because traffic to and from the new houses travels too quickly for the safety of other road users. The Council's assessment that the effect of the short length of road would prevent dangerously high speeds underestimated the power of modern cars.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN79	Upper Cullernie Farm	
--------------	----------------	------	----------------------	--

Customer Number	03150	Name	Mr Tom Ashley	Organisation	Turnberry Consulting Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN80	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

The land identified as ‘public open space’ is included within the Campus allocation (Site IN80)

Representation

Inverness Campus – Site IN80 As you will be aware construction of the Inverness Campus is well underway with the site expected to open early in 2014. We are therefore pleased to note the reference under 4.15 to the Inverness Campus as “an international hub for learning, a centre for modern sporting facilities, and a haven for modern research and development particularly in the Life Sciences”. We also support the allocation of the majority of the land (comprising 62.4ha) under Site IN80 for Business, Student Accommodation and Community “in accordance with Permission 09/00887/PIPIN and related permissions”. However, HIE have asked us to make it clear that they strongly object to the land on the eastern boundary being identified as public open space. As you are aware the Campus will be providing a large area of high quality, landscaped and maintained public open space. Whilst the A9/A96 Trunk Link Road (TLR) will form a divide through the Campus site, it is HIE aspiration that the land to the west of the TLR is effectively integrated with the Campus, accommodating complimentary uses and activities. To this end we suggest the land identified as ‘preferred open space’ is included within the Campus allocation (Site IN80). This will allow HIE flexibility to effectively integrate this land within the wider (landscape) proposals for the Campus as the site develops (rather than isolating the land as ‘open space’ which sits outside of the Campus).

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN80	Inverness Campus, Beechwood	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------------------	--

Customer Number	04485	Name	Fraser Grieve	Organisation	Scottish Council for Development and Industry
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN80	Type	Support	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Representation

SCDI continues to be a strong advocate of the Inverness Campus as an important hub for the city but also as a key location to meet the education and business needs of the wider region. We welcome the progress that has been made and believe once completed it will play a major role in the economic wellbeing of the Highlands and Islands.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN80	Inverness Campus, Beechwood	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------------------	--

Customer Number	03150	Name	Mr Tom Ashley	Organisation	Turnberry Consulting Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN81		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Extend allocation to include the whole of this parcel of land.

Representation

West of Castlehill Road – Site IN81 Whilst we are supportive of the Council preferred Mixed Use allocation for this site (Business/Housing/Leisure/Community) we note that it has not been extend to the whole of this parcel of land. We see no rationale for arbitrarily dividing the site and suggest that this entire parcel of land would be best allocated for Mixed Use as this would make most efficient use of the land. In any event we consider the proposed allocation of the eastern part of the site as public open space to be inappropriate, not least since this site is situated directly adjacent to the new Inverness Campus which, as set out above, will deliver a large area open space. As such there will be adequate provision of high quality public open space for the use and enjoyment of the local community in this area. We therefore suggest that there is little need or justification for the (part) allocation of the land west of Castle Road for open space. Notwithstanding the above we recognise that a sensitive approach would need to be taken to the development of this site to ensure that it complimented the delivery of the proposed A9/A96 Trunk Link Road (TLR).

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN81	West of Castlehill Road	
--------------	----------------	------	-------------------------	--

Customer Number	00324	Name	Dr Donald Boyd	Organisation	Westhill Community Council
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.17	
Reference	IN81 and IN89		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

We object to the proposed use of this agricultural area for housing.

Representation

Para 4.17 IN81 West of Castlehill Road We note that WCC's view has not prevailed. We object to the proposed use of this agricultural area for housing, and we wholeheartedly endorse the ‘significant cons’ listed in the Main Issues Report Spring 2012 against this proposal. Para 4.17 IN89 Land south east of Drumossie Hotel We note that this site was not mentioned in the Main Issues Report. As it can be seen from the A9 on the approach to Inverness, we recommend that our proposed new Gateway criteria should apply to it (see other entry). We are grateful to have the opportunity to record our opinions. We appreciate the new interactive online facility, with the hyperlinking of the downloadable PDF file, but we encourage more robust testing that all hyperlinks are active and correct. We take this opportunity to congratulate all those involved in the preparation of this complex and detailed draft Plan, the associated Action Plan, and the objective summary of responses to the previous consultation round.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN81	West of Castlehill Road	
--------------	----------------	------	-------------------------	--

Customer Number	01311	Name	The Executory Of Hector Munro	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Mr Alan R Farningham		Farningham Planning Ltd	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land		Type	Support	Comment Late
No					

Comment Changes

Representation

Support Plan as written.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	01669	Name	Catriona Johnson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN82 Ashton Farm and adjoining land		Type	Change	Comment Late
No					

Comment Changes

Allow for development of a large district park only - no further development of housing for the area

Representation

For Inverness to survive (and emerge successfully) the current global economic downturn, it must capitalize on its tourism assets. Its well-established hospitality industry will help provide long-term employment as long as it remains a tourist destination. It is, therefore, essential to protect, not only the beautiful surrounding landscape, but also the city itself. Many councils would envy open farmland and green spaces so close to a city. These must be retained preventing further urban sprawl and allowing Inverness to "breathe" and maintain its image as a "green" city. Almost 2500 houses already have planning permission in the neighbouring Stratton Farm development. Whilst new towns demand the concomitant new infrastructure, frequently development areas result in further pressure on often already overstretched services. Developer contributions cannot finance total "new builds" merely temporary additions and modifications and, since dependant on house sales, rarely materialize until a major part of the development is completed. Further development in this area will, not only put pressure on schools, surgeries, roads etc., but also exacerbate the flood risk - presently the open fields can act as a sink; the proposed creation of a park, whilst highly welcomed, would not replace these acres of fields. Whilst there is a need to identify further areas for housing, brownfield sites must be developed first. The local authority must ensure developers build in those areas which already have planning permission (rather than sitting on sites waiting for house prices to rise) before releasing more sites to them.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number 04353 Name Maria de la Torre Organisation On behalf of Lochardil and Drummond Community Council

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section 4.Development Allocations Paragraph

Reference IN82 and IN83 Type Change Comment Late No

Comment Changes

The Community Council would request a reduced density and the creation of a green corridor along the burns and retention of some farmland.

Representation

The Community Council would request a reduced density and the creation of a green corridor along the burns and retain of some farmland to maintain the rural character of the area.

Allocated to East Inverness IN82 Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land

Customer Number	00662	Name	Scottish Prison Service	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Mr Neil Gray		Colliers Internatioinal	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	Proposal IN 82		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 “Ashton Farm and adjoining land” for uses described as “1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution”. SPS notes the Council’s recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement “1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution” to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions.

Representation

PROPOSED PLAN PROPOSAL REFERENCES: IN8 (FORMER LONGMAN LANDFILL), IN82 (ASHTON FARM AND ADJOINING LAND) AND IN2 (PORTERFIELD PRISON). Colliers International is retained by Scottish Prison Service as property and planning advisor in relation to its future estate redevelopment project concerning the provision of a new HMP Highland prison facility and any future subsequent re-use of the existing HMP Inverness facility at Porterfield, Inverness. Earlier representations were made to Highland Council’s consultation into the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMF LDP) at the Call for Sites and the Main Issues Report stages. The most recent being to the Main Issues Report dated May 2012 where SPS made no specific reference to any development site for a future HMP Highland but did indicate that in the event of any future re-location of the existing prison facility away from Porterfield, then the existing property would become surplus to requirements and available for re-development. A further representation dated 7th August 2013 advised Council officers that progress had been made with early feasibility studies on potential development sites that may be suitable to accommodate a future HMP Highland. These feasibility studies are ongoing. Some of the early results, coupled with the site proposals identified in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan, have provided SPS with a degree of comfort to proceed with further investigations concerning a range of land use matters relevant to development in future, such as: accessibility, ground conditions and geotechnical, drainage and flood risk. This remains work in progress and is still subject to the resolution of technical and financial issues. SPS welcomes the Council’s support for accommodating a new prison within the City. Accordingly, SPS is pleased to note the Council’s broad direction of the IMF LDP Proposed Plan to accommodate the use on larger mixed use allocations where a degree of site layout masterplanning and set-back can be achieved, along with good public transport and other connections where they exist or can be created. SPS notes the Council has recognised “non-residential institutional” use possibilities for sites such as Proposal IN8 and IN82 in this regard. SPS would however wish modification to the Proposed Plan where the specific Use Class 8A “Secure residential institutions” as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Scotland Order 2006, which directs modification to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes (Scotland) Order 1997 at Class 8 (residential institutions) should be inserted. For uses which apply to the Crown, it states at paragraph 16: “Use for the provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks”. Proposed modifications to the Proposed Plan are discussed further below in this context. SPS appreciates and supports the Council’s development strategy for Central Inverness as explained in the IMF LDP Proposed Plan Paragraph 4.5. SPS particularly welcomes the statement: “Central Inverness’ development options are focused on the re-use of previously developed land or reclamation. This Plan will be flexible and encouraging in terms of development proposals on vacant, underutilised, contaminated and potentially surplus sites to aid regeneration. For example, a flexible approach is offered in respect of Longman College, Cameron Barracks and Porterfield Prison to encourage efficient relocation of existing uses and quicker re-use of land and buildings which are vacated. This turnover is healthy and will allow the City to diversify its role and adapt to changing market trends and opportunities.” SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN8 “Former Longman Landfill” for uses described as “Business, Industrial, Non-residential institutional, Temporary Stop Site for Travellers”. It is acknowledged that these uses could be suitably combined to provide a mixed development and that each use is compatible with each other to enable co-existence on the re-generated Longman site. However, SPS suggests the list of acceptable uses be modified and expanded to include “Class 8A Secure residential institutions”. It is noted and supported by SPS that the Council will require developers of Proposal IN8 to prepare a “Developer masterplan to incorporate/address: woodland retention to provide wind stable tree belt depth and visual screen to A9; suitable for Class 4, 5, 6 and 10 uses only. SPS wishes the statement “suitable for Class 4,5 6 and 10 uses only” to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. It is noted how the Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for the Proposal IN8 site and wider former Longman Landfill. The developer requirement statement reads”...demonstration of no adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar as a result of disturbance to or pollution of the SPA or adjacent bird feeding and roosting areas linked to the SPA.

The Council may produce Supplementary Guidance for this site and the wider, former Longman Landfill area which would be based on the same guiding principles as listed above. Flood Risk Assessment to support any planning application, this may affect the developable area”. This is considered by SPS to be a sensible approach to enable site constraints and limitations to be identified at an early stage in site layout planning. This would also assist the various indicated land uses, including for use Class 8A, to be accommodated in positions that take account of these limitations. By taking a flexible approach to the masterplanning process this can realise a series of positive outcomes – including regeneration of vacant or derelict land; remediation of land previously used as a landfill; creation of new business and community uses that bring people and new investment into the area; place making features can be planned into the site from an early stage which will enhance the setting of this visible location and allow the co-existence of compatible uses within the site. SPS would wish to work with Highland Council in the preparation of the guidance at the appropriate time. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN82 “Ashton Farm and adjoining land” for uses described as “1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution”. SPS notes the Council’s recognition of acceptable uses within Proposal IN82 may include Class 10 non-residential institution. SPS wishes the statement “1,300 homes, Community, Business, Industrial, Non-residential Institution” to be modified and expanded to include reference to Use Class 8A Secure residential institutions. SPS indicates support for the identification of Proposal IN2 “Porterfield Prison” for housing use in principle. However the proposed indicative capacity of 30 units is not supported. At this early stage, SPS would prefer no specified capacity for the site and thus the Proposal IN2 should be modified to reflect this position. As the developer requirements sought by the Council are described in Proposal IN2 as “Developer masterplan to address: need for widening of adjoining roads, footways and service vehicle access; possible left in/out access from Old Edinburgh Road; built heritage value of existing buildings; accommodation suitable for the elderly” it is believed it will be more appropriate for a site capacity to evolve from that process, once all site specific matters are understood and addressed. SPS would be willing to work with Highland Council in the preparation and agreement of a developer masterplan as is indicated as a requirement for this Proposal. SPS notes the housing use stated by the Council in the Proposal IN2 should be for ‘suitable for the elderly’. Whilst this is a logical aspiration in recognition of the future housing needs for this sector of the population, the Proposal IN2 should remain as a broad housing allocation for a range of potential types of occupier and not one specific type as stated currently. Again the specific type of use can be determined at a later date, possibly as part of the required Developer masterplan process. SPS notes the developer requirement to include ‘built heritage value of existing buildings’. The prison buildings are not statutorily listed, however there is a recognition of their historic value as RCAHMS (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland) has recorded the buildings as having historical interest cited for being ‘Victorian prison buildings’. SPS does not consider it appropriate at this time to progress any historical listing exercise in light of the process of estate redevelopment described earlier, as this may prejudice the full potential of the redevelopment project. SPS may consider appropriate property disposal mechanisms available to it. It would be appreciated that you contact me in the event that you wish to discuss the ongoing feasibility works in progress at this stage. For instance if you require any further supporting information in relation to this consultation.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	03150	Name	Mr Tom Ashley	Organisation	Turnberry Consulting Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN82		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

HIE request that a separate mixed use allocation is made for their land, to the north of railway, allowing development to come forward on the site in isolation, provided that it can be demonstrated that it can be adequately serviced.

Representation

Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land - IN82 We note that the land to the north of the railway has been included within the site IN82 which is allocated for “1300 homes, community, business, Industrial and non-residential”. We also note that the Council intends to produce a masterplan/development brief for the entire site which will be adopted a Supplementary Planning Guidance. HIE have aspirations to bring forward development on this parcel of land in support of the Campus, potentially accommodating complimentary business activities. As such, whilst we recognise that any development on the site would need to have careful regard to development at Ashton Farm, particularly with regard to likely transport corridors, HIE consider this parcel of land is should not form part of the wider Ashton Farm site and should not be dependent upon the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Guidance. Given the relative shortage of sites in the IMFLPD suitable for the types of activities HIE is seeking to promote and encourage alongside the delivery of the Campus, HIE considers it extremely important that a deliverable mixed use allocation for this site is secured. HIE is therefore keen that the allocation is not unduly restricted by planning policy requirements. HIE therefore request that a separate mixed use allocation is made for this land, allowing development to come forward on the site in isolation, provided that it can be demonstrated that it can be adequately serviced.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	00986	Name	Mr Fraser Hutcheson	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Administrator Yvonne Macdonald		G H Johnston Building Consultants	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN82	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

1. Clarify the full extent of transport improvements required or cross reference to the HwLDP. Alternatively, clarify that these are matters that will be covered by the development brief/framework plan to be prepared in the Summer of 2014. 2. The Plan should explain: (a) how the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar can be determined; (b) what a recreation access management plan is; and (c) why mitigation works are required in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail particularly for land allocations more distant from the Coastal Trail.

Representation

Our client, Fraser Hutcheson, owns land at Cradlehall Farm forming part of IN82 and welcomes the continued support for development through the Proposed Plan. However, despite successive submissions to each stage of the IMFLDP we yet again have cause to raise concerns about the servicing and phasing of the development relative to the Highland wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) provisions and the lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the strategic road network in the area. The reference in the draft Schedule 4 response to our comments on the MIR about dependency upon others for transport improvements was all too easily dismissed as being “noted” and then by stating that this “is a reality given the site’s location and need for connectivity to local and strategic road networks.” The response goes on to say that “there is no quantitative need to accelerate the supply of housing land within or close to the City. Earlier phased proposals would have to be justified by developer funded transport assessment and not be prejudicial to sensible future transport improvement options.” We also note from the Action Plan that the Council “intends to prepare and subsequently adopt as Supplementary Guidance a development brief/framework plan to address land use and transport issues for the site” with an indicative timescale for this of Summer 2014. The first point we make about all of this is that by amalgamating our client’s land with additional areas and then referring to the intention to prepare a development brief/framework plan, possibly in the Summer of 2014, it is still not clear what the detailed infrastructure requirements are, how these will open up his land and what the timescale for development is. The HwLDP indicates our client’s land for residential in Phase 2 with a timescale of 2016 to 2021. Now it has been lumped together with a greater amount of other land at Ashton Farm and allocated for Mixed Use. The Ashton land is Phase 4 in the HwLDP and post 2031. With all the relevant requirements to be met and lack of clarity over access, for example, we see little prospect of its development within the next 20 years. This is not what our client expected from the outset of the A96 Corridor Framework Plan and then the HwLDP when he agreed that his land be included. The list of transport provisions in the HwLDP relating to the development of the East Inverness area is extensive and as previously asserted our client is concerned that most of these provisions/ requirements will depend on the action of others. The Proposed Plan does now confirm that the Council will “definitely” require a distributor road connection between the rear of the Inverness Retail Park and Barn Church Road. However, it is not clear if this land is still East Link dependent, as indicated in response to our Main Issues Report (MIR) submission, or if indeed Transport Scotland will commit to this. The HwLDP indicates that development of the later phases of East Inverness have to contribute towards the A9-A96 (East) Link road. This now suggests that with our client’s land (Phase 2 in the HwLDP) being amalgamated with Phase 4 land at Ashton Farm, it will now be East Link dependent. This undoubtedly adds to the confusion but also suggests the development timescale as being much further into the future. As we have stated in previous submissions it is vital that this opportunity is not land-locked or hindered by the uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. Reluctantly, it appears that we shall have to wait until the development brief/framework plan is prepared next summer for the Council to provide the clear development guidance, rather than through the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. This will mean further participation at the expense of our client to seek clarification he has been looking for since 2006 and represent his interests. Finally, we seek clarification about the meaning of the part of the “Requirements” listed under this allocation. In particular we ask the following: - (a) How can the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar be determined? (b) What is a “recreation access management plan”? (c) Why would mitigation works in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail be required for the development of this allocation?

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	04258	Name	Lynne Bradshaw	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN82 Ashton Farm and adjoining land		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

The boundary line of the development should be moved. It currently extends up to the fence line of the properties right along Resaurie, on Cauldfield Road North. I believe at least the width of the first field, and preferably the second, directly in front of the houses should be retained as a green space or "parkland corridor". This would involve setting the boundary line some way back from the houses. It would go some way to protect the character of Resaurie and retain the beautiful views currently enjoyed by the householders whose properties face the open agricultural land with an outlook over the firth, the Black Isle and over the city to the Strathconon hills.

Representation

Resaurie is a semi-rural settlement of mixed houses of various sizes and ages, and very much enjoys a peaceful village atmosphere with many of the properties looking out to stunning views over the farmland across to the firth and the Black Isle. It is very different to the uniform modern housing schemes with identical houses which have been crammed into the nearby areas of Smithton, Westhill and Cradlehall. Despite its proximity to these large swathes of houses behind our community, Resaurie has retained its unique character as a quiet hamlet, set apart, and I genuinely fear that if this development in front of our homes goes ahead Resaurie will be swallowed up in a large suburban sprawl, and lose its character, amenity and beautiful views so treasured by its residents. The visual impact of a development of 1,300 houses in front of this small community of houses dotted along a narrow single track, tree-lined, dead-end road will be extremely damaging. In an ideal world I would prefer it if this development proposal is scrapped and no houses or other buildings be erected on the parcel of fields facing our homes. However, if a masterplan for this development is drawn up I strongly urge planners to retain a strip of greenfield between Resaurie and the new scheme to allow our community to retain its character. It would be a disgrace if Resaurie was allowed to be strangled by being encircled by strips of high density housing, with no thought being given to the existing thriving little community that is already there.We who are lucky enough to live here enjoy a peaceful atmosphere with one of the most stunning outlooks in Inverness. I feel strongly that Resaurie should be protected. Local development plans should consider the environment and surroundings of the people who already live in the area and should strive to retain and enhance these surroundings, not destroy them. I respectfully request that the boundary line of the development be set back some way from the fence line of the houses in Resaurie to ensure that a section of green field separates our community from this proposed Ashton Farm development. Resaurie is currently separated from the housing schemes behind it by the railway line and a strip of woodland, which gives the community a definite boundary. I feel this masterplan should also include a definite boundary of undeveloped fields between Resaurie and the Ashton Farm scheme to save our distinct community and allow it to keeps its identity.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	04260	Name	Andrew Bradshaw	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN82-Ashton Farm		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Ideally I would like the proposed plan to be abolished completely but, recognising that this is unlikely, I would ask that the proposed plan should end at least two fields' distance from the border line of the plan to the houses that currently exist in Reasurie.

Representation

Resuarie is a community of its own with its own identity, being neither an annex of Smithton nor of Cradlehall. For many years, this clearly identifiable settlement has enjoyed a demarcation from the other two larger communities, but we have seen more and more houses grow up around us. We have already had to endure a large development of flats at the Smithton end of Caulfield Road North which we believe will have a significant impact on the single track road. Now we are being asked to accept proposals for a further 1,300 homes or community, business, industrial or non residential institution use which will back on to our back garden. The visual amenity which we will enjoy, looking on to the Black Isle and beyond, will be destroyed. We will become absorbed in a greater Easter Inverness urban sprawl with no demarcation from Raigmore to Culloden. We will lose our identity. However, I have to accept that the current culture within the council seems to include a determination to develop on any suitable plot of land, irrespective of demand, and so I would respectfully ask that consideration be given to the establishment of a buffer zone of at least two fields between the existing houses in Resaurie and the boundary line for the proposed plan. I feel that, while being far from ideal, and while still impacting severely on the visual amenity that we currently enjoy, this this would represent some form of compromise between the current proposal and the wishes of the residents here. It would also constitute some sort of break between where Inverness ends and Resaurie starts which would allow us to continue to have some degree of separation from the spread of the city. I would also ask that consideration be given not to use Caulfield Road North to access teh proposed Development. I am concerned that the single track Caufield Road North is simply not wide enough to support access to the size of development currently envisaged. The road has already been recently altered to cater for the Barratt's development of flats at the end of this road, and we are currently having to adapt to the consequences of that. Many people walk along this road as an access into the city, many of those are young children travelling to Cradlehall Primary School or Smithton School. Cyclists also use this road regularly and so do horses. While it is a clear road with a 30mph speed limit, to all intents and purposes it is used in the same way as a country lane in its current state. The fact that houses front directly onto it in many sections means that widening it is impossible and it simply could not carry the traffic that a development of the size planned would generate. I recognise the need for change and I recognise the need for development, but in line with what we have already had to face from the Barratt's development, I honestly believe this latest proposal to bring the development area right up to the garden fences of the houses that have been in Resaurie for many years, and enjoyed the benefits of spacial and visual amenity, would be brutally excessive, rapacious act which would serve neither existing residents nor the intended land users to their satisfaction. Resaurie has traditionally been a semi rural idyl, enjoyed by the people who live here. The proposal in its current state is for a development that will be very much right in our faces. If it has to go ahead we would respectfully ask that a distance of two fields is kept between what we have and what you plan which may at least give us the illusion that we have not lost everything.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	00324	Name	Dr Donald Boyd	Organisation	Westhill Community Council
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	IN82	
Reference	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land		Type	Support	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Representation

East Inverness District Park: Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land (IN82) We invite the Highland Council to initiate a specific action plan immediately for the District Park itself, so that the park can be established without further delay. We particularly welcome the Council’s intention in the Proposed Action Programme Nov 2013 to prepare Supplementary Guidance on this and other Ashton Farm-related issues by Summer 2014. Provision for a District Park in East Inverness was also included in the Inverness Local Plan adopted in March 2006, so that action to initiate its provision is long overdue. As the IMFPLDP states concerning West Inverness: “The best way to protect greenspace is to make positive use of it.” (Para 4.10). The recognition that parkland is useful for flood control is particularly relevant in view of the established flooding risk. Ashton Farm (IN82), Stratton (IN83), Housing (Para 2.10) and East Inverness expansion (Para 4.15) We continue to oppose the proposed expansion of the city into the East Inverness area for the reasons described in detail in our former responses to the Main Issues Report 2012 and the HwLDP adopted on 5 April 2012. "Green corridors" through open farmland must be retained in East Inverness and not only adjacent to the A96 corridor developments. The planned park at Ashton Farm is welcome but not sufficient. The open farmland and green space so close to the city would be the envy of many councils. It must remain undeveloped to give the city space to "breathe" and retain its image as "green Inverness". If the city moves eastward, we will need this green area within the city and not only on its outskirts. We strongly object to any further housing in the Ashton Farm area since approval has been granted already for 2475 houses in the neighbouring Stratton Farm development. The established flood risk in this area should influence the decision in favour of retail, business and even industrial development rather than residential housing, and this should be considered along with our comments on industrial development at the former Longman Landfill site. Historically, developer contributions rarely materialized until a large part of the development was completed, being dependant on house sales. Infrastructure such as schools, medical surgeries, roads, water and sewerage have struggled to cope with extra housing. The argument that developer contributions cannot finance "new builds" is inadequate and there needs to be a scheme of phased development so that infrastructure can keep pace with development. We note the attempt to do so in the Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions adopted by the PED Committee on 13 March 2013. The public perception is that infrastructure lags too far behind development. The credit crisis teaches us the importance of the correct balance between profit for private companies and the risk of failure being carried by the public purse. The uncertainty about developer funds in the West Link teaches us that developer contributions need to be secured in a manner that minimises risk to the Council. In our submission to the Main Issues Report Spring 2012 (Annex B) our collective community council submission said: “We have been told by planning officials that the previous 25% settlement expansion policy will be removed because local communities used it too often against the wishes of developers. We are concerned that these earlier principles of sustainable development are being replaced with exponential growth.” This was said in the context of Croy and Cawdor, and we note that some redress is planned for Croy. This should not be ad hoc, but consistent, sustainable and testable principles need to be available for all developments to limit the current "urban sprawl" which is putting pressure on existing services.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	04217	Name	The Seafeld Farm Trust	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Mr Ken Bowlts		Bowlts Chartered Surveyors	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.15	
Reference	IN82		Type	Support	Comment Late

Comment Changes

Representation

We write on behalf of our clients, The Seafeld Farm Trust, the owners of part of site IN82, identified within the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan as “Ashton Farm and adjoining land”. We attach a copy of the East Inverness Plan overlaid with our clients’ ownership shown cross-hatched and outlined in red. We write to confirm our clients’ continued support of the inclusion of their land within the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan and their hope that the land can be brought forward for development in early course.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	01923	Name	Mr Neil Hornsby	Organisation	Highlands and Islands Green Party
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	3.Strategy for Growth Areas		Paragraph	4	
Reference	inverness		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

As per representation.

Representation

Inverness District Park: We welcome the provision for a district park in East Inverness (though we note this was also a provision of the 2006 Inverness local plan!). We (therefore) particularly welcome the Council’s intention to prepare supplementary guidance on this and other Ashton Farm-related issues, and by Summer 2014. Inverness bus and rail stations: We are particularly disappointed with (p 33 of the Transport Appraisal) the designation of relocating the bus station nearer to the rail station as a ‘long-term aspiration’. The Council makes much of its plans to revitalise the city-centre. Arguably, the bus and rail stations relocation issue needs to be addressed first and as a priority, so that other redevelopment plans can be drawn up around that plan. Putting off this key issue makes a nonsense of further discussion about city-centre redevelopment. West and East Links: The Council makes much of its proposals for West and East Links, but as the Council knows, the business case for the West Link is very weak, and no business case at all has been made by the Council for an East Link. If the Council is so set on a West Link, it should comprise a bridge for pedestrians and cyclists only, which would give ready access to the Bught Park/Whin Island facilities for those staying to the East of the canal and river. The East Link proposal should be dropped entirely – there is little or no traffic demand for it, and its imposition would decimate the Beechwood and planned Aston District Park. Rail: We would welcome a specific provision for a Beechwood/Inverness Light-Rail Shuttle and Halt to be included in the Plan. The case for this facility is strong, and growing stronger, particularly with the recent planning application for student accommodation at Rose St. (NB The halt would be ‘off’ the main-line, in a siding. We would not expect main-line trains to stop at the halt). We anticipate that the shuttle would run approx every twenty minutes. Such provision would tie-in well with the Council’s proposals for a Park-and-Ride facility Energy-from-waste plant provision: We very much welcome the proposals in the draft Plan to make more use of the Longman area for industrial purposes. However, we object in the strongest possible terms – and indeed we see no reason to include - any proposal to designate any part of this area, here or elsewhere in Inverness, for an energy-from-waste facility. There has been no prior public consultation specific to this proposal on this, a well-known controversial issue, with potential wide ranging impacts, and no business case is provided in the draft Plan. The current text goes on to state that the Council will produce a masterplan/development brief for the area; we welcome that intention, which would comprise a useful starting point for any debate on the detailed future use of the site.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN82	Ashton Farm and Adjoining Land	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------------------	--

Customer Number	00985	Name	Macdonald Hotels	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Administrator Yvonne Macdonald		G H Johnston Building Consultants	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN84		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

1. Separate out our clients’ land from this allocation and show it as a stand alone housing allocation or as an extension to housing allocation IN76. 2. Indicate the requirement for a master plan/development brief. 3. Clarify the extent of transport improvements required or cross reference to the HwLDP and refer to the need for a Transport Assessment if proposals brought forward in advance of wider improvements to the network. 4. The Plan should explain: (a) how the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar can be determined; (b) What a recreation access management plan is; and (c) why mitigation works are required in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail for land allocations distant from it.

Representation

Our client, Macdonald Hotels Ltd, owns the former Stratton Lodge Hotel (IN76) and adjoining land to south, the smaller part of IN84. The fact that the Proposed Plan continues support the inclusion of the land for development is welcomed, albeit mixed uses. However, as with previous stages of the preparation of the LDP, the Proposed Plan still fails to clarify the servicing and phasing relative to the Highland wide LDP provisions. This is not helpful and neither is the lack of clarity from Transport Scotland over the proposed strategic road network in the area and local connections to it. There is no reference to the Council producing a master plan/development brief as the Plan does for IN82. At least this might produce a development framework that clarifies the future road network and related/required off site improvements to serve the development of IN84. The reference in the draft Schedule 4 response to our comments on the MIR about dependency upon others for transport improvements was all too easily dismissed as being “noted” and then by stating that this “is a reality given the site’s location and need for connectivity to local and strategic road networks.” The response goes on to say that “there is no quantitative need to accelerate the supply of housing land within or close to the City. Earlier phased proposals would have to be justified by developer funded transport assessment and not be prejudicial to sensible future transport improvement options.” However, our clients consider that the survival of the former Stratton Lodge Hotel Listed building depends upon the ability to bring forward proposals for housing development on IN76 in conjunction with the development of their part of IN84. The list of transport provisions in the HwLDP relating to the development of the area to 2016 as per Phase 1 is extensive and, as previously asserted, our clients are concerned that most of these provisions/requirements will depend on the action of others. As such, development at Stratton Lodge/Milton of Culloden will be significantly delayed whilst commitments are made. For example, the recent consultation exercise by Transport Scotland on options for dualling the A96 gave no confidence that even the improvements between the Smithton and Inverness Retail and Business Park roundabouts would be delivered in the near future. It also omitted details of the East Link between the A96 and A9 which the strategy for delivery development across the Corridor, as indicated in the HwLDP, is based upon and where there is a requirement that development of the later phases of Stratton have to contribute to. Our client fully understands the need for the link between the A9 and A96 through East Inverness but has concerns about its route, the connectivity with his and adjoining development land, its deliverability and the nature of the major junctions with both the A9 and A96. It is still not clear whether this Strategic Link Road has to be completed in its entirety in advance of commencing Phase 2 or what the timescale is for its completion. There has also been some doubt in the past about whether the section through Ashton Farm (part of IN82) can be completed as it may remain in agricultural use for some considerable period of time. It is also unclear if Transport Scotland will commit to the building of the East Link. This is not part of the current consultation exercise on the A96 dualling and Transport Scotland officials attending the recent exhibition for this advised that the East Link will be the subject of yet another consultation exercise in the Spring of 2014. This will presumably follow up on the one conducted for the Inshes to Nairn link early in 2012 at which there was a notable absence of detail about the nature and timing of the provision of local road connections and improvements required to open up development land at Stratton. Our main concern here is whether there is a need to upgrade Barn Church Road from the A96 Smithton roundabout to Smithton in advance of any of our client’s land being developed (both IN76 and part of IN84). In addition, the former Stratton Lodge Hotel and immediate grounds are indicated as a Phase 1 housing site in the HwLDP but we are concerned that this may not be feasible or permissible without allowing access through the open part of their land, indicated as Phase 2. Please see attached plan of the preferred means of access. As previously stated but not fully addressed by the Council, it is vital that the Stratton Lodge area is not land-locked or hindered by the uncertainty over the timing of key transport infrastructure. As such, we would prefer that the open part of our clients’ land and forming part of IN84 is separated from that allocation (as it is in terms of ownership) and shown as a housing site. The intention here is to allow proposals for its development to come forward in the same timescale as IN76. Our clients have recently had to deal with the fall-out from further extensive vandalism of the former Listed hotel (a serious fire), which has more or less completely

destroyed the building. If the building can be saved, which is a serious doubt, at the very least remedial works need to be undertaken in the near future. In doing so our clients have to be mindful of the development potential and how realistic the provisions of the LDP are to allow an acceptable proposal to be prepared and delivered. The feasibility of restoring the building also depends on a degree of enabling development within the grounds, where flood risk and tree assessments allow. The alternative would be to promote development on the adjoining open land to the south. This is the smaller part of IN84 which is also in our clients' ownership. If this cannot be achieved and if the development of IN76 alone triggers off the need to meet the extensive list of developer requirements and/or await implementation of many of the transport provisions listed in the HwLDP, then we anticipate that any remaining hope of saving the Listed building will disappear. We also seek clarification about the meaning of some of the "Requirements" listed under this allocation. How can the adverse effect on the integrity of the Inner Moray Firth SPA/Ramsar be determined? What is a "recreation access management plan"? Why would mitigation works in connection with the Inverness–Nairn Coastal Trail be required for the development of this allocation?

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN84	Milton of Culloden	
--------------	----------------	------	--------------------	--

Customer Number	04110	Name	Caspian UK	Organisation	Caspian UK
-----------------	-------	------	------------	--------------	------------

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)	Mr Scott Mackay	Mackay Planning
---	-----------------	-----------------

Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	
---------	---------------------------	-----------	--

Reference	IN85 - West of Eastfield Way	Type	Support	Comment Late	No
-----------	------------------------------	------	---------	--------------	----

Comment Changes

Representation

The site has been refused consent twice now for alternative uses in order to protect the city centre. Inverness needs good quality available employment land kept for Class 4 and 5 uses and no other uses. This development of this site should only be for business/office uses or other uses compatible with the completion of the business park. Maintaining the Business allocation is important to achieving this. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) requires planning authorities to ensure that there is a range and choice of marketable sites and locations for business allocated in development plans. This site meets those requirements and can be well serviced and brought forward within the local plan period. It is accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN85	West of Eastfield Way	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------------	--

Customer Number	00944	Name	Inverness Estates	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Mr Brian Muir		Muir Smith Evans	
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN85	Type	Change	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Site IN85 (West of Eastfield Way) should be allocated for mixed-use commercial development, supportive of the function of Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park as a whole. The allocation should indicate that such development should include business accommodation, commercial leisure facilities, restaurants, drive-through restaurants and ancillary commercial activities. For the avoidance of doubt, retail use is not sought.

Representation

The site was created as part of the original development proposals for Inverness Retail and Business Park. The site was allocated for a hotel complex, and this use was confirmed within the 1994 Inverness and Ardersier Local Plan. In the subsequent Inverness Local Plan, the site was allocated for business development. For over 17 years, the site has been marketed as a development opportunity, so far unsuccessfully. The site owner has had every incentive to attract development to the site. Without development the asset cannot deliver a return on the investment. However, there has been no market interest for business development on the site, either in the form of small pavilions or in the form of headquarters buildings (such as when the site was promoted as a potential location for the new headquarters of Scottish Natural Heritage). Therefore, although the site is set in a prominent location at the entrance to Inverness Retail and Business Park, it does not contribute positively to the setting or function of IRBLP in terms of economic activity, employment generation, or infrastructure support. However, there is currently significant market interest on the part of restaurant and drive-through operators. The only realistic prospect of beneficial economic development taking place on the site will be if a more flexible approach to planning policy is adopted. In support of this representation we attach letters from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1) and Montagu Evans (Doc 2). These represent independent assessments, from both local and national agents, of why there has been no interest in business development on the site in question, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. Also in support of this representation we attach a copy of the Supporting Statement (Docs 3, 4 & 5) which was part of the information submitted with a recent planning application for the site in question (12/04555/PIP). That application was recommended for approval by officers but was refused by committee. Particular attention is drawn to Appendix 1 of that document, where the planning and infrastructure benefits of the proposed land-use and development is clearly set out. Particular attention is drawn to the infrastructure benefits which will be delivered for the Beechwood Campus.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN85	West of Eastfield Way	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------------	--

Customer Number	00944	Name	Inverness Estates	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Mr Brian Muir		Muir Smith Evans	
Section	Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN85		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Site IN85 (West of Eastfield Way) should be allocated for mixed-use commercial development, supportive of the function of Inverness Retail Business and Leisure Park as a whole. The allocation should indicate that such development should include business accommodation, commercial leisure facilities, restaurants, drive-through restaurants and ancillary commercial activities. For the avoidance of doubt, retail use is not sought.

Representation

The site was created as part of the original development proposals for Inverness Retail and Business Park. The site was allocated for a hotel complex, and this use was confirmed within the 1994 Inverness and Ardersier Local Plan. In the subsequent Inverness Local Plan, the site was allocated for business development. For over 17 years, the site has been marketed as a development opportunity, so far unsuccessfully. The site owner has had every incentive to attract development to the site. Without development the asset cannot deliver a return on the investment. However, there has been no market interest for business development on the site, either in the form of small pavilions or in the form of headquarters buildings (such as when the site was promoted as a potential location for the new headquarters of Scottish Natural Heritage). Therefore, although the site is set in a prominent location at the entrance to Inverness Retail and Business Park, it does not contribute positively to the setting or function of IRBLP in terms of economic activity, employment generation, or infrastructure support. However, there is currently significant market interest on the part of restaurant and drive-through operators. The only realistic prospect of beneficial economic development taking place on the site will be if a more flexible approach to planning policy is adopted. In support of this representation we attach letters from Graham & Sibbald (Doc 1) and Montagu Evans (Doc 2). These represent independent assessments, from both local and national agents, of why there has been no interest in business development on the site in question, and why there is not likely to be any interest in the future. Also in support of this representation we attach a copy of the Supporting Statement (Docs 3, 4 & 5) which was part of the information submitted with a recent planning application for the site in question (12/04555/PIP). That application was recommended for approval by officers but was refused by committee. Particular attention is drawn to Appendix 1 of that document, where the planning and infrastructure benefits of the proposed land-use and development is clearly set out. Particular attention is drawn to the infrastructure benefits which will be delivered for the Beechwood Campus.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN85	West of Eastfield Way	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------------	--

Customer Number	00492	Name	Mr Ian Williams	Organisation	Balloch Community Council	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)						
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph			
Reference	IN 86		Type	Support	Comment Late	No

Comment Changes

Representation

It has consistently been the wish of the Balloch residents that these fields remain as open green space. It is therefore entirely appropriate that if development is to take place on this land it is only to provide playing fields for Culloden Academy.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN86	Land North East of Culloden Academy	
--------------	----------------	------	-------------------------------------	--

Customer Number	04432	Name	M Cameron	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		Mr Colin Mackenzie		G H Johnston Building Consultants	
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN87		Type	Change	Comment Late
				No	

Comment Changes

Proposals Map should be adjusted to omit land between the properties 2-8 Moray Park and Barn Church Road which is inappropriately identified for community uses as part of IN87; and that land should either be coloured green or recognised as existing uses, as per the land to the west

Representation

1. This objection concerns the Proposals Map and its presentation of IN87. It refers to land between the properties 2-8 Moray Park Avenue and Barn Church Road identified for community uses with “requirements” to “safeguard for community facilities including allotments, meeting space and neighbourhood shop”. 2. We represent M Cameron, resident at 8 Moray Park Avenue, Culloden and the owner of that property. The property is one of four houses located east of Moray Park Avenue facing from the rear, towards Barn Church Road. The intervening ground - is open space; it has been open space since the Thains/Muir Homes development was built some 35 years ago, and appears to have been integral to the layout of that development. 3. The land is maintained regularly as amenity space, it provides amenity and outlook for the residents that overlook it and an appropriate set for development from Barn Church Road the principal district distributor through Culloden. That separation is given greater importance by the restricted depth (12m) of the rear gardens of the adjoining properties. 4. These circumstances appear to have arisen (in part) as a result of the line of the trunk sewer that runs parallel with the rear boundary of the properties (2-8 Moray Park Avenue) and diverts through the open space, in effect centrally, east to west, dissecting the land to which this objection relates (see diag.). The sewer and its operational safeguards (for which a 10m corridor would be applied) and the configuration of Barn Church Road and Moray Park Avenue (and their junction) would completely nullify any realistic potential for any development on the land in question. 5. This is a small, discrete open space - grass with trees - that is separated from other land with potential under the policy IN87 by structural woodland of high amenity value. The land does not “read” with IN87, it “reads” with the open frontage and parklands which extend west of Moray Park Avenue along the whole length of Barn Church Road as far as Smithton - some 1 km. It is part of the structure of Culloden; the amenity of Barn Church Road as a main thoroughfare, and the separation afforded to some of the districts main residential areas to that route. 6. The Proposals Map should be adjusted to omit land between the properties 2-8 Moray Park Avenue and Barn Church Road identified for community uses as part of IN87; and that land should either be coloured green or recognised as existing uses as is the land to the west; and indeed numerous other incidental open amenity spaces throughout Culloden. 7. The land is not suitable for community facilities including allotments, meeting space and neighbourhood shop for the following reasons: Having regard to the above, the reasons are: • the land in question is separated from the wider IN87 allocation, it comprises only about a twentieth of it and it is physically separated from it. It is has no discernable functional or even visual association with the wider allocation IN87. Its purpose and value is in its existing use. It should not be identified for community use or as “safeguard for community facilities including allotments, meeting space and neighbourhood shop”. • development would impose on a longstanding recognised and established open space that is of value to the residents that overlook it, to users of the main thoroughfare through Culloden and is part of the structure, set back and separation of residential development from the districts main distributor. Development would remove the maturing (planted) trees from the open space that also give the land an association with the parkland to the west. Any community use - other than the purpose of the land as incidental open space - would impose unduly and unnecessarily on the amenity of the adjoining residents; • a trunk sewer running through the land would dissect it and completely nullify any potential for development; • the proximity of the junction of Barn Church Road and Moray Park Avenue offers no reasonable prospect that an access - off one or other or both of these roads - could safely be formed to serve development. This is one of the primary junctions in Culloden and a public transport route and close to an existing staggered junction on the urban distributor network; • the land in question is bound by these roads to the north and west; and by housing to the south and woodland to the east. The line of the trunk sewer and the operational safeguards required for access to it, the (20m) set back from large trees to the east as required by policy and the visibility splays for access, make the proposition that a building, for an intensive community use, with parking and servicing and a safe access to standard, is a completely impractical proposition. The site is too small; • the terms of the Proposed Plan are vague. It presents three “uses” of different character and implications with no indication as to where these might be proposed. However, the land in question comprises some 4% of the allocation IN87. There can be no reasonable presumption (in the context of the whole allocation of 4.3 ha) that it is essential to any of the “uses” proposed; • furthermore, and in any event, allotments and the paraphernalia that goes with them - sheds, fencing, parking, services etc. - would be prominent and intrusive on established amenity at this location; could not be serviced as a result of the access limitations above; and would lack critical mass to be viable as a “community use”; and the use “meeting place” is not recognised in statute and is an inappropriate reference in a development

plan; • finally, there is a well established structure of neighbourhood shops within the Culloden urban district – at Cradlehall, Westhill, Smithton, and Balloch (the established neighbourhood centres) and at Culloden (the district centre): five general stores in total, but with a greater range of shops (baker, butcher etc) in these centres. The Inner Moray Firth Local Plan does not allocate any further land for development in the vicinity of the allocation IN87 – none at all that might offer any hint that a further shop at Moray Park Avenue could be viable. Conclusion The site of this objection - the land between 2-8 Moray Park Avenue and Barn Church - Road is unsuitable in principle for any of the uses the Local Development Plan proposes and it should be deleted from the Proposals Map. It conflicts with amenity, residential amenity, safe access and strategic infrastructure and the value of the land in its existing use as open space. The land is physically and visually detached from the substantive part of the allocation IN87; and is of different character and use. Its use is longstanding and settled as part of an infrastructure/amenity corridor; and it is of the same character and appearance as neighbouring open land that affords a parkland amenity, set back and separation to housing. There is no overriding reason to alter that character and purpose; and it should be retained as existing. The Local Development Plan is vague as to the “uses” and their location; but in any event, the land to which this objection refers is too small to offer any reasonable development potential, nor could it be safely accessed; and the alignment of the sewer through it presents an absolute constraint on its potential for uses other than as existing open space. Our client is disappointed that the planning authority has not recognised the technical constraints imposed by the trunk sewer and access which clearly affect the land. Had these been researched and considered, they ought not to have led to the proposed allocation. Documents Diag: Location of Sewer/Letter dated 26 October 1981 from Divisional Planning Officer Extract Proposals Map

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN87	Land North East of Culloden Academy	
--------------	----------------	------	-------------------------------------	--

Customer Number	00492	Name	Mr Ian Williams	Organisation	Balloch Community Council
-----------------	-------	------	-----------------	--------------	---------------------------

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)		
---	--	--

Section	4.Development Allocations	Paragraph	
---------	---------------------------	-----------	--

Reference	IN 87	Type	Change	Comment Late	No
-----------	-------	------	--------	--------------	----

Comment Changes

Remove the suggested use of 'neighbourhood shop'. Add to this area the field around the Balloch Primary School and Hall.

Representation

We believe it is an inappropriate area for another shop as the communities of Balloch and Culloden are well provided with retail outlets. The field around the school and hall could be used to expand existing community facilities to meet the demand for a playpark, all weather sports surface or community garden.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN87	Land North East of Culloden Academy	
--------------	----------------	------	-------------------------------------	--

Customer Number	03950	Name	James Higgins	Organisation	
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph		
Reference	IN87		Type	Support	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

Representation

My wife and I are delighted to see provision being made for Allotments in Balloch. The nearest existing allotments are on the outskirts of Nairn with, we understand, a substantial waiting list. We are equally delighted that this "green corridor" that effectively separates Balloch and Culloden is not being promoted for housing. This is an important factor in maintaining the individual identities of Culloden and Balloch and avoiding a merger of the two.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN87	Land North East of Culloden Academy	
--------------	----------------	------	-------------------------------------	--

Customer Number	00324	Name	Dr Donald Boyd	Organisation	Westhill Community Council
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	4.Development Allocations		Paragraph	4.17	
Reference	IN88		Type	Change	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

There should be more consideration to the road layout and the speed limit in order to improve road safety at the entrance.

Representation

Para 4.17 IN 88 Easter Muckovie - Caravan Campsite We note the “requirement for site access visibility improvements”, but we continue to express our concerns about road safety because the suggested improvements only address visibility. There should be more consideration to the road layout and the speed limit in order to improve road safety at the entrance. We note that the Settlement Boundary was moved to accomode this solitary business development on the south side of Inverness, and planning permission was granted on 14/9/2010, contrary to the expressed wishes of many residents in the Westhill Community Council letter of 19/3/2010. This is a solitary business development on the tourist route to the historic Culloden Battlefield. We hope that this will not set a precednet for future development outside the Settlement Boundary.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN88	Easter Muckovie	
--------------	----------------	------	-----------------	--

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

IN90 - change from retail

Representation

I am concerned that further expansion of the already considerable retail park east of Inverness will lead to further, reduced demand for retail facilities in Inverness town centre and further erosion of the vibrancy and sustainability of the retail sector in central Inverness, by encouraging further use of the retail park.

Allocated to

Customer Number Name Organisation

Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)

Section Paragraph

Reference Type Comment Late

Comment Changes

We welcome the restriction identified in the proposed plan for this site. As with the Dell of Inshes site allocation, we request that further text is added to the allocation under the 'Requirements' heading to say the following: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Representation

We welcome the restriction identified in the proposed plan for this site. As with the Dell of Inshes site allocation, we request that further text is added to the allocation under the 'Requirements' heading to say the following: 'Any retail development at this location will be restricted to bulky goods retail floorspace in order to protect and support the City Centre'.

Allocated to

Customer Number	03993	Name	Harry H Kelly	Organisation	Barchester Healthcare Ltd
Agent Name amd Organisation (if applicable)					
Section	1.Introduction		Paragraph	Can confirm NO objections to proposed development	
Reference	IMFDP/PP/NN IN90 Bulk Storage Retail Only		Type	Support	Comment Late
					No

Comment Changes

Representation

In response to Neighbour notification October 2013 Acknowledgement by Barchester Healthcare Ltd (adjoining property to development) that they have no objections to proposed development. Proposal in line with Local Plan provision. Harry H Kelly Head of Development Planning Barchester Healthcare Ltd.

Allocated to	East Inverness	IN90	South of Inverness Retail and Business Park	
--------------	----------------	------	---	--